ED 304 865   EC 220 537

AUTHOR   Thousand, Jacqueline S.; Villa, Richard A.
TITLE   Accommodating for Greater Student Variance in Local
              Schools.
PUB DATE   Apr 89
NOTE   29p.; Paper presented at the Preconvention Training
              Program "Exploring the Theory/Practice Link in
              Special Education" at the Annual Convention of the
              Council for Exceptional Children (67th, San
              Francisco, CA, April 2-3, 1989).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
              Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Disabilities; *Educational Practices; Elementary
              Secondary Education; *Heterogeneous Grouping;
              Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional
              Effectiveness; *Mainstreaming; Preschool Education;
              *Public Schools; *Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice
              Relationship

ABSTRACT
              This conference paper identifies and describes
practices which appear to be associated with successful schooling of
students in heterogeneous groupings. Fundamental characteristics of
heterogeneous public schools include actualization of the "zero
reject" principle and implementation of exemplary educational
practices from both general and special education. Instructional
practices described include: outcomes-based instructional models,
instructional practices utilizing peer power, cooperative learning
models, effective use of homogeneous and multi-age groupings,
redefining of school organizational structure, redefining of
professional roles, and creating opportunities for collaboration. The
staff of heterogeneous schools need to acquire common conceptual
frameworks, language, and technical skills through inservice
training. Areas of training could include collaboration, best
educational practices, and use of the clinical supervision model.
(JDD)

ACCOMMODATING FOR GREATER STUDENT VARIANCE
IN LOCAL SCHOOLS

Jacqueline S. Thousand, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
University of Vermont

Richard A. Villa, Ed.D.
Director of Pupil Personnel Services
Winooski School District
Winooski, Vermont

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to identify the
fundamental characteristics of successful heterogeneous
public schools. Included are specific examples of
educational and organizational practices which enable
schools to accommodate greater student variance. These
examples are derived from the results of research and model
demonstration efforts as well as the authors' first hand
experiences in Vermont schools which have made the
commitment to educating all of their students in
heterogeneous groupings within their neighborhood public
schools.

The purpose of this paper is to identify and describe
those practices which appear to be associated with
successful schooling of students in heterogeneous groupings.
Before discussing these practices, it is important to
clarify what we view as fundamental characteristics of
successful heterogeneous public schools.

First, these schools are comprehensive. They are
comprehensive in that they actualize the "zero reject"
principle (Lilly, 1971) by welcoming and educating all
students in their own "home" schools; they accommodate the
unique variations in students' educational needs through
responsive and fluid instructional options rather than
"pigeonholing" students into one of several standing,
standard programs (Skrtic, 1987). They also are
comprehensive in that they expand the body of
decision-makers concerned with individual student,
instructional, and organizational issues to include not just
a small, select group of administrators and instructional
personnel, but to include also members of the broader school
and general community (e.g., parents, students,
paraprofessionals, school nurses, guidance counselors, lunch
room staff, community members, generic human service agency
personnel, community employers). Finally, they are
comprehensive in that they look beyond academic achievement
as the major or sole criterion of school success and promote
the mastery of social and life skills requisite to success
in work, home, recreational and community life beyond high
school.

The second characteristic of successful heterogeneous schools is the great amount of effort put forth to ensure that school personnel are as effective as they can be in their instructional practices. The leadership of these schools are bent upon merging and successfully implementing exemplary educational practices from both general and special education in order to take advantage of the knowledge base and demonstrated benefits of both sets of practices. They do this by making available to all instructional and administrative staff timely and intensive training and supervision related to targetted practices.

This paper is structured to provide the reader with brief descriptions and specific examples of educational and organizational practices and beliefs which promote student success in heterogeneous schools. These examples are derived from the results of research and model demonstration efforts as well as the authors' first hand experiences in Vermont schools which have made the commitment to educating all of their students in heterogeneous groupings.

Instructional Practices

Outcomes-Based Instructional Models

Common to most outcomes-based models is a sequence of six teacher behaviors (Block & Anderson, 1975; Brookover, et.al, 1982; Vicker, 1988). First, teachers engage in diagnostic procedures to determine whether students have the prerequisites for the lesson or unit. Additional

instruction on the prerequisites is offered to students who need it. Secondly, teachers create an atmosphere of anticipation or readiness to learn by giving the students a brief description of what they will learn, why they are learning it, and what they will be able to do with the new learning. Next, teachers provide "best shot" instruction; they select and implement the instructional strategies which they judge to have the best chance of enabling all students to attain the lesson's objectives. Following best shot instruction, teachers structure opportunities for guided practice in which each student's progress is monitored. The objective here is to assure that students have the skills and procedural knowledge to successfully engage in independent practice.

The fifth teacner behavior involves the administration of a formative assessment or test to determine whether students have mastered the lesson's or unit's objectives. Students who need additional instruction receive it, while those who have mastered the objectives engage in enrichment activities. The sixth and final teacher behavior involves the summative assessment of students' mastery of a cumulative set of objectives from a number of lessons or units.

Instructional Practices Utilizing Peer Power

A major resource which can facilitate the education of all learners within regular education is the use of "peer power." In our estimation, peer power is a key variable in meeting the needs of a diverse student population within regular education settings. Schools which effectively utilize peer resources do so in a variety of ways. Among the strategies employed are peer tutor and peer buddy systems, cooperative learning models, and the inclusion of peers on the individualized educational planning teams of students with identified handicaps.

Peer tutor systems. Same-age and cross-age peer tutoring systems are two forms of peer power upon which heterogeneous schools need to capitalize. In a review of the literature regarding peer tutoring, Pierce, Stahlbrand, and Armstrong (1984) have cited the benefits of peer tutoring to tutees, tutors, and instructional staff.

Good and Brophy (1984) have suggested that peers trained as tutors may be more effective than adults in teaching particular content such as mathematical concepts (Cohen & Stover, 1981). They further speculate that their superior effectiveness lies in their tendency to be more directive than adults; their familiarity with the material and their resultant understanding of the tutee's potential frustration with the material; and their use of more meaningful and age-appropriate vocabulary and examples.

Peer tutoring partnerships are a cost-effective way for teachers to increase the amount of individualized instructional attention available to their students (Armstrong, Stahlbrand, Conlon, & Pierson, 1979). By using same-age and cross-age tutors, teachers can add instructional resources to the classroom without adding additional adult personnel.

Peer_support_networks_and_peer_buddies. Historically, some students, particularly students with disabilities, have been excluded from certain aspects of their school life (e.g., school clubs and other co-curricular activities, school dances, attendance at athletic events). Peer support groups or networks have been established in some schools and have proven to be effective in enabling these students to participate more fully in the life of their schools.

The purpose of a peer support network is to enrich another student's school life.

> Peer support is a bunch of kids working together to break
> down the barriers that society has built into the public's
> idea of what the norm is. Teachers and peers need to be
> trained; they need to understand that the goal of peer
> support is not competitive academics. The goal is to belong,
> to meet new people, to learn to break down the barriers.
> (Budelmann, Farrel, Kovach, & Paige, 1987)

Peer buddies are different from peer tutors in that their involvement with other students is primarily non-academic. The diversity of support which peer buddies can provide other students is limitless. For example, a peer buddy might assist a student with physical disabilities to use and get items from his or her locker or "hang out" in the halls with a student before or after classes. A peer

buddy might accompany a student to a ball game after school
or speak to other students, teachers or parents about the
unique physical, learning, or social challenges that they
see their friend facing and mee 'ng on a daily basis.

Peer support networks have helped to make heterogeneous
schools places where students' learning is expanded to
include an understanding of one another's lives.

Cooperative learning models

The benefits of the use of cooperative learning groups
have been well documented. Cooperative learning experiences
with heterogeneous groups of learners tend to promcte higher
achievement than competitive or individually structured
learning experiences (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, &
Skon, 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1987a). This has been found
to be true across grade levels, subject areas, and different
types of learning tasks (e.g., concept attainment,
retention, verbal problem solving, motor performance).
Furthermore, students who participate in cooperative
learning experiences, compared with competitive and
individualistic ones, like their teachers and the subject
matter more (Johnson & Johnson, 1987a).

Cooperative learning experiences, compared with
competitive and individualistic ones, also promote higher
levels of self-esteem as well as positive relationships,
acceptance, support, trust and liking among students who are
different in ethnic membership, gender, social class, and

the need for special educational services (Johnson &
Johnson, 1987a; Johnson, Johnson, & Maruyama, 1983).

Critical_components_of_cooperative_learning_models.
Cooperative learning models, as defined by Johnson & Johnson
(1987c), can be differentiated from other types of small
group learning because of the presence of four critical
components. The first component is positive
interdependence; the perception among the students in the
group that they "sink or swim together." This perception
may be created by defining mutual goals; dividing the task,
resources, or information among group members; assigning
different roles (e.g., recorder, reader, timekeeper,
observer) to members; or giving all members a common reward
or grade. The second critical component is face-to-face
interaction among students; the third, individual
accountability for learning the assigned materials or
performing the assigned task to mastery; and the fourth, the
appropriate use_of_social,_interpersonal,_and_small_group
skills. As a rule, it is recommended that the membership of
cooperative learning groups be heterogeneous in ability and
personal characteristics (Johnson & Johnson, 1987c).

The_role_of_the_teacher_in_cooperative_learning_models.
When implementing cooperative learning, the teacher becomes
more of a "facilitator of learning" or a "manager of the
learning environment" than a "presenter of information"
(Glasser, 1986). As a facilitator or manager,
the teacher is responsible for five major sets of strategies
(Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, & Roy, 1964):

1. Clearly specifying the (academic and collaborative)
    objectives for the lesson

2. Making decisions about placing students in learning
    groups before the lesson is taught

3. Clearly explaining the task, goal structure
    (positive goal interdependence), and learning
    activity to the students

4. Monitoring the effectiveness of the cooperative
    learning groups and intervening to provide task
    assistance (such as answering questions and
    teaching task skills) or to increase students'
    interpersonal and group skills

5. Evaluating students' achievement and helping
    students discuss how well they collaborated with
    each other. (p. 26)

Responding to individual differences through
cooperative learning models. One question often asked by
teachers new to cooperative learning is, "How do I integrate
a low achieving student or a student with handicaps into
heterogeneous cooperative learning groups?" Several
strategies have proven to be effective (Johnson & Johnson,
1987c). One strategy is to assign the student a specific
role which promotes participation and minimizes anxiety
about collaborating with more capable students. Examples of
appropriate roles are praising members for participation,
summarizing group answers, and checking that all members can
explain the group's answer. A second strategy is to

pretrain these students in select collaborative skills so they have unique expertise to bring to the group.

A third set of st ategies involves adapting lesson requirements for individual students. This can be done in a number of ways. Different success criteria can be used for each group member; the amount of material each group member is expected to learn can be adjusted; or group members can study and coach one another on different problems, lists, reading materials, words, and so forth. If a test is given, the entire group might receive bonus points based upon the extent to which members exceed their individualized success criteria.

Peer_membership_on_individualized_educational_planning teams. Peers also have proven to be invaluable members of individual educational planning teams for students with identified handicapping conditions. They are particularly helpful in identifying appropriate social integration goals to be included on a student's IEP.

Students also have been enlisted to assist in planning for the transition of students with handicaps from more segregated to regular education settings. Recently, the entire student body of a small junior high school met with school staff in small groups to plan the transition of a student with multiple handicaps from a segregated residential facility to their seventh grade. The advice they gave was enlightening, ranging from suggestions for an augmentative communication device which they felt would best

help the new student communicate his needs to what kind of notebook he should have to "fit in" (Scagliotti, 1987).

How peer power enables heterogeneous schools to be successful. Effective teachers try to take advantage of every resource that is available to them to promote student success in both academic and affective domains. Generating peer power through the use of peer tutoring and peer buddy systems, cooperative learning models and peer membership on IEP planning teams facilitates the education of all learners within regular education classrooms by increasing the human resources available to respond to the diverse instructional and psychological needs of a heterogeneous student body.

Effective Use of Homogeneous and Multi-Age Groupings

Homogeneous grouping, also know as ability grouping, clusters students of similar "ability." Although this practice is one of the most controversial issues in education, its use is widespread in American schools. Given that American schools and school teachers seem to be inclined to group students homogeneously in spite of evidence questioning the practice, the question becomes, "Is there a place for homogeneous grouping in schools?" In his recent review of the effects of ability grouping on the achievement of elementary school students, Slavin (1987) answers this question with a qualified "yes."

In theory, teachers group students according to performance or ability in order to more closely match the

pace and content of their instruction with the learning
characteristics of different students. However, in
practice, ability grouping frequently is misused or abused.
Noting this, Slav'n wisely cautions that research-based
ability grouping plans be used only when the following
conditions can be met (Slavin, 1987):

1. The grouping plan must measurably reduce student
    heterogeneity in the specific skill being taught;
2. The plan must be flexible enough to allow teachers
    to respond to misassignments and changes in student
    performance level after initial placement; and
3. Teachers must actually vary their pace and level of
    instruction to correspond to students' levels of
    readiness and learning rates. (p. 322)

Slavin also recommends that students be regrouped for
no more than two subject areas, spending the majority of
their school day in heterogeneous groupings. This increases
the likelihood that low-achieving students or students with
handicaps will have a heterogeneous student group as their
primary reference, avoiding the potential detrimental
psychological effects of being associated with a low ability
track or a special class (Posenbaum, 1980; Schafer & Olexa,
1971).

Redefining School Organizational Structure

A number of characteristics of the organizational structure of the traditional American school stand in the way of heterogeneous schooling. First, most schools continue to stratify their students into high, medium, and low groups through heavy reliance upon segregated or pull-out special and compensatory education service delivery models, ability groupings, and tracking systems.

Secondly, most schools continue to rely upon a "lock step" curriculum approach (Stainback & Stainback, 1985); that is, what students are taught is determined not by their assessed individual needs, but the grade level to which they are assigned. Students are placed in a grade according to their age and expected to master the predetermined curriculum by the end of the school year. If they fail, they are retained, referred for special education or compensatory education services and pulled out of the regular classroom for part or all of their day.

Finally, most teachers, whether they have been labelled regular or special educators, generally are expected to work alone. Few schools encourage or expect instructional personnel to team teach with one another; and little, if any, time is structured into the work day for collaboration or planning with others.

Schools which are educating all of their students in heterogeneous environments have attempted to eliminate these and other organizational barriers in a number of ways.

Specifically, they have redefined professional roles; created opportunities for collaboration; and created common conceptual frameworks, knowledge, and language among school staff through inservice training.

Redefining Professional Roles and Dropping Professional Labels

"I used to think of myself as a speech and language pathologist; but now I think of myself as a teacher who happens to have training and expertise in the area of communication" (Harris, 1987). The redefinition of job functions is viewed as necessary in order for a school to make the shift from categorical educational programs (e.g., regular classroom, special classes, pull-out services for speech and language and compensatory education services) to a single unified system where broad-based support ultimately would be availab' to all teachers and any of the students (Villa, 1988).

Job titles and the formal or informal role definitions trar accompany them determine the way in which a person behaves within a school (Brookover, et. al, 1982). For exa ple, the title, resource room teacher, may carry with it a set of expectations that (1) this teacher works in a separate room, (2) students must leave the regular classroom to get this person's services, and (.) only those students identified as special education eligible can or will be allowed to benefit from this person's expertise. This person, however, has a great deal of training and expertise

in assessing students' strengths and needs, task and concept analysis, designing and implementing classroom and behavior management programs, and other areas which, if shared with classroom teachers, might help them to maximize their responsiveness to the diverse educational needs of students.

Suppose the resource room teacher label was dropped and this person's role was redefined to be a support person who was expected to provide technical assistance to any number of educators in the building through modeling, consultation, team teaching and inservice training. Such a change in job definition should result in an exchange of skills, thus increasing the number of students whose needs may be met in heterogeneous classrooms.

The Winooski School District is an example of a Vermont school district which has taken a number of steps to redefine roles and responsibilities of school personnel in order to successfully educate all students in general education settings. First of all, a single Department of Pupil Personnel Services has been created to unite guidance, health, gifted and talented, special education, compensatory education, and early childhood services and personnel. The former special education administrator directs this department and collaborates with the other administrators to jointly supervise and evaluate all district instructional personnel. These changes have eliminated the preexisting departmental boundaries that had administratively separated programs and have facilitated the coordination of services and sharing of professional expertise.

Secondly, the roles of professional and
paraprofessional personnel in the new Department of Pupil
Personnel Services have become primarily consultative in
nature. Whereas they historically had delivered services
exclusively through pull-out programs, they now are expected
to consult and team teach with general educators. The
elementary communication specialist, for example, has "come
out of the closet" and now delivers speech and language
instruction mainly by team teaching with classroom teachers.

In a final move to alter professional roles and
responsibilities, the special education classes for students
with moderate and severe handicaps were closed. Students
who would have been in these classes now are educated in
age-appropriate classrooms and integrated community and
vocational settings. The responsibility for supporting
these students is distributed among a cadre of educators who
collectively have skills in health, vocational,
communication, counseling, and functional (i.e., domestic,
community, recreational, vocational) as well as traditional
(e.g., reading, math) curriculum domains.

Expecting and Creating Opportunities for Collaboration

"The integration of professionals within a school
system is a prerequisite to the successful integration of
students. We cannot ask our students to do those things
which we as professionals are unwilling to do" (Harris,
1987).

Local schools have within them a natural and often times untapped pool of "experts." Each teacher's unique skills and interests may be of value to another teacher or a broader range of students than those for whom he or she is directly responsible. A key to successfully meeting the educational needs of all students is the development of a collaborative relationship among the school staff so that expertise may be shared. "A teacher is more willing to share responsibility for a student who presents challenges when that student comes with a team to support him" (Tetreault, 1988).

Establishing a collaborative teaming process. In a number of Vermont schools a problem-solving and decision-making process referred to as "collaborative teaming" is employed to promote the sharing of expertise (Thousand, Fox, Reid, Godek, Williams, & Fox, 1986). Collaborative teaming is a process in which team members work cooperatively to achieve a common, agreed-upon goal. The process involves the application of the principles of cooperative group learning, as forwarded by Johnson and Johnson (1987c), to adult planning groups. In the words of a collaborative team member,

> We've taken the technology of cooperative group learning for kids and applied it to our adult teams. We meet as cooperative groups. Everyone shares in the common goal, that goal being the most appropriate education for the students we serve. (Cravedi-Cheng, 1987)

Creating opportunities for teams to meet. One issue which all schools attempting to implement a collaborative teaming process must address is how the school's

organizational structure can be modified to create
opportunities for staff to meet as teams.   One Vermont
school district has dealt with this issue by contracting a
permanent substitute who rotates among schools and relieves
regular classroom teachers so they may participate in
meetings concerning students in their class

Another school district has instituted th practice of
reserving every Friday morning for team meetings. All
professional and paraprofessional support personnel (e.g.,
special education teachers, nurses, counselors) are expected
to hold their Friday mornings open until they are notified
of scheduled meeting times for students on their caseload.
During the times when they are not scheduled for meetings,
they relieve classroom teachers so that they may attend
their Friday meetings.

It is important for administrators to appreciate and
support this type of collaborative time by coordinating the
school's schedule so events are scheduled other than during
times when collaboration occurs, setting an expectation that
teachers will collaborate, and arranging incentives and
rewards for collaboration.

Creating Common Conceptual Frameworks, Knowledge, and Language Through Inservice Training

For school personnel to be most effective in their
collaborations with one another and their instruction of
students, they need to share common concepts, vocabulary,

and training in instructional strategies which are founded
in sound research and theory.

Staff of heterogeneous schools need to acquire the
conceptual frameworks, language, and technical skills to
communicate about and implement assessment, and
instructional and collaborative teaming practices which
research and theory say will enable them to respond to the
unique needs of a diverse student body.

The authors' reading of the literature and personal
experiences in providing inservice training to staff of
schools attempting to establish more heterogeneous
instructional opportunities for students has led them to
identify several areas in which inservice training may be
needed (Villa, Thousand, & Fox, 1988). One content area in
which all school staff may need training involves
collaboration (Johnson & Johnson, 1987b, 1987d; Thousand, et
al., 1986). As already discussed, school personnel need to
become skillful in implementing a collaborative teaming
model and using interpersonal and small group skills to
function optimally as collaborative team members.

A second area of training would promote knowledge and
positive beliefs regarding current "best educational
practices" in heterogeneous schooling. This training would
examine the characteristics of scnools which general
education researchers have found to be more effective than
others in promoting students' learning and development
(Brookover, et al., 1982). It also would examine that which
special education researchers promote as best educational

practice (Fox, et al., 1986). Armed with this information, school personnel would be equipped to articulate the demonstrated benefits of these practices and argue for the establishment and merger of exemplary practices within their school.

A third content area would cover a variety of instructional practices which enable teachers to effectively accommodate a heterogeneous group of students within general education classrooms. Training might include outcomes-based instructional models (e.g., Block & Anderson, 1975; Hunter, 1982); cooperative group learning models (e.g., Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, & Roy, 1984; Slavin, 1983); computer assisted instruction (e.g., Heerman, 1988); an assessment model which enables teachers to discuss learner characteristics and make decisions about their own instructional behavior (e.g., Lyon & Moats, in press; Lyon & Toomey, 1985); classroom management strategies (e.g., Becker, 1986); methods for teaching positive social skills and reinforcing students' use of these skills in school (e.g., Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman, & Sheldon-Wildgen, 1981; Jackson, Jackson, & Monroe, 1983); and the use of peers as tutors, buddies and members of educational planning teams.

Finally, school supervisory personnel may need some specialized training and practice in using a clinical supervision model (e.g., Cummings, 1985). If the supervisory personnel of a school are to promote teachers' successful and continued implementation of any of the assessment and instructional strategies just mentioned, they

must be skilled in observing, analyzing, and conducting
conferences regarding teacher's instructional performance.

It is important to emphasize here that, whatever the
training content a school's staff elects to study, the
principles of effective instruction should be followed in
the delivery of the content; that is, trainers need to model
multiple and diverse examples of the desired knowledge or
practice, provide guided practice in the application of the
knowledge or practice, and arrange for coaching and feedback
in the actual school situations in which the knowledge or
practice is expected to be employed (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

Beliefs

Heterogeneity is possible

For school personnel to enthusiastically open their
doors to a more diverse student body and promote each
learner's success within regular education classrooms, it is
important for them to believe or, at least temporarily,
suspend disbelief that heterogeneous age-appropriate
classroom environments can meet the unique educational needs
of each student (Thousand, 1985; Nevin & Thousand, 1986).
In other words, they must believe that they can do a quality
job. They also need to trust that they will receive the
material and human resources, technical assistance, and
training which will enable them to effectively do the job.

Often, school and community members take a "show me"
posture. Some embrace the belief that heterogeneous

would have been excluded from regular educational experiences. Students with special educational needs who have spoken out as to the positive effects of heterogeneous schooling focus on their own emotional well-being and sense of belonging. A high school sophomore has commented, "I was in a special class. I've been in regular classes for five years. I'm more a part of the school now" (Budelmann, Farrel, Kovach, & Paige, 1987). A classmate who uses a wheelchair for mobility and who is educated with her peers in heterogeneous classrooms, has stated:

> I feel like I am a part of the school. I am aware of the things that are going on; I've gone to the school car wash and homecoming. I have friends in and out of school, and this helps me feel better about myself. (Budelmann, et al., 1987)

Clearly, both young women recognize their heterogeneous school experiences as a primary source of their feelings of inclusion.

Parents as equal partners

In successful heterogeneous schools, parents are considered valid and valued members of the collaborative team; they are seen as active, contributing members in the educational planning process for their child. To view parents otherwise limits the school's access to the valuable resources which parents offer in identifying their child's strengths and needs, designing realistic and effective interventions, and evaluating the outcomes of their child's education. An appreciation for parents' unique expertise is conveyed in the eloquent words of a parent.

Parents should be thought of as scholars of experience. We
are in it for the distance. We see and feel the continuum.
We have our doctorate in perseverance. We and the system
must be in concert or the vision shrinks (Sylvester, 1987).

Summary

The organizational, instructional and attitudinal
variables presented in this paper influence the success of
students and educational personnel in heterogeneous schools.
We encourage all who are interested in or charged with the
responsibility of planning for school improvement to
carefully examine the practices and beliefs which are
operating in their schools to promote or impede continued
progress toward meeting the diverse needs of all students.
We further encourage the school community to embrace the
belief that there are actions which each individual can take
to positively influence the learning environment of all
students, for "we know that a school can change if the staff
desires to improve or modify beliefs, structures, and
instructional practices" (Brookover et al., 1982, p. 35).
The quality of education provided to this generation of
school children will be determined by the collective
responsible actions of the diverse group of educators and
parents who commit to being life-long learners and students
of the promise which research, current best educational
practice, and creative problem solving offers.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, S. B., Stahlbrand, K., Conlon, M.F., & Pierson, P. M. (1979, April). The cost effectiveness of peer and cross-age tutoring. Paper presented at the International Convention of the Cou· il for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 058).

Becker, W. (1986). Applied psychology for teachers: A behavioral cognitive approach. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates.

Block, J., & Anderson, L (1975). Mastery learning in classroom instruction. New York: MacMillan P·blishing Co.

Blair, K. (1987, October). A parent's perspective on age appropriate placement. Paper presented at Vermont's Least R. .rictive Environment Conference, Burlington, VT.

Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezzotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools: An inservice program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

Budelmann, L., Farrel, S., Kovach, C., Paige, K. (1987, October). Student perspective: Planning and achieving social integration. Paper presented at Vermont's Least Restrictive Environment Conference, Burlington, VT.

Cohen, S.A., & Stover, G. (1981). Effects of teaching sixth-grade students to modify format variables of math work problems. Reading Research Quarterly, 16, 175-200.

Cummings, C. (1985). Peering in on peers. Edmonds, WA: Snohomish Publishing Company.

Donahue, S. (1988, March). Examples of integration in Addison Northeast Supervisory Union. Paper presented at the Teaming for Creative Mainstreaming Conference, Ludlow, VT.

Fox, W., Thousand, J., Williams, W., Fox, T., Towne, P., Reid, R., Conn-Powers, C., Calcagni, L. (1986). Best educational practices '86: Educating learners with severe handicaps. (Monograph No. 6-1) Jurlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Glasser, W. (1986). Control theory in the classroom. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J.E. (1984). Looking into classrooms (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Harris, T., (1987, October). A_speech_and_language
    pathologist's_perspective_on_teaming_to_accomplish
    cooperation_between_and_among_regular_and_special
    educators for the provision of services in the least
    restrictive environment. Paper presented at Vermont's
    Least Restrictive Environment Conference, Burlington,
    VT.

Hazel, J. S., Schumaker, J. B., Sherman, J. A., &
    Sheldon-Wildgen, J. (1981). ASSET:_A_Social_Skills
    Program_for_Adolescents. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Heerman, B. (1988). Teaching_and_learning_with_computers.
    San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hunter, M. (1982). Mastery_teaching. El Segunda, CA: TIP
    Publications.

Jackson, N. F., Jackson, D.A., Monroe, C. (1983). Behavioral
    social_skill_training_materials_-_Getting_along_with
    others:__Teaching_social_effectiveness_to_children.
    Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Johnson, D.W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., &
    Skon, L. (1981). Effe s of cooperative, competitive
    and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A
    meta-analysis. Psychological_Bulletin, 89, 47-62.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1987a). A_meta-analysis_of
    cooperative,_competitive_and_individualistic_goal
    structures. Hilsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1987b). Joining_together:
    Group_theory_and_group_skills (3rd ed.). Englewood
    Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1987c). Learning_together
    and_alone:__Cooperation,_competition,_and
    individualization(2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
    Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1983).
    Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among
    heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A
    theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the
    research. Review_of_Educational_Research, 53, 5-54.

Lyon, R., & Moats, L. (in press). Critical factors in the
    instruction of the learning disabled. Journal_of
    Consulting_and_Clinical_Psychology.

Lyon, R., & Toomey, F. (1985). Neurological, neuropsychological and cognitive-developmental approaches to learning disab lities. _Topics_in_Learning Disabilities._ Montpelier, VT: Vermont Department of Education.

Lilly, M. S. (1971). A training based model for special education. _Exceptional_Children_, _37_, 745-749.

Nevin, A., & Thousand, J. (1986). Limiting or avoiding referrals to special education. _Teacher_Education_and Special_Education_, _9_, 149-161.

Pierce, M. M., Stahlbrand, K., & Armstrong, S. B. (1984). _Increasing_student_productivity_through_peer_tutoring programs._ Austin, TX: Pro-ed.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1980). Social implications of educational grouping. _Review_of_Research_in_Education_, _391_, 361-401.

Scagliotti, L. (1987, December 20). Helping hands: School works to overcome student's handicap. _Burlington_Free Press_, Section B, pp. 1, 10.

Schafer, W.E., & Olexan, C. (1971). _Tracking_and opportunity._ Scranton, PA: Chandler.

Skrtic, (1987). An organizational analysis of special education reform. _Counterpoint_, _8_(2), 15-19.

Slavin, R. E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary school: A best-evidence synthesis. _Review_of_Educational_Research_, _57_, 293-336.

Sylvester, D., (1987, October). _A_parent's_perspective_on transition:__From_high_school_to_what?_ Paper presented at Vermont's Least Restrictive Environment Conference, Burlington, VT.

Thousand, J. (1985). _Social_integration_and_parent involvement:__Special_education_teacher_attitudes_and behaviors._ Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT.

Thousand, J., Fox, T., Reid, R., Godek, J., & Williams, W. (1986). _The_homecoming_model:__Educating_students_who present_intensive_educational_challenges_within_regular education_environments._ (Monograph No. 7-1) Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Thousand, J.S. (1988). Addressing individual differences in the classroom: Are we up to the Job?: A conversation with Reid Lyon, Ph.D. Teacher Education and Special Education, 11, 72-75.

Vicker, T. R. (1988). Learning from an outcomes-driven school district. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 52-55.

Villa, R. (1988, January). Full integration. Paper presented at the Wisconsin's Administrator's Training Project Conference, Eau Claire, WI.

Villa, R., Thousand, J., & Fox, W. (1988). The Winooski Model: A Comprehensive Model for Providing a Quality Education for all Learners. 'ith and Without Handicaps Within an Integrated Public School Setting. (Available from Richard Villa, Winooski School District, Winooski, VT)