

Approved: 3/14/94
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dave Kerr at 1:30 p.m. on March 9, 1994 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research Department
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
LaVonne Mumert, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Ken Fredette, Topeka
Wilson Anderson, Jr., Topeka
Joe Swallowell, Topeka

Others attending: See attached list

HB 2755 - School districts, school breakfast program

The Committee was provided with written testimony in opposition to the bill by Susan Chase, Kansas National Education Association (Attachment No. 1).

Senator Langworthy made a motion that HB 2755 be recommended favorably for passage. Senator Tiahrt seconded the motion. Senator Walker made a substitute motion that HB 2755 be amended to provide that schools who have between 15-34 percent of students eligible for free and reduced lunches come under the waiver process and that schools who have less than 15 percent of students eligible for free and reduced lunches be exempt from the waiver process. Senator Downey seconded the substitute motion.

During committee discussion, a question was raised about the federal reimbursement of the costs of the breakfast program. Jim Yonally (Shawnee Mission Schools) and Jacque Oakes (School for Quality Education) advised that there are some buildings where the federal reimbursement does not cover the cost of the program.

Upon a vote, the substitute motion carried. Senator Walker made a motion that the bill, as amended, be recommended favorably for passage. Senator Hensley seconded the motion, and the motion failed.

Chairman Kerr announced that the remainder of the meeting would be devoted to further hearings and review of the policy on inclusion. The Committee was provided with a copy of the Kansas State Board of Education Policy on Least Restrictive Environment for Students with Disabilities adopted March 8 (Attachment No. 2).

Ken Fredette, Topeka, described his experience with a pilot inclusion program in the Topeka schools. He said that he is the parent of a child who was identified as learning disabled last year during sixth grade. His son tested as reading at the second grade level. Mr. Fredette said resource rooms have been totally eliminated in the middle schools in his district. His son is assisted by a paraprofessional and is not required to do any writing or reading. He believes that his son can receive a learning disabled high school diploma but that he will have a totally dysfunctional reading level. Mr. Fredette is concerned that regular education does not have the capability or tools to follow through on inclusion models. He noted that teachers are already dealing with a number of changes such as Quality Performance Accreditation and statewide testing.

Wilson Anderson, Jr., Topeka, noted that he is Co-Chair of the Governor's Task Force on Literacy and Learning Disabilities, immediate Past President of the Orton Dyslexia Society, Learning Disabilities Specialist

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 1:30 p.m. on March 9, 1994.

and Supervisor of Teacher Education at the Menninger Clinic and serves as a consultant to school districts throughout the United States, Canada and Bermuda, but stated he was not representing any organization and was testifying as an individual and parent of two learning disabled children (Attachment No. 3). Mr. Anderson said that inclusion is only a portion of the full range of services to be provided for children. He stressed that there is a major difference between accommodation and remediation. He said that the greater the difficulty a person has in learning, the more specific the remediation must be. Chairman Kerr asked about Mr. Anderson's impression of the newly adopted State Board policy on inclusion. Mr. Anderson said that, while he has not had an opportunity to review the policy in depth, he believes it is "liveable" and is much better than the January draft proposal. In response to a question, Mr. Anderson said that all education is designed so that a student must fail before they get help.

Joe Swallwell, Topeka, testified that he is also the parent of a learning disabled child. He is the national President of Learning Disabled Association of America, a 30-year old organization with a membership of 60,000 parents and professionals, and Mr. Swallwell provided a copy of the organization's official statement on inclusion (Attachment No. 4). He said that comprehensive reform should be an orderly process and must include preparation and training of teachers and administrators and changes in both regular and special education. He stated that PL 94-142 (IDEA) has never been fully funded or implemented as intended. Mr. Swallwell said, in short, he is saying: prepare for it (with staff, parents, administrators, school boards), make sure that the services are available and that regular education is included in the process. He said his organization is compiling a report detailing inclusion programs in all 50 states and expects a preliminary report to be presented at the August board meeting of the organization. Chairman Kerr requested that the Committee be provided with a copy of the preliminary report. Senator Downey asked if Mr. Swallwell would agree with the statement that inclusion has fulfilled its expectations in the social and emotional growth of students but has failed in the aspect of academic growth. Mr. Swallwell said that, at this point, there is not enough history to show whether or not the social growth has been enhanced, but he thinks there might be some validity to the statement. Mr. Anderson said he would tend to agree with the statement, although the social issues are still being studied.

Mr. Swallwell provided copies of the following: Learning Disabilities Association of America Position Paper on Full Inclusion of All Students with Learning Disabilities in the Regular Education Classroom (Attachment No. 5), The Council for Exceptional Children Policy on Inclusive Schools and Community Settings (Attachment No. 6), American Federation of Teachers press release (Attachment No. 7) and the Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children Position Paper on Inclusion (Attachment No. 8).

Senator Frahm made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 7, 1993 meeting. Senator Langworthy seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 10, 1994.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 PLACE: 123-S DATE: 3/9/94

GUEST LIST

| <u>NAME</u> | <u>ADDRESS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION</u> |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Mark Tallman | Topeka | 12/33 |
| Gerald Henderson | Topeka | BAH of KS |
| Jacque Oakes | " | SQE |
| Jim Zoually | Overland Park | USD #512 |
| Carol Dermeyer | KSBE | |
| Sherrill Buss | Newton | U.S. 40 #373 |
| Helma Hunter Dalton | Topeka | SRS |
| Josie Torrez | Topeka | Families Together, Inc. |
| Doris Grosh | Manhattan | LWV |
| Atina Hanna | Manhattan | LWV |
| Carolee Stark | Manhattan | LWV |
| Diane Gjerstad | Wichita | USD 259 |
| John Lunschell | Topeka | LDAA |
| E. Wilson Anderson Jr. | Topeka | Self |
| Ken Probst | Topeka | parent |
| Marian Hansen | Topeka | intern |
| Dean Strahm | Sabetha | parent |
| Jane Rhyne | Topeka | KPCDD |
| Barbara Cole | Topeka | KNEA |
| Rob WINTER | Lacey | USD 378 |
| Lisa Chisley | Topeka | The Area |
| Mark Elmole | Leawaca | JCMRC |
| Kent Williams | Topeka | LDAA |

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 PLACE: 123-S DATE: 3/9/94

GUEST LIST

| <u>NAME</u> | <u>ADDRESS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION</u> |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Kathy Fredette | Topeka | — |
| Bob Suderman | Lawrence | — |
| W W Musick | Manassas | St. Bd. of Ed. |
| Vic Braden | Topeka | KACC |
| Merle Hice | Topeka | KACC |
| Dave Bishop | Topeka | SpEd Dirctor |
| Cathy Holthaus | Seneca | — |
| John Ann Lister | Beem | Parent |



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 W. 10TH STREET / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Susan Chase Testimony before
Senate Education Committee
Tuesday, March 8, 1994

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am Susan Chase and I represent Kansas NEA. I appreciate this opportunity to visit with the committee today regarding HB 2755 relating to the school breakfast program.

We strongly support the school breakfast program and believe that in order for students to achieve at their potential they must receive a good breakfast. We also understand some problems have arisen concerning the waiver procedures. Our concern with the proposed legislation is that under the existing proposal, a district may opt out of providing breakfast when as many as one-third of their students are on free and reduced lunch, without obtaining any information as to the interest in or need for the program. A possible compromise to this proposal is to allow districts with less than 20% of students on free and reduced lunch to make the choice, and have those districts with 20% to 35% required to receive a waiver. The survey procedure, although somewhat time-consuming, is definitely beneficial in determining the need for a school breakfast program.

We ask that you consider some modifications in this bill prior to your vote on this issue.

Thank you for listening to our concerns.

March 8, 1994

Kansas State Board of Education Policy on Least Restrictive Environment for Students with Disabilities

Background

Since the enactment of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), a variety of terms have been coined to reference the practice of educating students with disabilities with students who are not disabled. Mainstreaming, the Regular Education Initiative (REI), integration and inclusion have been used frequently and interchangeably. Given the absence of State or Federal definition, these terms mean different things to different people. This policy is intended to set forth guidance to local education agencies in carrying out the requirement of IDEA that, *to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved.* This is the legal premise which provides the basis for including students with disabilities in general education.

Historically, students with disabilities have been separated from their nondisabled peers based upon the belief that quality instruction to address their unique needs could only be provided in special separate settings by personnel with special education or related services credentials. The result has been the creation of a separate system of education and a dilution of the instructional resources available to all students. This dual system, while perhaps a necessary step in the evolution of educational practice, promoted an exclusionary philosophy and the separation of students with disabilities from their nondisabled peers. Frequently, students with disabilities have been educated in separate schools or in classrooms located in cluster arrangements rather than in their neighborhood schools. The result for students with disabilities has been little or no access to the general education classroom, as well as a lack of opportunities to develop friendships with nondisabled classmates. Special and general educators have taught in isolation without opportunity for collaboration, accountability and a mutual responsibility for all children and youth in Kansas.

In contrast, inclusive educational programs are those which serve all students, including those with disabilities, in the context of general education. Students are removed from the general education environment only when it is clear that they cannot succeed in that environment even with adequate supplemental aids and services. The amount of time spent outside of the general education classroom is determined by the student's individualized education program (IEP). Placement decisions are based on the student's unique needs rather than on categorical characteristics. It is critical that the placement process be carefully considered with opportunity for participation by the affected parties--parents, students and school personnel. The cost of providing inclusive education may be a factor in determining placement when that cost has a significant adverse affect on the other students in the school district. As stipulated in 34 CFR 300.552(c), *[u]nless the IEP of a child with a disability requires some other arrangement, the child is educated in the school that he or she would attend if nondisabled.* Placement is reviewed annually, but may be changed whenever the IEP Team deems necessary. A change of placement is indicated when a student with a disability is so disruptive in a general education setting that the education of other students is significantly impaired or when the safety of others is endangered.

Sen. Ed.
3/9/94
Attachment 2

Important Points

- Schools should value each student regardless of his or her abilities or disabilities.
- Schools should provide dynamic, individualized and innovative learning opportunities for ALL students.
- Schools should strive to provide education based on the needs of individual students with disabilities as determined by a well designed-IEP.
- Schools should facilitate outcomes-based education by combining all of the specialized resources at the school to enhance learning of all students at the school.

Factors Involved in Student Placement

It is imperative that each student's individual needs determine placement. Placement should reflect the setting in which the student's needs can best be met when providing the educational services needed to implement the student's IEP. Placement decisions must not be based solely on any of the following factors: category of handicapping condition, configuration of the service delivery system, availability of educational or related services; availability of space; curriculum content; or methods of curriculum delivery. Individual strengths and needs should determine the student's program. The type and intensity of special education and related services required for the student to derive educational benefit must be made available.

In the field of education, the value of diversity, is beginning to be recognized, as well as the value of individualizing each student's education, to address his/her diverse learning styles, strengths and needs. Kansas students who have disabilities benefit from receiving their education in general education settings alongside their nondisabled classmates. Similarly, Kansas students who do not have identified disabilities also benefit from inclusive educational programs by learning to appreciate diversity and value the achievement of those with disabilities. The Board recognizes the need for a full continuum of special education service options, but supports the age-appropriate, general education classroom in the school the student would attend if not disabled as the placement of choice for Kansas students with disabilities. Instead of a separate track educational system, schools are encouraged to strive toward a unified system that values and includes students of varying levels of ability.

Important Points

- Placement is comprised of the SETTING of the educational program and the EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM itself.
- Placement shall not be made based upon the student's categorical label nor upon administrative convenience.
- Special education is not a place-it is services which may be provided in any setting.

Supplemental Aids and Services in the Classroom

When students with disabilities are included, adequate resources must be provided from the outset to the general education program. Support can be provided at many levels. Supplementary aids and services include, but are not limited to, materials or equipment provided in conjunction with

general education classroom instruction, consulting specialists, itinerant teachers, resource rooms, tutoring, instructional support provided by paraprofessional personnel, assistive technology, readers and interpreters. Support may take the form of teacher consultation or direct instruction by the special educator in the classroom. Teacher training is also a vital support. Training in curriculum models which address diversity in the classroom, as well as training in skills of collaboration, are key elements of successful teacher inservice training plans. Practices which have been proven effective include: teaming arrangements involving general and special education staff and parents working together collaboratively to support students with and without disabilities; special and general educators teaching together; and the provision of related services and other needed supports within the context of the general educational program.

Support in the general education classroom must be more than a token effort. It should not be assumed that even an extremely skilled teacher and supportive peers can adequately include a student with disabilities without direct support from special educators. Support must be provided at the level needed in order for the student with disabilities to derive educational benefit from his/her educational program. The responsibility for ensuring adequate programming remains with the school district and the IEP process.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE PHILOSOPHY
OF INCLUSION IN THE STATE OF KANSAS

C. Wilson Anderson, Jr., MAT
2812 SW Osborn Rd.
Topeka KS 66614

913-271-7281 H
913-273-7500 W

Inclusion, like universal access to basic medical care, sounds appealing on the surface, but it is in the implementation of inclusion where the disagreements between adults will create policies that allow our children to be hurt.

Because of the discrepancy/eligibility formula Kansas, only allows 2.9% of its student population to be identified as Learning Disabled. Inclusion should mean that more students should be receiving help.

Inclusion is a philosophy and is not the law.

The law guarantees a full range of services and inclusion is only a portion of the full range of services for our children. IDEA has not been fully implemented. To do away with the range of services because we believe in "inclusion" violates this law.

Who says that a student who has not learned to read, write and spell on a level commensurate with his intelligence has only a mild handicapping condition?

Parents of Learning Disabled students want academic skills and social skills for their children. Other groups place no academic demands, but want social skills for their children. The original inclusion model was designed for these kids.

According to the 1993 "Position Paper on Inclusion" issued by the Division of Learning Disabilities, "There currently is no validated body of research to support large scale adoption of inclusion as the service delivery model for ALL students with Learning Disabilities."

A student needing remediation in reading because he is reading on a third grade level, yet placed in an "inclusion seventh grade English class," is denied appropriate remediation and will set him up for failure.

THERE IS A MAJOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACCOMMODATION AND REMEDIATION!

Mainstreamed students can handle the regular curriculum with some modifications and accommodations. Those students who are "included" still need special instruction whether it is in the classroom or in a special room. To read, write, spell and compute adequately, some LD students may require remediation through their high school years.

Sen. Ed.
3/9/94

Attachment 3

Mr. Bob Uhing, Doctoral Candidate at the University of South Dakota and Director of Special Education in Wayne Public Schools in Wayne, Nebraska, has released the following figures based upon his doctoral research about inclusion. This was a survey of all of the Special Education Directors in Nebraska. This survey had a response rate of 91%.

73% agreed that with inclusion Federal and State funding will have to be restructured.

65% agreed that inclusion will require more special education personnel.

70% agreed that more money will have to be spent on materials.

97% agreed that inclusion will mandate more intensive inservice programs for both regular and special education staff.

68% agreed that regular education will have to employ more teachers, especially those with dual certification.

In closing, I would like to the committee members that the more difficulty that a child or adult has in learning, the more specific the remediation process has to be. The average classroom teachers has been trained in one or two reading methods. It is assumed that the special education teacher is trained in more. Remember what assume means?

Please refer to the chart on the next page which illustrates the many reading programs that need to be available to our children.

Three Classes of Reading Techniques

Traditional Reading Approaches

Basal

Whole Word

Basal

Analytic Phonics

Whole Language

Without Reading Recovery

Language Experience

Remedial Approaches

Non-reading Therapies

Frostig

Irlen

Motor skills

Chiropractor

Visual Training

Sensory Motor Intergration

Linguistics

ECCRI

Analytic (Workbook) Phonics

Synthetic Phonics

Lindamood

Schmerler

Intensive Phonics

Distar / Corrective Reading

Words in Color

Cloze Procedures

Reading Recovery

Neurological Impress

Kansas Strategies

By-Pass Strategies

Multi-Sensory Approaches (VAT-K)

Synthetic Phonics

Orton

Spalding

Project Read

Fundamentals of Reading

Success

VoWac

Gillingham

Alphabetic Phonics

Slingerland

Wilson

Herman

MTA

Syllable Patterns

Upper Level Phonics

Orton - Gillingham

Fernald

Whole Word

Combination

Orton - Fernald

LDA has been aware of "school reform" and all that it implies for several years. We have looked at reform carefully and thoughtfully. We have come to believe that true reform cannot be a quick fix and piecemeal change. When we speak of reform, we speak of comprehensive reform that is based on validated programs that are introduced in an orderly manner. We believe that many of the needed changes and modifications of current practices must take place not only in student placement in the classroom, but is must include the preparation and training of teachers and administrators. We need changes in both regular and special education. That calls for a new cooperation between the two systems.

Included in the reform is the need for comprehensive, on-going in-service for all teachers, administrators and support personnel on learning disabilities and related concerns. The caliber of teachers, the size of classes, and classroom support, as well as up-to-date technology, are but a few of the items needing to be addressed by the schools

Sen. Ed.
3/9/94
Attachment 4

across the nation.

LDA supports responsible restructuring of our education system based on valid research of programs that work and not experimentation. We believe one reason special education is sometimes criticized as "not working" is because it has never been implemented fully as Congress intended. PL 94-142 has never been fully funded as promised. We believe that the lessons of special education could provide the underpinning for education reform measures. Individualized programs to meet the learning needs of each student in a learning environment permitting individualized attention from the teacher should be a goal of education reform. We must continue to work with the educational and political organizations who control the educational future of our children.



Learning Disabilities Association of America

4156 Library Road • Pittsburgh, PA 15234 • 412/341-1515 • 412/341-8077 • FAX 412/344-0224

POSITION PAPER ON FULL INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES IN THE REGULAR EDUCATION CLASSROOM January 1993

The Learning Disabilities Association of America, LDA, is a National not-for-profit organization of parents, professionals and persons with learning disabilities, concerned about the welfare of individuals with learning disabilities. During the 1990-91 school year 2,117,087 children in public schools in the United States were identified as having learning disabilities. This is more than fifty percent of the total number of students identified in all disability categories.

"Full inclusion," "full integration," "unified system," "inclusive education" are terms used to describe a popular policy/practice in which all students with disabilities, regardless of the nature or the severity of the disability and need for related services, receive their total education within the regular education classroom in their home school.

The Learning Disabilities Association of America does not support "full inclusion" or any policies that mandate the same placement, instruction, or treatment for **ALL** students with learning disabilities. Many students with learning disabilities benefit from being served in the regular education classroom. However, the regular education classroom is not the appropriate placement for a number of students with learning disabilities who may need alternative instructional environments, teaching strategies, and/or materials that cannot or will not be provided within the context of a regular classroom placement.

LDA believes that decisions regarding educational placement of students with disabilities must be based on the needs of each individual student rather than administrative convenience or budgetary considerations and must be the results of a cooperative effort involving the educators, parents, and the student when appropriate.

LDA strongly supports the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) which mandates:

- a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment appropriate for the students' specific learning needs.
- a team approved Individualized Education Program (IEP) that includes current functioning levels, instructional goals and objectives, placement and services decisions, and procedures for evaluation of program effectiveness.
- a placement decision must be made on an individual basis and considered only after the development of the IEP.
- a continuum of alternative placements to meet the needs of students with disabilities for special education and related services.
- a system for the continuing education of regular and special education and related services personnel to enable these personnel to meet the needs of children with disabilities.

LDA believes that the placement of **ALL** children with disabilities in the regular education classroom is as great a violation of IDEA as is the placement of **ALL** children in separate classrooms on the basis of their type of disability.

LDA URGES THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EACH STATE TO MOVE DELIBERATELY AND REFLECTIVELY IN SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING, USING THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT AS A FOUNDATION - - - MINDFUL OF THE BEST INTERESTS OF ALL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.



CEC POLICY ON INCLUSIVE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SETTINGS

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) believes all children, youth, and young adults with disabilities are entitled to a free and appropriate education and/or services that lead to an adult life characterized by satisfying relations with others, independent living, productive engagement in the community, and participation in society at large. To achieve such outcomes, there must exist for all children, youth, and young adults a rich variety of early intervention, educational, and vocational program options and experiences. Access to these programs and experiences should be based on individual educational need and desired outcomes. Furthermore, students and their families or guardians, as members of the planning team, may recommend the placement, curriculum option, and the exit document to be pursued.

CEC believes that a continuum of services must be available for all children, youth and young adults. CEC also believes that the concept of inclusion is a meaningful goal to be pursued in our schools and communities. In addition, CEC believes children, youth, and young adults with disabilities should be served whenever possible in general education classrooms in inclusive neighborhood schools and community settings. Such settings should be strengthened and supported by an infusion of specially trained personnel and other appropriate supportive practices according to the individual needs of the child.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Schools. In inclusive schools, the building administrator and staff with assistance from the special education administration should be primarily responsible for the education of children, youth, and young adults with disabilities. The administrator(s) and other school personnel must have available to them appropriate support and technical assistance to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities. Leaders in state/provincial and local governments must redefine rules and regulations as necessary, and grant school personnel greater authority to make decisions regarding curriculum, materials, instructional practice, and staffing patterns. In return for greater autonomy, the school administrator and staff should establish high standards for each child and youth and should be held accountable for his or her progress toward outcomes.

Communities. Inclusive schools must be located in inclusive communities; therefore, CEC invites all educators, other professionals, and family members to work together to create early intervention, educational, and vocational programs and experiences that are collegial, inclusive, and responsive to the diversity of children, youth, and young adults. Policy makers at the highest levels of state/provincial and local government, as well as school administration, also must support inclusion in the educational reforms they espouse. Further, the policy makers should fund programs in nutrition, early intervention, health care, parent education, and other social support programs that prepare all children, youth, and young adults to do well in school. There can be no meaningful school reform, nor inclusive schools, without funding of these key prerequisites. As important, there must be interagency agreements and collaboration with local governments and business to help prepare students to assume a constructive role in an inclusive community.

Professional Development. And finally, state/provincial departments of education, local educational districts, and colleges and universities must provide high-quality preservice and continuing professional development experiences that prepare all general educators to work effectively with children, youth, and young adults representing a wide range of abilities and disabilities, experiences, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, attitudes, and expectations. Moreover, special educators should be trained with an emphasis on their roles in inclusive schools and community settings. They also must learn the importance of establishing ambitious goals for their students and of using appropriate means of monitoring the progress of children, youth, and young adults.

ADOPTED BY THE CEC DELEGATE ASSEMBLY, 1993
San Antonio, Texas



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
May 6, 1993

CONTACT: Janet Bass
202-879-4554

SEVERAL LESSONS CAN BE LEARNED
FROM "EDUCATING PETER" DOCUMENTARY
Washington -- "Educating Peter," the 1993 Academy Award
winning short-subject documentary, is an inspiring film about
the successful transfer of a disabled child from a special
education classroom into a regular classroom.

The film, to air on HBO on May 12, shows the teacher's
commitment and planning for Peter's "inclusion" in the class
and the other students' extraordinary maturity and tolerance
of Peter, who has Down's syndrome.

But what rounded out the situation to make it a success
-- yet was not discussed in the film -- is that the teacher
had a full-time aide and Peter had a disabilities specialist
an hour a day: an example of an ideal situation, according
to the American Federation of Teachers.

"Inclusion," a new way of mainstreaming, allows special
needs students to be in regular classrooms full time and
services are supposedly brought to them.

But thousands of teachers nationwide are being thrown
into frustrating situations in which school systems rush to
include disabled children into regular classes without proper
planning or support services, possibly to save money.

"Often, the good intentions have become a formula for
failure," said Eugenia Kemble, AFT Assistant to the President
for Educational Affairs.

-more-

Sen. Ed.
3/9/94
Attachment 7

"With little or no training and often without an aide, teachers must cope with the demands of 25 to 30 or more students, including those with disabilities that may range from severe cerebral palsy to behavioral disorders. There is little hope that any student can get the proper attention when inclusion is poorly planned," Kemble said.

The American Federation of Teachers believes successful programs for disabled children should:

- ** Have long-range planning that includes classroom staff.
- ** Provide a full range of educational placement opportunities to meet the individual student's needs.
- ** Bring together administrators, teachers, teachers' aides, psychologists and other non-teaching professionals to choose the best placements for disabled students and to develop individual educational plans.
- ** Inform students' parents fully.
- ** Train classroom teachers and their aides carefully to understand and work with each disabled student.
- ** Involve special education teachers in providing support for regular teachers both in and out of the classroom.
- ** Provide enough aides and services to fully support each teacher.
- ** Have frequent reviews with the people who work with the students and consider new arrangements when placements are not working.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act states that the federal government will pay 40 percent of the cost to give all children, regardless of disability, access to a free public education. Yet less than 10 percent is provided.

"States and local school districts need the funds to help implement programs that thoughtfully mix disabled and non-disabled students so that all children receive the best education possible," Kemble said.

The AFT represents 820,000 teachers, school support staff, higher education faculty, nurses and other health care professionals, and state and municipal employees.



THE DIVISION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD

EXECUTIVE OFFICES: 320 EAST NORTH AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PA 15212

TELEPHONE: (412) 359-1636

FAX: (412) 231-4620

News Release:

Contact: Barbara J. Smith, Ph.D.
(412) 359-1636

DEC POSITION ON INCLUSION

The Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children held their Annual Business Meeting at the CEC Convention in San Antonio. On April 5, 1993 the Division for Early Childhood adopted a DEC Statement on Inclusion which is printed below.

POSITION STATEMENT ON INCLUSION

DIVISION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD OF THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

ADOPTED: APRIL, 1993

Inclusion, as a value, supports the right of all children, regardless of their diverse abilities, to participate actively in natural settings within their communities. A natural setting is one in which the child would spend time had he or she not had a disability. Such settings include but are not limited to home and family, play groups, child care, nursery schools, Head Start programs, kindergartens, and neighborhood school classrooms.

DEC believes in and supports full and successful access to health, social service, education, and other supports and services for young children and their families that promote full participation in community life. DEC values the diversity of families and supports a family guided process for determining services that are based on the needs and preferences of individual families and children.

To implement inclusive practices DEC supports: (a) the continued development, evaluation, and dissemination of full inclusion supports, services, and systems; (b) the development of preservice and inservice training programs that prepare families, administrators, and service providers to develop and work within inclusive settings; (c) collaboration among all key stakeholders to implement flexible fiscal and administrative procedures in support of inclusion; (d) research that contributes to our knowledge of state of the art services; and (e) the restructuring and unification of social, education, health, and intervention supports and services to make them more responsive to the needs of all children and families.