A special studies institute on resources for effective teaching was designed to train newly appointed or potential Curriculum Resource Consultants (CRC) who work in conjunction with special education instructional materials centers in Michigan. Objectives of the workshop sequences included the development of teacher-training competencies in the CRC's and the provision of actual kits of training materials. The role of the CRC was defined as providing services to special education staff in the areas of inservice materials and curriculum, material selection, and directed consultation. Eight basic inservice kits (some containing tape cassettes) three supplementary kits, and one participant developed kit were used during the workshop to prepare participants to utilize the kits in their districts. Topics of the kits include the design of an instructional game criterion measures, feedback, building a perceptual-motor experience, and evaluation. Key concepts of the institute were communication, dissemination, and adoption; and CRC's were encouraged to employ all three concepts for effective work with teachers. In evaluation, all participants indicated they would be comfortable in offering inservice training in their own districts. (DB)
RESOURCES FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

SPECIAL STUDY INSTITUTE
July 14 - 18, 1971

CURRICULUM RESOURCE CONSULTANT
Twenty-nine persons came to East Lansing June 14-18, 1971, to participate in a Special Study Institute, Resources for Effective Teaching. The objective was to train Curriculum Resource Consultants (CRCs) for the State of Michigan. Sponsored by the Michigan State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (USOE), the Institute brought together already appointed or potential CRCs to develop initial competencies in their new roles.

The planning and structure of the Institute was based on the assumptions that...

1. The CRC serves educational needs of other teachers;

2. The CRC conducts workshops;

3. The CRC carries on consultations with small groups and individuals related to the effectiveness of the teacher;

4. The CRC maintains channels for receiving and relaying new and timely materials about the improvement of instruction;

5. The CRC serves as a link among three agencies—the local school districts, the State Department of Education and teacher education institutions;
6. The CRC is involved in the use of prepared instructional experiences for teachers;

7. The CRC designs specially-created experiences to meet specific local needs;

Based on their experience in the Institute, the CRCs are now prepared to carry out these objectives.

The Institute program was designed in workshop sequences which would...

1. Develop teacher-training competencies in CRCs;

2. Provide CRCs with actual kits of training materials;

3. Provide the opportunity for the CRCs to develop kits for their own particular needs; and

4. Share their concerns with other members of the group.

WHO ARE THE CRCs?

Institute participants were chosen in accordance with the Division of Special Education proposal for CRCs and state instructional materials centers.

The Division of Special Education expects to endorse the establishment of local, intermediate or regional instructional materials centers for special education. These centers may be developed in conjunction with existing Title II centers or other instructional materials centers already established. Monies for such centers may be provided by the sponsoring district.

In addition, the Division of Special Education expects to endorse the hiring of a reimbursable person to provide services to the special education staff through the center, in regard to:
1. In-service
   Materials
   Curriculum

2. Selection of materials

3. Direct consultation on children’s or
   program needs.

The Curriculum Resource Consultant would be
well versed in all areas of special education... as well as having a knowledgeable background in
curriculum for special education and materials in
special education. He would be hired as a
Curriculum Resource Consultant for 100 percent of
his time, having no classroom assignment. He
might work in conjunction with an existing instruc-
tional materials center director or might in the
future, hold this role. He would be fully cer-
tified in at least one area of special education,
hold a valid Michigan teaching certificate, and
have taught special education successfully for
three years in Michigan. The Curriculum Resource
Consultants would also submit a letter of recom-
mandation for their immediate superior and/or
superintendent.

Such a person would be qualified, with Department
approval, for reimbursement under the clause of
"other professional personnel." Intermediate and
first class or second class districts would be
the districts...reimbursed for this position.

Workshop co-directors, Ted Ward and S. Joseph Levine
of Michigan State University, used the above guidelines
when they designed kits to be used by the workshop
participants. The sessions were planned to promote
participation in game-like experiences. Says Dr. Ward:

in general, when experiences capitalize on the
motivations of enjoying a participatory experi-
ence--where there's some sense of winning, some
sense of collaboration with a group of people working together for a common good—we enjoy it more than if we are simply brought together to be lectured at.

THE KITS FOR THE INSTITUTE

Eight basic in-service education kits for the Curriculum Resource Consultants were prepared for the Institute. Each participant was assigned a number which he kept throughout the week. The group was then subdivided according to numbers. Each small group then worked together on the eight kits. Members of groups changed each time a new kit was introduced. The positions of leader, co-leader and evaluator were assigned in advance. Therefore, when all the kits had been used, each person had taken a leadership role at least once.

Some kits contained tape cassettes with instructions for the kit's use.
The following eight kits were used by the participants:

1. Designing an Instructional Game
2. Defining Objectives for the Teaching of Concepts
3. Designing Criterion Measures
4. Learners' Approaches to Learning
5. Goals for Education
6. Designing Objectives-Oriented Instruction
7. Focus on Feedback
8. Building a Perceptual-Motor Experience

The participants became thoroughly versed in the employment of these kits and are now prepared to offer their services using these kits in workshops with teachers in their districts.

In addition to the eight basic kits, the Institute participants were able to experience three other kits:

9. The Evaluation Game
10. Ad Agency (a language usage game)
11. What's the Sentence? (language usage)

The final test of what they had learned in the course of the workshop was the development of Workshop Kit 12. The participants were given instructions for designing their own kits. The specification and plan sheet read:

\begin{quote}
In partnership with two or three of your associates, you are to design and prepare a training kit for in-service education of teachers.
\end{quote}

It might deal with the use of an instructional material, a teaching procedure, or a skill in planning and evaluating instruction. To stimulate your thinking, the first meeting will be held in the USOE/MSU Regional Instructional Materials
Center where you can look over many new instructional resources and select one or more to use as the focus of your training kit.

Remember these constraints and suggestions:

1. 30-minute time allocation for teaching the unit;
2. Specify your objective(s) clearly;
3. Don't attempt to teach too much at once;
4. Make the experience active;
5. Plan and carry out an evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the experience you design; and
6. The finished kit should be written up well enough that others could use it.

The group was to present its original kits.

Two other design teams (combined) will constitute your "learner group," so be prepared to teach your kit to six or seven people at that time. Be sure you have adequate materials planned.

HELPING TEACHERS IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL EXPERIENCES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Throughout the five-day Institute, three words were stressed--communication, dissemination and adoption. These were key concepts for potential CRCs to employ in their activities with teachers.
COMMUNICATION--Knowing About

For in-service education this would mean:
- telling/hearing
- showing/seeing
- writing/reading

DISSEMINATION--Experience With

For in-service education this would mean:
- doing
- trying
- gaining skills

ADOPTION--Identification With and Predictable Use Of

For in-service education this would mean accepting through:
- reduced anxiety
- stimulus-response-reward
- redesign of the teacher's own system.

The CRC must accomplish all three in order to be effective in his relationship with teachers. His workshop and in-service sessions, as well as his personal contacts with special education personnel will draw upon his knowledge of these concepts.

The kits from the Institute will help him implement these ideas. The CRC knows (through his own participation in the use of the kits) the importance of having teachers take active, rather than passive, roles in any workshop he holds in the future.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION

An evaluation questionnaire at the conclusion of the Institute indicated only 12 participants had had either a considerable or moderate amount of experience in in-service training procedures prior to the Institute. After the Institute, 19 felt they knew a considerable amount and 10 a moderate amount.
Of the 15 who had previously conducted workshops, 14 felt the Institute assisted in clarifying workshop procedures. And all participants indicated they would be comfortable in offering in-service training in their own districts.

In general comments about the Institute various participants wrote:

This is, no doubt, the busiest workshop I ever attended, but probably the most productive. I felt the materials presented were pertinent and will be useful in the coming year.

One of the most valuable contributions of this workshop has been the clearer definition of the roles a leader assumes. Also, awareness of roles and of some basic interaction processes that occur within the group setting has been most valuable.

I feel that I can utilize the basic kit, but revise it for better use with other teachers.

I'm new to this area--shy, withdrawn. I feel I gained experience, practice in the mechanics of the techniques and an opportunity to compare my personality and skills with others who will do or have done this kind of activity. I feel comfortable now in making a start in my school district.

I thought this was an extremely valuable and practical workshop--I appreciated the structure and feel I am going home with a great deal more ability to lead inservice and that's what I came for.

The idea of using a tape to brief us on the Institute in advance was clever. It made me more aware of the many uses of the tape recorder. The kits were well written--it was easy for the leaders to follow the intended purpose.

The most important aspect of the Institute is that we now have some knowledge of the development of workshop kits and we have specific kits with which to conduct in-service training.
In the fall of 1971, a one-day follow-up session will be held in which the Curriculum Resource Consultants will discuss problems they may be encountering and share ideas with each other. Then, the State of Michigan's CRCs will be on the job again, helping special education teachers meet the needs of their handicapped students with new ideas, materials and workshops.
For additional information about the role of the Curriculum Resource Consultant, contact:

Mrs. E. W. Walline  
Michigan Department of Education  
P.O. Box 420  
Lansing, Michigan  
Phone: 373-0923

INSTITUTE STAFF

Co-directors

Dr. Ted Ward  
S. Joseph Levine  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Presenters

Mrs. Nancy Carlson  
Miss Sue Ann Yovanovich  
USOE/MSU Instructional Materials Center for Handicapped Children & Youth  
East Lansing, Michigan

Consultant

Mrs. E.W. Walline  
Michigan Department of Education Special Education Division  
Lansing, Michigan
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