This newsletter issue describes the Community Based Inservice Model (CBIM) of the Teaching Research Infant and Child Center (Oregon). This project provides training to personnel who serve secondary age students with moderate to severe disabilities. The project has been funded by the Federal Government and is based on the philosophy of teaching practices currently recognized as effective. Best educational practices in the areas of community based instruction and vocational training were identified. The CBIM training offers professional training in transition planning, community based activities, and the placement of students in community jobs. It offers either model replication training (in a comprehensive classroom) or component training (in a single component of the model). Project results after 3 years indicated that a total of 186 educators from 13 states received training, that there was substantial improvement on measures of training impact, and a greater percentage of student programs were conducted outside the classroom following the training. (12 references) (DB)
The purpose of this newsletter is to share with you our activities and projects. Each issue features a different project or activity. This issue describes the Community Based Inservice Model (CBIM) and was prepared by Gary Glasenapp.

A list of our demonstration sites and those who manage them follows.

**Early Childhood/Special Education**
Teaching Research Child Development Center:
- Director: Pam Dearnordt
- Associate Teachers: Cassie Kroeker, Gaynor Kupa, Claudia Austin-Prevost
- Assistant Teachers: Doris Marumke, Melissa Raub, Cindy Brown
Early Intervention Staff:
- Coordinator: Patty Severns
- Infant/Toddler Specialists: Margaret McCaffrey, Kim Udell

**Services for Persons with Moderate and Severe Disabilities**
- Training Staff: Torry Templeman, Carol Bunse, Joyce Peters, Gary Glasenapp, Kathy Haydon, Lisa Carlson, Tom Udell
- Supported Work Training for Adults: Kirk Hendrickson, Miriam Waintrup, John Gallagher, Adrienne Bonosovich
- Residential Supervisor: Bud Fredericks
  - Group Home for Adolescents with Severe Handicaps, Polk County: Eric Karlinger
  - Group Home for Adults with Profound Handicaps, Clackamas County: Daphne Richardson
  - Group Home for Adults who are Medically Fragile: Margaret Gearhart
- Marion County Children's Project: Evelyn Ferris

**Services for Students with Severe Emotional Disturbances**
- Supervisor: Vicki Evans
  - High School Resource Room, Salem Public Schools: Marlene Karlinger
  - Training in Classroom Services: Vicki Evans
  - Vocational Program for Adolescents, Marion County: Phillip Martinez
  - Group Home for Adolescents, Marion County: Kelly Knechtel, Jaque Edinger
  - Apartments for Adolescents: Jaque Edinger, Kelly Knechtel
  - Foster Parent Training: Vicki Evans
  - Vocational Program for Youth and Young Adults With Serious Emotional Problems, Benton County: Constance Lehman, Janet Corbit, Kathleen Paris

**THE COMMUNITY BASED INSERVICE MODEL**

The purpose of this article is to describe an inservice training project developed by Teaching Research that was designed to provide training to personnel who serve secondary age students with moderate to severe disabilities. The project evolved as a result of a cooperative effort between Teaching Research, the Yamhill Education Service District, and McMinnville (Oregon) High School. Included in this article is a discussion on the historical and philosophical basis of the project, the training content, training costs and availability, and project results.

**Historical Background**

The Community Based Inservice Model (CBIM) was a three-year federal grant funded through the U.S. Department of Education,
Programs for Severely Handicapped that began in October of 1988. The purpose of the grant was to develop a training package and to provide training for personnel who work with secondary age students with moderate to severe disabilities in a comprehensive program that included classroom, community based and vocational components.

In the past decade teaching research has provided inservice training in several projects for educators who serve the secondary age population. These projects include the Teaching Research Secondary Severely Handicapped Model (which last trained in 1984) that focused its training efforts on activities that occurred in the classroom setting. A second project, the Secondary Transition Project (1983-86) centered on transition planning and transition issues. A third undertaking, the Community Based Vocational Training Project (1985-88) provided training to educators in vocational training and associated work skills instruction. Finally, the Handicapped Youth in Trouble Project (HYT) was designed for court adjudicated individuals with mild to moderate disabilities and students with severe behavior problems. The HYT Project did include classroom, community based and vocational activities and training for individuals with mild disabilities.

Feedback from individuals who completed training in the projects listed above indicated that the training was valuable as far as it went. However, many of the trainees expressed a need for training in a comprehensive model that served students with moderate and severe disabilities that included all aspects of a secondary program containing classroom, community based and vocational components. The CBIM was designed to provide this comprehensive training package.

In addition to the feedback from previous trainees numerous studies have indicated that the needs of students with moderate to severe disabilities are not being met while in the school program and that they are not adequately prepared to meet the needs of adult life after they leave the school program. A U.S. Census Bureau report (1989) stated that 67 percent of all Americans with disabilities were not working. Wagner (1990) reported that 36 percent of students with disabilities drop out of school. This compares to a rate of 25 percent drop out rate for all students. While these figures may be disturbing it does not mean that students with disabilities are destined to continue to have a high dropout and unemployment rate. Wehman, Kregel & Barcus (1985) suggest that comprehensive special education programs can make a difference in school retention rates and in altering the employment status of individuals with disabilities. They report that those schools that provide community based instruction and job training at integrated sites yield better long-term school and job retention rates. Additional studies by Haazi, Gordon & Roe (1985), Wehman, et al (1987), and McDonnell & Ferguson (1985) showed that students who graduated from high school programs that emphasize only general vocational preparation have not been as successful in the job market as those who have specific community based preparation. Thus, the CBIM was developed based on the belief that a comprehensive educational program can result in better preparing students with disabilities to meet the demands of adult life.

Philosophical Framework

The purpose of the CBIM was not to develop a new secondary model but was intended to develop an inservice training package based on an existing program that contained currently accepted effective or best practices in the areas of community based instruction and vocational training. A review of the literature was conducted to identify what leaders in the field consider "best practice" or "program quality indicators." Meyer, Biehinger, & Park Lee (1987), Fox et al (1986), Falvey (1987), Wehman, Moon, Everon, Wood, & Barcus (1988), Rusch & DeStefano (1989), McDonnell & Ferguson (1988), Sailor et al. (1986), and Wilcox & Ballam (1982) have each listed best practices. Among these and other leaders in the field, there seems to be significant agreement of what the educational program for individuals with disabilities should entail. The basic life skills program at McMinnville High School was chosen to serve as the training classroom for the project. The program, which is administered by the Yamhill Education Service District, contained the components that are cited in the literature as best practice or program quality indicators. Below is a summary of these practices.

**Community Based Instruction**

**Instruction in the Least Restrictive Environment**--Individuals with disabilities are placed in regular schools with peers without disabilities. Students attend their neighborhood school and are placed in classes and activities that offer the greatest opportunity to interact with their peers who do not have disabilities. Students are placed in classes based on their chronological not mental age.

**Age Appropriate Instruction**--Activities and materials used are the same as those used by peers of the same age who do not have disabilities. Participation in activities are age appropriate.

**Instruction in Functional Skills**--Skills that are taught are meaningful and necessary not only in the current setting but also in future environments. The focus of the instruction is on skills that are most relevant in the students’ daily lives and allow them to function as independently as possible.

**Community Referenced Instruction**--Skills that are taught are referenced to the community where the skill will be used. The skills are chosen on the basis of ecological inventories that identify those which will be needed in the environment. Skills are taught in the natural setting.

**Comprehensive Curriculum**--The program includes instruction in a variety of domains and settings and includes residential, vocational, and leisure skills.

**Programming for Future Environments**--Skills are taught based on the most probable future placement of the students in the areas of vocational and residential placement. It is vital to begin teaching these skills before the students are actually placed in these settings.

**Transition Planning**--The transition from the school program to adult life and adult services must begin well in advance of graduation. The transition process must be a systematic, planned process, not something that happens during the last few months of school.

**Parental Involvement**--Parents need to be involved in all aspects of their child's education. For parents of secondary age students transition issues become more vital.

**Data Based**--Data must be collected and analyzed to track and maximize student progress.

**Vocational Training**

**Participation in a Competitive Job or Job Training Daily**--The closer students get to graduation the more time they spend at the job site. All high school age students need to spend some time each
day at the work site or in job training activities.

Community Jobs at Integrated Job Sites--Students are placed at jobs in the community that afford them the opportunity to work with their peers without disabilities.

On-site Job Training & Availability of Long-term Support--Job training takes place at the actual job site. Arrangements need to be made to monitor the job site and provide long-term support after students graduate from the school program.

Variety of Job Experiences--In the middle school and early high school years students need to be exposed to a variety of job experiences to help determine their likes and dislikes. Later the job choices will be narrowed down to provide specific job training and placement.

Non-paid Work Experience Leading to Paid Work--The ultimate vocational outcome is that students will leave the school program with a paid job. To reach this goal it is necessary that students be provided with a variety of non-paid work experiences to determine job preferences and to learn valuable associated work skills.

Associated Work Skills Training--Training is provided in a variety of associated work skills that are not job specific but important to survive at the job site (e.g., social skills, transportation skills).

Utilization of Co-workers, Peer Tutors, Volunteers--A number of individuals can be utilized to help train and monitor students at the job sites.

Data Based--Data are collected at the job sites and analyzed to monitor the students' progress.

The CBIM and Types of Training

The CBIM training offered instructional opportunities in transition planning, community based activities, and the placement of students in community jobs. One major component of the model was the emphasis on providing vocational training and job placement in the community. The vocational segment, including training in associated work skills as well as specific job skills, laid the groundwork for educators to place students at paid, integrated job sites with workers who are not disabled. This is a shift away from placement in activity centers and sheltered workshops toward supported or competitive employment. The model featured community jobs at integrated job sites, on-site job training, a variety of job experiences, non-paid work experience leading to paid employment, and associated work skills training. One goal of the program was that all students would have a paid job when they leave the secondary program.

The second aspect of the CBIM involved a strong community based component. Skills necessary for a successful transition from the school program to community life (such as the appropriate use of recreation, shopping, banking and eating facilities) are taught in the community where the skills will be used. The community based segment of the model emphasized instruction in the least restrictive environment, age appropriate, functional activities, community referenced instruction, programming for future environments, and transition planning.

In the CBIM the majority of the students' time was spent either in the community or at vocational sites. The classroom was used primarily as a meeting place as the students are transitioning from one activity to another. However, the classroom was also used to supplement and reinforce training that occurred in the community and at job sites and to teach skills that could be taught in the community.

Two types of training were offered in the Community Based Inservice Model. Model replication training was designed for educators who sought training in a comprehensive classroom, community based, and vocational model. Training consisted of all aspects of the model in a four-day practice based session at McMinnville High School and in the surrounding community. Component training was designed for those who sought training or technical assistance in a single component of the model. Each four-day to full-day component training session concentrated on one of the following topics: student assessment and program planning; identification and development of potential job sites; data collection and analysis; recruitment, training and monitoring of peer tutors; management of inappropriate behaviors; and management of the classroom and program including liability concerns and labor laws. Component training was offered either at the trainees' sites or at the demonstration site.

Training Costs and Availability

There was no fee for either model replication or component training. All training materials were also provided at no cost. These included the CBIM Training Manual, a book entitled Vocational Training for Students with Severe Handicaps, the Teaching Research Curriculum for Handicapped Adolescents and Adults: Assessment Procedures, and Associated Work Skills: A Manual. Trainees were responsible for their own meals, lodging and transportation expenses. As a follow-up to both model replication and component training, Teaching Research provided one day of post-training technical assistance at each trainees' job site at no cost.

Project Results

During the three years of the project that ended in September, 1991 a total of 186 educators from 13 states received training in the CBIM. Fifty-six of the participants received model replication training while an additional 130 educators completed component training. Of those who participated in component training 36 attended the Assessment Session, 25 the Peer Tutor Session, 26 in the Data Collection and Analysis Session, 21 in the Managing Inappropriate Behaviors Session, and 13 participated in each of the Job Identification and the Program Management Sessions. Model replication trainees successfully completed 95% of the training objectives while those participating in component training successfully completed 96% of the objectives.

Several evaluative measures were utilized to determine training impact. Pretraining visits were conducted on a sample of the trainees to determine what was occurring in their classrooms prior to their participation in CBIM training. The Quick Check: Evaluating a High School Classroom for Students with Disabilities, developed in Olympia, Washington and the CBIM Follow-up Form were used as measurement instruments. Pretraining results were compared to results obtained during the posttraining visit. On average, the posttraining visit occurred approximately 10 weeks following training. As shown in Figure 1, the average pretraining rating on the Quick Check was 52% compared to a rating of 90% at the time of the posttest visit. Figure 2 reveals that on the CBIM Form, 61% of the components were present in some form at the time of the pretraining visit and 41% were judged to be at criterion levels. At the time of
the posttraining visit, 94% of the components were present and 90% were judged to be at criterion levels.

Results were also analyzed to determine whether there was any change in the settings in which student programs were conducted. Figure 3 compares the settings in which programs were conducted on a pre and posttraining basis. The reader will note that the percentage of programs conducted outside the classroom (school, community, and at vocational sites) increased from the pretraining to the posttraining visit while the number of programs in the classroom decreased. Figure 4 summarizes the settings in which student programs were conducted for all trainees who have received a posttraining visit.

For all the trainees, the Quick Check rating at the time of the posttraining visit was 89% (80% indicates an acceptable standard). On the CBIM Form, 92% of the components were present in some form with 89% of those judged to be at criterion.
Discussion

The educational program for secondary age students with moderate to severe disabilities has undergone considerable change over the last decade. The classroom-based program emphasizing a academic curriculum is no longer considered the accepted norm. Instead, more and more programs have embraced the community-based approach in an effort to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Community-based training involves more than taking students out into the community to visit different sites and facilities. Instead, community-based training involves teaching specific skills to meet the goals or objectives identified either on the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) or the Individualized Transition Plan (ITP).

Before community-based programs, the objectives identified by the IEP or ITP had been restricted by the constraints of the classroom setting. Now, with the availability of the community as an educational site, we can truly move toward the teaching of functional skills that are based on the needs of future environments. The identification and assessment of future environments has increased the importance of the IEP and the ITP. Recently, with the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Act, the ITP has come to the forefront. Part of the Act requires that an ITP be developed when students with disabilities reach the age of 16 (14, if determined appropriate).

Accompanying this shift to community-based programs are a number of program management issues that must be considered. The shifting of staff duties and responsibilities as well as staffing patterns and ratios for community-based programs is one major challenge. In the community-based approach, the classroom teacher becomes more of a manager rather than a person that provides direct instruction to students. Management skills such as scheduling, training other staff, and delegating responsibilities are all competencies that the teacher must display. In addition, support must be provided for students whose major educational focus requires that the majority of their day be spent in the community and at job sites. Creative scheduling and the use of peer tutors, volunteers or co-workers have proven to be effective in providing the support necessary for conducting community-based programs.

A second consideration for conducting community-based programs centers on liability and safety issues. Specific written procedures must be in place that delineate safety and emergency procedures, as well as policies that explain the insurance coverage for both staff and students while they are in the community and at work sites. Liability and safety issues in transporting students to community and work sites must also be resolved prior to undertaking a community-based program.

A third factor that must be addressed is the adherence to labor laws as they pertain to the vocational portion of the program. The U.S. Fair Labor Standards Act and the Department of Labor have established standards that have been designed to protect workers. Administrators and teachers must be aware of these laws and how they apply to their community-based/vocational programs.

Although each of the factors described above provide challenges when implementing community-based programs, they are not insurmountable. Educators who are committed to a community-based approach will meet these challenges.

Summary

The purpose of this article has been to describe the Community Based Inservice Model that is designed to provide inservice training to personnel who serve secondary age students with moderate and severe disabilities. The goal of the project was to improve or increase the quality of services for students with disabilities. The training model was based on currently accepted effective practices in the areas of community-based instruction and vocational training.

An analysis of the results of the project to date have indicated the following: a) CBIM trainees successfully completed the vast majority of the training objectives, b) there has been substantial improvement in the scores on the two measures that were used to indicate training impact on the trainees' programs, and c) for those sampled, the percentage of student programs conducted outside the classroom (at school, community and job sites) showed an increase from the time of the pretraining visit to the time of the posttraining visit. The percentage of programs conducted in the classroom itself decreased.

The results of the project have raised some interesting questions for possible future investigation. Perhaps the most intriguing center around the increase in the percentage of programs that were conducted outside the classroom setting. Will merely increasing the number of programs conducted in the community translate into the students learning more functional skills? What is the carry-over value as the students transition from community-based programs to adult services? What is the optimum amount of time students with disabilities should spend in the community? At what age should we begin community-based instruction? Does an increase in the amount of time in the community away from their non-disabled peers negatively affect their social network and social skills? What types of support structures are best for community-based activities? These and other questions have been raised by the practice of using the community as the major "classroom".
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MATERIALS LIST

In the transition area the following materials are available from Teaching Research Publications.

Associated work skills: A manual. The Teaching Research Special Education Department Staff. Teaching Research Publications, Monmouth, Oregon 97361. $10.00


Transition for Persons with Deaf-Blindness and other Profound Handicaps. Fredericks, H. D., Covert, A. Teaching Research Publications, Monmouth, Oregon 97361. $10.00

Vocational Training for Students with Severe Handicaps. H. D. Bud Fredericks and Staff of the Teaching Research Vocational Training Model. Teaching Research Publications, Monmouth, Oregon 97361. $13.00

To purchase the above, please fill out the order form and send to:

Teaching Research Publications
345 N. Monmouth Avenue
Monmouth, OR 97361

Title(s) Ordered: ____________________________

Name of Person Ordering: _______________________

Address: ____________________________

Purchase Order Enclosed ( ) Check/Money Order ( ) Bill Me ( )
Presentations/Workshops


