MICRO–TEACHING ASSIGNMENT LESSON PLAN: MAINSTREAMING

Subject: Educational Philosophy
Grade Level: University (Junior Level)
Duration: Twelve (12) minutes

Topic: Mainstreaming

LR Objective: The prospective teacher will develop a personal strategy for
                    mainstreaming in his/her classroom.

Set: 1.   Examples of braille, sign language, a parapodium, a depression inventory,
                    a visual skills chart, and work from a student with dyslexia will illustrate
                    the "stuff" or special tools / curricula of special education.
                    [Transparencies]

            2.   Hypothetically, students who are dyslexic, ventilator assisted, paraplegic,
                    speech impaired, and mildly regressive will be placed by the principal in
                    the prospective teacher's classroom. At the very least, the prospective
                    teacher will make judgments about mainstreaming.   [Probing questions]

Objectives:

1.   The prospective teacher will define mainstreaming.

2.   The prospective teacher will list three philosophical ideas that form the basis for
        mainstreaming.

3.   The prospective teacher will recall the legal basis for mainstreaming.

4.   The prospective teacher will identify at least two challenges of mainstreaming for
        teachers and schools.

5.   The prospective teacher will develop his/her own reasons either for or against
        mainstreaming and will be able to defend his/her position in a classroom discussion.

Modeling:

The presentation of information can be followed or modeled via the note taking sheet / outline.

Instructional Procedures:

1.   *Objectives 1, 2, & 3*. Show transparencies with definition, basic foundations, and legal basis of mainstreaming. Discuss each briefly. Use handout of definitions to review, advance understanding, and transition to next objective.

2.   *Objective # 4*. Draw upon class knowledge to identify challenges for mainstreaming. Use questions on transparency to stimulate discussion. If time permits, ask class to think of reasons for and against what is called "full inclusion".

3.   *Objective # 5*. Note: This would normally be reserved for another class period, since much more time is needed. However, I will encourage the class to consider and formulate their own rationale about mainstreaming. Education majors at the junior level will probably already have some measure of opinion about mainstreaming.

Checks for Understanding:

1.   Discussion of definitions will provide a check for *Objective # 1*.
2.   Q & A following *Objectives 2 & 3*.
3.   Feedback and brainstorming will check *Objective # 4*.
4.   *Objective # 5*, not observed.

Guided Practice: See IPs # 1 & # 2. Also, Alternate Activities.

Closure:

1.   Two famous examples–Helen Keller and Stephen Hawking.
2.   Two potential excellers from children's literature–Nick & Jenny.

Alternate / Extra Activities:

1.   Ask class members to develop a rationale for or against full inclusion in a local setting.
2.   Ask class members to develop a rationale for or against full inclusion of students with particular disabilities, i.e., a person both blind and deaf, students who are ventilator assisted, a child who has acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), a teenager who suffers from attention deficit disorder (ADD), etc.
3.   Divide class and debate the issue of full inclusion.

Materials:

1.   Overhead transparencies.
2.   Class handouts.
3.   Children's literature books.

Resources:

D'Alonzo, Bruno J., Gerard Giordano, and Dawn M. Vanleeuwen. "Perceptions by Teachers about the Benefits and Liabilities of Inclusion." *Preventing School Failure* 42, no. 1 (Fall 1997).

> This study of New Mexico educators about the benefits and problems of inclusion reveals the following practical concerns on the minds of teachers: "adequate administrative support, stress, class size and management, curriculum changes, parental cooperation, and personnel conflict." The movement toward inclusion and existing research on inclusion are surveyed. This is followed by details on method of research and results from the New Mexico study.

DeMitchell, Todd, and Georgia M. Kerns. "Does Least Restrictive Environment Mean No Restrictions?" *The Clearing House* 70, no. 3 (January-February 1997).

> This case study of Rachel Holland in the Sacramento City School District of California details four tests in her case that are based on the stipulations of "least restrictive environment" as established by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These tests are: "the educational benefits of placement in a regular class, the nonacademic benefits of interaction with children who were not disabled, the effect that Rachel had on the teacher and children in the regular class, and the costs of mainstreaming Rachel." These tests are seen as not only a judicial model but also an educational model for consideration when placing students with disabilities.

Fassler, David G., and Lynne S. Dumas. *"Help Me, I'm Sad": Recognizing, Treating, and Preventing Childhood and Adolescent Depression*. New York: Viking, 1997.

Hermann, Helen and Bill. *Jenny's Magic Wand*. New York: Franklin Watts, 1988.

Jones, David E., Chris C. Clatterbuck, Janet Marquis, H. Rutherford Turnbull III, and Rebecca L. Moberly. "Educational Placements for Children who are Ventilator Assisted." *Exceptional Children* 63, no. 1 (Fall 1996).

Lanier, Nancy J., and William L. Lanier. "The Effects of Experience on Teachers' Attitudes toward Incorporating Special Students into the Regular Classroom." *Education* 117, no. 2 (Winter 1996).

> Teachers were surveyed on the basis of sixty classroom scenarios dealing with students who have a disability. Scenarios varied in degree of challenge from expecting little difficulty, to intermediate difficulty, to much difficulty. Since the assumption that "many decisions to include or exclude special students will depend upon the willingness of classroom teachers to accept and support those students" guides the goals of inclusion, the authors portray a need for general education teachers to "have realistic expectations of the special students and their ability to deal with those students." Inclusion is enhanced when such expectations are built upon a supportive school environment, appropriate teaching materials, set policies with characteristic situations, and good communication between general and special teachers.

Lasker, Joe. *Nick Joins In*. Chicago: Albert Whitman & Company, 1980.

Marcus, Rebecca. *Being Blind*. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1981.

Mitzel, Harold E., ed. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. 4 Vols. 5th ed. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

Nosek, Kathleen. *The Dyslexic Scholar: Helping Your Child Succeed in the School System*. Dallas: Taylor Publishing 1995.

Roach, Virginia. "Supporting Inclusion: Beyond the Rhetoric." *Phi Delta Kappan* 77, no. 4 (December 1995).

Sandler, Adrian. *Living with Spina Bifida: A Guide for Families and Professionals*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Scruggs, Thomas E., and Margo A. Mastropieri. "Teacher Perceptions of Mainstreaming / Inclusion, 1958–1995: A Research Synthesis." *Exceptional Children* 63, no. 1 (Fall 1996).

> Perceptions of teachers regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom reveal that about two-thirds support the concept of mainstreaming / inclusion. However, only about one-third thought they had necessary time, skills, training, or resources for mainstreaming / inclusion. A definition of mainstreaming / inclusion is offered. Method of research is detailed. Results are structured around the following questions.
>
> 1. Do teachers support mainstreaming / inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes?
> 2. Are general education classroom teachers willing to teach students with disabilities?
> 3. Do students benefit from mainstreaming / inclusion?
> 4. Do students with disabilities have a negative effect on the classroom environment?
> 5. Do general education teachers have enough time for mainstreaming / inclusion?
> 6. Do teachers have sufficient expertise / training for mainstreaming / inclusion?
> 7. Do teachers have sufficient resources for mainstreaming / inclusion?
>
> Practical implications for the research are noted, i.e., in the areas of time, training, personnel resources, material resources, class size, and consideration of severity of disability.

Slavin, Robert E. "Neverstreaming: Preventing Learning Disabilities." *Educational Leadership* 53, no. 5 (February 1996).

Valett, Robert E. *Dyslexia: A Neuropsychological Approach to Educating Children with Severe Reading Disorders*. Belmont, CA: David S. Lake Publishers, 1980.

Walters, Gregory J. *Equal Access: Safeguarding Disability Rights*. Vero Beach, FL: Rourke Corporation, Inc., 1992.

Ward, Jill. *Ward's Natural Sign Language Thesaurus of Useful Signs and Synonyms*. Northridge, CA: Joyce Media, Inc., 1978.

Wilcox, Daryl J., and Stanley E. Wigle. "Mainstreaming Revisited: 20 Years Later." *Education* 117, no. 3 (Spring 1997).

> Six school districts in Washington state, Texas, Arizona, Kentucky, and West Virginia were revisited in this follow-up study which was begun by Birch in 1974. Four important factors for mainstreaming were evident: "teacher preparation, placement / services for students, attitudes toward mainstreaming, and cost factors of mainsteaming." These factors and practical implications are discussed for each locale (except the West Virginia district which chose not to report for the follow-up).

MAINSTREAMING: NOTES / OUTLINE

I.   Definition of mainstreaming

II.   Three philosophical bases or foundations for mainstreaming

III.   Legal basis for mainstreaming

IV.   Mainstreaming? Partial inclusion or full inclusion?

V.   Challenges facing teachers and schools

DEFINITIONS OF MAINSTREAMING

"**Definitions of mainstreaming vary according to the philosophy of the school system**."   —Wilcox & Wigle

"According to Birch's classic study of mainstreaming for students with mild mental retardation, mainstreaming involved more than requiring students with mild mental handicaps to spend part of the school day in general classes such as physical education, art, music, or vocational classes. Rather, students were to be assigned to the general classroom teacher. The student would then go to the resource room only for essential instruction. General and special educators would share responsibility for instructing students and for the achievement of those students. Birch thought mainstreaming to be a carefully designed, balanced, and individualized teaching arrangement beneficial to students with a variety of learning needs. . . . **He saw mainstreaming as a valid alternative to self-contained special classes for appropriately selected students and teachers, but he also maintained that mainstreaming was not applicable to all exceptional students. Both mainstreaming and individualization were considered to be desirable concepts but not easily attainable for every student with disabilities**."   —Wilcox & Wigle

"Over the years, a dual system of education has evolved with two independent branches, general and special. Increasingly, this dual system, with its labeling of students and domain building, has been questioned. Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) chronicled the movement toward more inclusive schools that would involve all teachers and support staff working together. **The goals of this movement have ranged from modification of the offered continuum of services (mainstreaming or partial inclusion) to elimination of the entire continuum (full inclusion, or, simply, inclusion). Elimination of the entire continuum of services leads to full inclusion, whereby all students with disabilities are educated full time in the general education program**."   —D'Alonzo, Giordano, & Vanleeuwen

"The New Mexico State Department of Education believes that all students must be educated in school environments which fully include rather than exclude them. School environments include all curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular programs and activities. Full inclusion means that all children must be educated in supported, heterogeneous, age-appropriate, natural, child-focused classrooms, schools and community environments for the purpose of preparing them for full participation in our diverse and integrated society. The New Mexico State Department of Education supports, encourages and will facilitate emerging local practices and creative utilization of resources **which address the full inclusion of all children in the local school and community**."   —D'Alonzo, Giordano, & Vanleeuwen

"IDEA requires that a state that accepts federal IDEA funds must meet three basic requirements in order to comply with the law. First, it must provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to qualified students, and second, **to the 'maximum extent appropriate,' a child with a disability must be educated in the least restrictive environment. This last requirement is often called the mainstreaming mandate**. The underlying rationale for this mandate is found in the Brown v. Board of Education (1954) desegregation case, which embraced the concept that separate is not equal. A third principle of IDEA is that education is to be individualized and appropriate to the child's needs. This is usually accomplished through the formulation of an individualized educational plan (IEP). All three of these components are important, but **the one that has received the most attention lately, and maybe the least understood of the three, is the least restrictive environment (LRE) requirement**."   —DeMitchell & Kerns

"In a full inclusive model, students with disabilities, no matter how severe, are taught in the regular classroom of their home school with their age and grade peers, for the full day, with support services provided within that classroom. **Inclusion differs from mainstreaming in that the latter term usually refers to integrating children with disabilities and non-handicapped children for only a portion of the day**, which may be during nonacademic times."   —Lanier & Lanier

"'**Mainstreaming' (and more recently 'inclusion')** describes the process of integrating students with disabilities into general education classes in order to address the requirement of 'least restrictive environment' mandated by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), now the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act."   —Scruggs & Mastropieri