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ABSTRACT

This descriptive case study is an examination of the collaboration between an art education preservice student; a special education teacher; and an art education doctoral student as they planned and implemented an interdisciplinary art based curriculum for students with developmental handicaps in a 6th grade special education resource room in a community school. The integration of art into the special education curriculum, preparation of art education preservice students to work with special needs students, and university and community school collaboration were explored.

Findings of the research indicated preservice programs that incorporate field experiences in special education settings promote teacher confidence and understanding for teaching students with disabilities. This study also suggests that collaborative experiences in teaching are most successful when all members are involved in initiating the program, share a commitment to the process, and are open to the concept of shared teaching and learning.

This study suggested that universities involved in collaborations with community schools can begin to bridge the gap between practicing teachers and present research and provide lifelong learning opportunities for all involved. Initiation of preservice university/community interaction may also set the stage for increased future collaboration between these institutions as community teachers realized the benefits of not only extra physical help in the classroom but also aid in the practical application of the latest education theories to their curricula.
Implications of this study are that preservice programs in art education need to include experiences in which preservice students work with students with developmental disabilities. Community schools are convenient arenas for such experiences. It would be my suggestion the cooperating community teachers be given college credits for undertaking collaborative projects as they learning through these experiences too.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Almost all teachers at some point during their teaching experiences will be responsible for the education of students with disabilities. Present day classroom student compositions include students with individual needs and learning styles. In the art classroom the process of mainstreaming, or the placement of students with disabilities into the regular classroom with their peers is not new. Schools continue to battle with theoretical interpretations of federal legislation imposed by Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act passed in 1975. This landmark law established mandatory access to public education for all students regardless of their disabilities. Under this law, schools were required to provide appropriate educational services for all students in order to receive federal funding. The law contains a provision requiring that the student with disabilities “be educated in the least restrictive environment [LRE] that is consistent with his or her educational needs and, insofar as possible, with students without disabilities” (Hallaman & Kauffman, 1994, p. 32). The diversity of student populations continues to increase as schools attempt to comply with this law. Defining such an environment has been a key issue in the special education debate.
The art classroom is no exception to today’s education inclusionary legislation. Art teachers must deal with mainstreamed students. According to Pfeuffer-Guay (1993):

As individuals in special education communities questioned the need for special programs and the validity of continued separation of students, the concept of exceptionality in the classroom gave way to one of diversity. Art teachers were challenged to meet the needs of an extremely diverse population in integrated art classrooms (p. 222).

Art teachers struggle with methods of integrating these students. The teachers faced with the problems of revising their teaching practices and providing effective instruction for all students are, in many cases, unprepared to do so.

I first became interested in the possibilities of using art as a teaching method for special education when it became evident to me that the special needs students, whom I was teaching as an art specialist in elementary and secondary school programs, often flourished in my classroom. The potential art might have as a learning tool for special students led me to initiate, develop, and investigate the results of a curriculum that integrated art concepts and production in a learning disabilities classroom (Fedorenko, 1994). My previous site-specific research focused on the study of art as an educational learning tool for students with learning disabilities. It was a collaborative effort between the learning disabilities instructor and myself. We utilized art to facilitate language acquisition through writing and discussion about artworks, enhanced students’ self-esteem through art production related to the artworks discussed, and incorporated interdisciplinary team teaching
methods by means of collaborative teaching. I determined from this study that there was a need for further investigation of art as an enhancement for students with disabilities and that educational reform in the area of special education should include collaboration between the art specialist and the special education teacher.

**Background to the Problem**

As previously noted, the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) of 1975, now renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990, requires schools to provide a free, appropriate education for all children regardless of their handicaps. Special needs students are to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) possible. This requirement caused educational programming to integrate special needs students into regular classroom settings. Methods of this integration include mainstreaming, which means placing special needs students in regular classes for part of their education curriculum while continuing to provide a continuum of special services for them, and full inclusion which means that students are completely educated in the regular school classroom thus eliminating the need for separate special education rooms.

Regardless of the type of integration a school has selected, all teachers, whether they are prepared or unprepared, will experience a large student population containing students with a variety of special needs. Hallman and Kauffman (1994) warned, “Because many children with exceptionalities may receive some or most of their instruction in regular classrooms all teachers must be prepared to work with exceptional students” (p. IS-3).
Art teachers are no exception. They must be prepared to teach mainstreamed and included students.

As a university supervisor for preservice art education student teachers, I had many opportunities to touch base with practicing art educators in the reality of the teaching world. These art teachers provided me with many insights concerning the integration of students with disabilities mainstreamed into their classroom. During this university assignment in the fall of 1995, I distributed a survey to the practicing art teachers asking questions regarding their personal attitudes and beliefs about teaching students with disabilities. Feelings of frustration and insecurity surfaced. One teacher commented, “I understand they should be included in society and the classroom. I did not choose to teach art to special education students. I chose art education. I did not realize special education would be mainstreamed back when I began this job” (personal communication, May, 1994). Another teacher explained, “Some students just end up losing out because too much has been unrealistically expected” (personal communication, May, 1994). The majority of the teachers claimed to have little, if any, preparation to teach special needs students. When asked about the sources of their support, most of the teachers responded that they obtained information about specific students or disabilities by seeking assistance from the special education teachers in their buildings.

Their greatest concerns were how to deal with the wide range of disabilities that they encountered and how to provide lessons and projects that were challenging for the able students yet adaptable to the limiting conditions of the students with disabilities. The solutions that they suggested to resolve these problems included
better preparation and inservices regarding the special needs, abilities, and limitations of mainstreamed populations. They requested guidelines on how to plan for, include, and grade the mainstreamed students, as well as how to help other students learn about and deal with the disabilities of their mainstreamed classmates.

My findings concurred with those of a study conducted by Pfüeffer-Guay (1990). She found that art teachers desired better preparation for dealing with students with disabilities. She recommended that preservice programs should provide hands-on opportunities for preservice students to work with special populations, thus familiarizing them with mainstreaming and inclusion and lessening their anxiety about working with students with disabilities.

Art Education Teacher Preparation

Blandy (1994) strongly recommended a preservice program for art education students that includes preparation for and understanding of working with students with disabilities. He predicted that “students with disabilities will no longer be content with themselves and their art being designated as ‘special’ ” (p. 184). He proposed that the art education curriculum afford the art education students opportunities to focus on activities and literature that address disability issues and to develop teaching appropriate teaching methods for these students. A study by Carrigan (1994) maintained that it was more beneficial for students to experience teaching special needs students than for them to take a single special education class in a preservice program. Her study, in which the results of the placement of a student intern with an adult with disabilities were examined, supported the need for student teacher interaction with persons with disabilities. Her results indicated that
practical experience increased student teachers' growth of confidence in working with persons with disabilities; however she cautioned, "It may be that these participants were still somewhat uncertain about their comfort level and may have needed more time or new opportunities to explore their attitudes about special problems" (p. 21). Although the pairing of student interns and adults with disabilities helped to improve student teacher preparation, it is my contention that, as the students in Carrigan's study taught in an isolated environment rather than a classroom setting, this practice did not sufficiently prepare the preservice students to meet the needs of their future diverse student populations.

Collaboration

Collaboration in my previous study was initiated through local university contacts (Fodoreko, 1994). Following that study, I was given the graduate student university teaching assignment as supervisor to art education preservice student teachers. Throughout my assignment I contemplated the role the university might play in strengthening the preparation of preservice art education students for teaching students with disabilities in the art classroom. I believed that the formation of a collaborative learning experience among a university representative, a preservice art education student, and a special education teacher in a local community school would enhance teacher preparation, encourage collaborative learning, and bridge the university and the community school.

The Holmes Group (1990) supported creation of links between community schools and universities. Their collaborative model was designed to improve the teaching profession "By linking experienced teachers' efforts to review their
knowledge and advance their status with efforts to improve their schools and to prepare new teachers” (p. xv). It was the intent of the Holmes Group to enrich teacher education and at the same time to research the needs and effectiveness of teacher development programs. To form a true partnership with the schools, one which is reciprocal, they advised that the Professional Development School (PDS) sites should cultivate collaboration that promotes mutual learning opportunities for all involved: professors, novice teachers, and students.

Inclusion of special needs students in the art classroom is a reality. Educational reform in the special education curriculum is promoting student inclusion in all areas of education, and the art classroom is no exception. As art teachers continue to face problems related to curriculum delivery for special needs students, investigation of teacher preparation should be carried out.

My study investigates the development and implementation of an art integration program and special education curriculum, was based on a collaborative curriculum effort of a special education instructor; a preservice art education student; and myself, an art education graduate student. My research was two-fold. It focused on the integration of art with a curriculum for students placed in a special education classroom and on the effects of a university/community collaborative teaching process for all those involved.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of my study was to initiate and describe the collaboration that took place between the special education teacher, the preservice art education student, and myself in the development of an art integration program in a special education
classroom. The effectiveness of the collaboration in curriculum revision and the description of the collaborative efforts and relationships between the community school and the university were explored. It was my objective to answer the following questions:

1. What happens in terms of collaborative development and peer learning when an art education pre-service student, a special education teacher, and a university researcher integrate art into a special education program?

2. In what way is community/university collaboration helpful in preparing art education students for teaching special needs students in the mainstreamed or inclusive art classroom?

3. How can a collaborative teaching situation aid a special education teacher, a pre-service art education student, and a university graduate student in developing an integrated art program?

**Theoretical Framework**

I reviewed literature from the fields of art education, special education, and pre-service education, to support my study. Authors in the areas of art education and special education were investigated with regard to interdisciplinary curriculum and teacher preparation. Studies supporting teacher collaboration and university and community school collaborations were explored.

**Art and Special Education**

Special education literature supports my contention that an integrated approach to special education has positive effects on student learning. Studies have been directed toward art as a tool for reading development, such as the program
“Learning to Read Through the Arts.” Sponsored by a nonprofit organization operating in conjunction with the Guggenheim Museum in New York (Robson in Miles, 1982), this study promoted the inclusion of art as an enhancement in the area of reading development. Silver (1989) studied the use of cognitive skill development in students with hearing impairments, language disorders, and learning disabilities. He concluded from his studies that children improve their abilities to represent concepts of space, order, and class when art is introduced to them as a part of their curriculum.

Goebel and Gowland (1982) designed a pilot program that contained some traditional aims of art education such as individual expression and skills in handling materials. The program’s main focus, however, was on improving self-concept and developing organizational, listening, and task completion skills. Two special education teachers of learning disabled and behavioral adjustment children aged 7-12 participated in the program. The teachers advocated that such a program be made a part of the special education curriculum to prepare special needs students for mainstreaming into regular classes.

Teacher Preparation

Whereas special educators must overcome their inhibitions concerning the use of art in their classrooms, the field of art education needs to address problems art educators and preservice art education students experience with regard to their personal conceptions of the limited capabilities of students with disabilities. Blandy (1994) demanded that “we rethink our conceptions of disability and become uncomfortable with the stereotypes that we bring to our encounters with people
experiencing disabilities” (p. 179). He maintained that due to art educators’ personal biases and misunderstandings concerning the students’ abilities, they are uncomfortable teaching them. Present art programs for those with disabilities often have been influenced by these misconceptions and are simplistically conceived. They tend to be therapeutic and rehabilitative in nature, constructed around special activities or special art. Providing experiences for art education preservice students to work with students with disabilities may assist in altering their preconceived notions about them.

Blandy (1994) gave many reasons, including and focusing on the legal aspect, for teachers to examine their views on children with disabilities in their art classroom. He took a social reconstructive stance and advocated that, until art teachers redefine their art programs to include these students, art educators should study how to instruct students with disabilities in the context of multicultural education. By addressing issues of diversity in curriculum development focusing on multicultural content and the diversity of students’ abilities, art teachers should implement methods that include all members of the student population. He proposed that future art educators need to be aware of legal aspects of discrimination of students with disabilities, need to become informed about disabilities through literature, and should be involved in fieldwork experiences at sites where persons with disabilities are served.

Preservice programs exist that address the issues of inclusion for regular educators and teaching specialists; however, there is still controversy on the best delivery model for preparing teachers to meet the needs of the special needs students.
Jones and Messenhiemer-Young (1989) conducted a study that investigated the content of special education courses for preservice regular education teachers. Using survey techniques, the researchers explored practicing teachers' beliefs about their preservice delivery model and specifically addressed course content. They asked the participants to identify all types of direct experience they had working with special populations that were incorporated in the class work. The study questioned whether one course provided sufficient preparation for the teachers. Jones and Messenhiemer-Young had this to say about the use of only one course or model of learning: "If preservice regular education teachers are only exposed to one special education course that primarily presents content in a categorical framework, there is the danger of creating stereotypic attitudes regarding exceptional learners in these future teachers" (p. 158).

Williams (1990) conducted a study of a preservice education programs which had required a course in special education for regular education teachers. Participants were regular classroom teachers who had taken a course as undergraduates and had at least one year of teaching experience. They were surveyed about what improvements in course content they felt were necessary to improve their preparation. The need for more opportunities to work directly with handicapped students was highest on the list. They ranked as second the need for more special education courses for regular education majors. The teachers found that the single course had offered some assistance in dealing with mainstreamed or full-inclusion students but advocated for an improvement in the way the material was presented. They suggested that much of the information was sketchy. More in-depth coverage
of material relative to real teaching experiences was requested. When discussing
teacher preparation in the area of special needs students, Askamit (1990) stated,
“Models for teacher preparation vary considerably. Some programs require a course
in special education, some infuse the mainstream into existing undergraduate
course(s) while others combine these approaches” (p. 22).

University and Community School Collaboration

Universities may offer opportunities for collaborative teaching with educators
in the communities in which they are located. Schiller (1994) conducted a study that
introduced seven special education teachers to an art unit on quilt making which
integrated art with written and oral language development. This collaborative model
promoted the sharing of expertise between a university professional and special
education teachers. She concluded, “These teachers have found, through art, an
avenue for language development in their classrooms....All seven teachers in the
staff development project are convinced that art should be more than a free-time
activity in the special education classroom” (p. 15). During this experience the
teachers learned a new way of utilizing art in their classroom. She explained,
“Although most of the seven teachers used art production activities in their
classrooms, none of the teachers had previous experience with using art as a vehicle
for stimulating practice in oral and written language” (p. 13).

Although there is evidence in literature of the positive effects of an integrated
art program for students experiencing disabilities (Silver, 1989; Goebel and
Gowland, 1982), teachers in the area of special education lack training in the arts and
are unsure of how to apply an interdisciplinary approach of learning through the arts.
Art education preservice students are not provided adequate preparation for teaching the students with disabilities. It has been my personal experience that the collaboration of the local university and the school community can promote a creative learning situation for all of those involved (Fedorenko, 1994).

Teacher Collaboration

My study relied on the collaboration of a special education teacher; an art education preservice student; and myself, an art educator and university researcher. Previous studies (Fedorenko, 1994; Gobel and Gowland, 1992; Weidmeyer and Lehman, 1991) indicated that the incorporation of art programs into special education settings are successful when there is a strong collaboration between the teachers of the two specialties and administrative support. Wiedmeyer and Lehman (1991) stated, “It must be stressed that for the collaborative teaching model to succeed, everyone involved must be flexible, willing to try something new and dedicated to the concept of mainstreaming” (p. 10). In this collaborative teaching study, the special education teacher in a community school was afforded an opportunity to learn art methods applicable to interdisciplinary teaching through curriculum planning with the preservice art education student. In turn, the special education teacher became an invaluable resource for the preservice student, providing insight as to the abilities of the special needs students and strengthening her teacher preparation in the area of special education.

Site and Participants

The site where the research took place was a sixth grade junior high school special education classroom for developmentally handicapped (DH) students located
in Columbus, Ohio, in close proximity to The Ohio State University. The ages of the students ranged between 11 and 13. Their developmental problems spanned a wide range. These students; the principal; and other staff members were the secondary participants of the study. The primary participants were the special education teacher Noreen; who had been teaching in the DH classroom at this school for five years, the preservice art education student Jancy; and myself, an art education doctoral student and researcher.

Methodology

The methodology selected for this research project is descriptive case study. An important characteristic that I considered in the design of the study was the subjective nature of the research problem. To insure rich description of the social situation I was studying, I employed the practice commonly termed triangulation (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). Triangulation, the use of multiple data sources, increases the validity of my findings (Miles and Huberman, 1984). I borrowed techniques from anthropological ethnographic research for data collection; participant observation was documented through the use of field notes, interviews, teacher journals, and document collection in the form of videos and photographs of student work. The difference between the use of ethnographic approach for anthropological studies and my use of them for educational research is in the interpretation and application to data analysis. In anthropological studies the data is analyzed from a cultural perspective whereas my data was analyzed from an educational reform perspective.
Stake(1988) defined an educational case study as one which explores “an educational problem in all its personal and social complexity” (p. 254). Stake further described a case study in this way: “The case study focuses on a bounded system....What is being studied is the case. The case is something deemed worthy of close watch. It has character, it has a totality, it has boundaries” (p. 256).

In this study, the educational problem under investigation was extremely complex: How to give preservice art education students practical knowledge for teaching mainstreamed and included students with disabilities in their classroom. I posited that collaboration between university and community schools was a good way to do so. The bounded system in this research was the collaboration that took place among myself, a preservice art education student, and a teacher of students with disabilities to design and implement an art integrated special education curriculum within a sixth grade special education classroom.

Ethnographic techniques permitted me to look at things as they happened and to narrate what I saw occurring. I refrained from drawing conclusions that might be generalized to similar situations. The goal of my qualitative study was to observe and describe what happened in terms of collaboration when an art preservice student, a special education teacher, and myself in the role of a university researcher integrated art into a special education program. My purpose was to allow others to become aware of what occurred in this particular situation, to permit further questions to emerge, and to use a personal insight to describe a subject that calls for further research. Donmoyer (1990) asserted that research concerned with individuals cannot be generalized in the traditional way, that is to predict behavior in a similar
situation. He stated, “Research can only function as a heuristic which can never dictate action but only suggest possibilities. It may well be the case that case study research can fulfill this function as well, or possibly even better than more traditional approaches to research” (p. 10).

**Data Analysis**

Spradley (1979) observed that analyzing the data collected in a participant observation study requires a search for patterns that emerge throughout the data collection. During this study I used the data analysis method described by Glesne and Peshkin (1992), that includes writing memos within the field log collections, developing analytical files, applying rudimentary coding systems, and sorting and recoding through data display.

Much of the analysis of data was done as the study progressed. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) explained, “data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds. Consistently reflecting on your data, work on organizing them and try to discover what they have to tell you” (p. 127). As my field notes developed, I kept personal memos as a reflective log to assist in the coding of the data. I transferred information and looked for patterns of behavior or themes to emerge. According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992), “As your data and experience grow, you will create relevant specific files on the social processes under investigation” (p. 178).

Charts were a part of the data analysis. I developed data display techniques to provide visual organization of data. Miles and Huberman (1984) described data display as organizing information in a manner that visually shows what one knows.
and assists in providing a format for future collection. Relying on an ethnographic approach, the final analysis of data included a written description of observations, work samples by students, and data displays. I referred to Spradley's (1980) technique for participant observations when producing a written account.

The written account of the data analysis is a descriptive case study of the collaboration of the teachers. Taking the suggestion of Glesne and Peshkin (1992), my story was constructed “like that of a painter whose vision emerges over time from intuition, sense, and feeling.” (p. 151) They continued, “For many, constructing a text is quite possibly some combination of both plan and intuition” (p. 151). I transformed my collected data into a descriptive tale to provide the reader with information that will paint the picture of the researched situation for them, thereby creating an opportunity for their deeper understanding of it.

**Significance of the Study**

This study was a case study of a collaboration between an art education preservice student, a special education teacher, and myself, an art education graduate student as we designed and implemented an art integrated special education curriculum. Through this collaboration, the primary participants; a special education teacher, a preservice art education student, and myself, were given the opportunity to share our individual expertise and learn from each other and the secondary participants; students in special education classroom were afforded alternate methods of learning through art. The role of the university and community school collaboration as a catalyst for collaborative models was investigated.
My previous study (Fedorenko, 1994) was a collaboration between a learning disabilities teacher in a public school and myself, an art education graduate student to integrate art into her classroom curriculum. Results of that study indicated that collaborative teaching provided a strong resource for each of us. Studies by Weidmeyer and Lehman (1991), and Gobel and Gowland (1992), have indicated incorporation of art programs into special education settings are successful when there is a strong collaboration among the teachers of the two specialties. This study supported collaboration between special education and art education.

In the area of curriculum revision my previous study (Fedorenko, 1994) supported the integration of art in the special education curriculum as a valuable method for teaching language concepts and provided opportunities for increasing student self-esteem. I believe this type of interdisciplinary program might render a new method for teaching students that have difficulty learning through traditional means and may influence their understanding in other areas. This study supports my beliefs. Dalke (1984) explained, “in the production of art there are no regimented patterns of wrong or right as in spelling. While producing art each child has an opportunity to succeed” (p. 80).

My present study provided a preservice art education student the opportunity to work with special needs students and provided experience in planning lessons for their specific learning abilities. This experience enhanced her understanding and acceptance of exceptional students; a group she will find included in the her future art classroom. Art teachers in the field have suggested that they lack adequate preparation for teaching a diverse audience. Guay (1994) produced a study that
found practicing art teachers felt they had experienced “inadequate preparation to
teach art to students with disabilities in integrated classes after experiencing a special
education course, any of a variety of ‘other’ courses, and after experiencing the
infusion of special education curricula into art education methods courses” (p. 54).
She recommended that

consulting or collaborating with special education faculty at the teacher
education level could strengthen both the infusion and special education class
models. These collegial relationships could also serve as a model for similar
relationships among art and special education teachers at the school level
(p. 54).

It is my opinion that my study proved her contention correct.

From my previous research (Fedorenko, 1994), I know that local university
contact provides opportunities for collaborative teaching. It is possible for university
personnel to conduct research that promotes a sharing of resources with public
school teachers. Schiller and Hanes (1994) contended that “A collaborative approach
can and should affect the professional growth of teachers and university personnel “
(p. 218). I would like to see more universities become involved in research projects
with community schools, in order that collaborative models of teaching may emerge.
I believe that if these education arenas collaborate, it will result in new ways of
sharing learning experiences and expertise. Zimpher and Howey (1989) also
advocated the need for more collaborative studies between school teachers and
university educators.
Many states require completion of a special education course for teacher certification. The federal government has not mandated such a requirement. I believe that universities need to design their present regular education and art education programs to include special needs teacher training. Providing preservice students and teachers with positive experiences when working with students with disabilities can better prepare them to work with diverse student populations and should correct teacher's personal biases against the disabled (Blandy, 1993). If teachers develop confidence and comfort with disabled people, they will be less likely to resist inclusion of differently abled students.

Teacher training models that encourage collaboration between special education teachers and art education preservice students promote stronger preparation for working with students with disabilities, encourage interdisciplinary teaching, and provide opportunities for researchers to make connections between theory and practice. Students in the community schools are given alternate ways of learning and may increase in their feelings of self-worth through an integrated art program. It is my conclusion that teachers, preservice students, and educational researchers can benefit from collaboration between community schools and local universities. This study may serve as a model for others to study and emulate.
CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents literature from the fields of special education, teacher education, and art education to support my study. The first section discusses the development of special education and defines the terms *mainstreaming* and *inclusion.* The next section addresses literature connected with teacher preparation, collaboration, and curriculum in special education and art education.

The Development of Special Education

The evolution of special education as a discipline is grounded in the fields of psychology and sociology as well as the political environment of society. When compulsory schooling became a reality and children with disabilities became active members of the community, it was necessary to focus attention on education for children with special needs. Litigation emerged that was directed towards providing education for all, and questions relevant to the delivery systems for special education arose.

The 1970s saw positive strides being made towards providing greater educational opportunities for persons with disabilities. The forerunner to the most influential legislative act, Public Law 94-142, The Education of the Handicapped Amendment, was enacted in 1973. Provisions compulsory under this amendment included full educational services for all children with disabilities. This concept, termed the *Least Restrictive Alternative,* stated that children had the right to be
educated in the environment with their nondisabled peers with the provision of supplementary services or aids unless such assistance is unsuccessful.

Also enacted in 1973 was the Rehabilitation Act, essentially a civil rights act for persons with disabilities. This act prohibited discrimination on the basis of disability, guaranteed that individuals with disabilities be afforded access to facilities and programs, and threatened the removal of federal education and rehabilitation funds if violations in the enactment of the law occurred. This law resulted in changes in public physical facilities and is echoed in legislation throughout the next decade.

Parent advocates for equal educational opportunities for their children with disabilities, growth of humanitarian concerns, and the issue of civil rights for all individuals paved the way for the landmark law in special education PL 94-142. This law passed in 1975 was titled The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, (now titled the Individuals with Disabilities Act, or IDEA) and was the strongest legislation passed that provided for educational opportunities for all children. This law established mandatory access to public education for all students regardless of their disabilities. Schools were required under the new law to provide appropriate educational services for all students in order to receive funding. In contrast to earlier legislation which was permissive in that it allowed programs for students with disabilities, PL 94-142 required that schools provide programs for these students (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1994).

Perhaps the most controversial provision of PL94-142 surrounds the requirement of educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. (LRE) and defining this environment has been a key issue in the
special education debate. Under this provision, the federal law guaranteed that “the student must be educated in the least restrictive environment that is consistent with his or her education needs and, insofar as possible, with students without disabilities” (Hallaman & Kauffman, 1994, p. 32). The definition of the least restrictive environment is under the discretion of the individual school systems and the ramifications of these differing interpretations has resulted in the creation of an assortment of programs of varying inclusiveness and effectiveness.

In 1990 two landmark laws were passed. The first law, The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), amended the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and illustrated changing societal values towards individuals with disabilities. One significant transformation made under the amendment was related to the language used to describe disabilities. Terminology used altered the term handicapped to become disabilities acknowledging the difference between limitations imposed by society (handicap) and the inability to do certain things (disability). Attempts were being made to place an emphasis on what individuals can do as opposed to what they cannot do. Bilken and Bogdan (1977) observed, “people without disabilities sometimes focus so intensely on the disability that it becomes impossible for them to recognize that the person with a disability is simply another person with many of the same emotions, needs and interests as other people” (p. 207). The human rights of persons with disabilities was again being addressed. The emphasis on language revision also included implementing the phrase “with disabilities” recognizing the need to place a person or individual first and further exemplifying that the disability of a person was only a part of the individual’s persona.
Supporting the influence of language on the formation of images, Blaska (1993) contended, “The words that are utilized to describe individuals convey individual and/or societal prejudices toward a specific group of people. Stereotyping persons with disabilities occurs when using words such as ‘handicapped’ which originated from a begging term meaning cap-in-hand” (p. 27). She continued to describe the influence language has on the stereotyping of individuals. She concluded that the emphasis on a people-first language, one in which the person is addressed before the disability, is a step in eliciting a change in societal attitudes as it creates respect for the individual first and refers to their disability only when it is needed. It is her determination that because the use of language has a very persuasive effect on society’s perceptions of individuals the use of language with positive connotations can help to eliminate the negative discrimination persons with disabilities have received.

Although legal advances have been made to protect and secure the rights of individuals with disabilities through recognition of the semantic power of language and the importance of providing free, appropriate educational opportunities for all, the legal description of the LRE is vague. According to Hasazi, Broady, Johnston, Ligget, and Schattman (1994):

Since the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975 (currently known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA), practitioners, researchers, parents, and policy makers have continually raised questions about the interpretation and implementation of the least restrictive environment (LRE) provision of the Act (p. 491).
Regulations required that a continuum of placements be available. These have included instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and in some cases hospitals and institutions. The mandate of the law gave the individual states and local school districts the power to interpret the least restrictive environment clause and has thus allowed for the creation of varying theoretical perspectives and interpretations. “The Act explicitly states that the LRE provision applies across the continuum of placement alternatives” (Osborne & Dimattia, 1994, p. 6). As a result chaos has developed concerning the issues of human rights and program implementations.

The Least Restrictive Environment - From Theory to Practice

Two key issues are addressed in the creation of the least restrictive environment mandate: one dealing with the human rights of individuals and the other concentrating on providing the most appropriate educational opportunities for students with disabilities that afford them the opportunity to be educated with their peers as much as possible. Osborne (1994) stated, “Conventional theory in the field of special education holds that each child with a disability is to be treated as an individual and that to be successful an instructional program must be designed with that child’s unique abilities and needs in mind” (p. 491). He explained that court rulings on educational discrimination upheld decisions that were based on the merits of each case, thus the courts advocated the need for a continuum of services. Osborne contented that it is the business of the court to ensure that the decisions made by educators are consistent with the law.
School districts continue to struggle with interpretation of the law. Programs that have been incorporated include mainstreaming and inclusion, each of these with underlying theories and varying degrees of interpretation. Although progress has been made, the field of education is in a constant struggle to determine what special education and related services should become.

**Mainstreaming**

"The terms *least restrictive environment* and *mainstreaming* are frequently confused. The terms are distinct and should not be used interchangeably" (Osborne & DiMattia, 1994, p. 6). The LRE is a term used in PL 94-142 to define the mandated educational environment of students with disabilities as an environment that is as close as possible to that of their nondisabled peers. Mainstreaming, an educational practice of practice of placing students with disabilities in regular education classes with support services for them when necessary. Mainstreaming is not a simple placement in the regular education classroom. Mainstreaming, while supporting the need for a student with disabilities to be educated within the regular classroom, provides a wide range of educational support environments.

Bowd (1986) explained,

The regular classroom and the special school are only two among the wide range of educational settings. The choice of placement for each individual child extends across this range and depends upon each person’s specific pattern of needs. Children who need more specialized programs than the regular classroom is able to provide should be entitled to a placement which is no more ‘special’ than is necessary. (p. 16)
The process of mainstreaming recognizes that the placement of a student with disabilities in the regular classroom for the entire educational experience may not always be the best placement for the student and a continuum of services are available. In the mainstreaming process, the continuum of placements for students with disabilities are varied and may include: regular class placement; regular class placement with instructional service support; part-time placement in a special class with some instruction in the regular class; self-contained special classroom settings; a special day school setting; and at the end of the continuum, placement in a full-time residential school.

**Inclusion**

A loosely defined term, *inclusive education* for students with disabilities has been interpreted and implemented in many different ways. Review of literature reveals the theoretical roots of inclusion and paints the picture of the confused ideology behind the varied interpretations. Friend and Cook (1993) explained,

The term inclusion has been defined in many ways by many people, and your school district may even have its own definition. Generally, inclusion is an educational philosophy based on the belief that all students are entitled to fully participate in their school community. (p. 53)

This philosophy is based on the premises of human and civil rights, covers a wide range of inclusive delivery systems, from partial inclusion to full inclusion, and transports a variety of delivery models for special services.

Inclusion is not a legal mandate. Inclusion is a theoretical perspective developed by states and school districts in their interpretation of the least restrictive environment. Based on the moral and ethical dilemmas faced by educators in
providing the assurance of human rights for individuals with disabilities, inclusion, and elements towards inclusive education systems are emerging. As state educational programs address the issues of equality in education, educators face the dilemma of creating a “free appropriate public education” within the “least restrictive environment” neither of which are clearly defined. Interpretations of appropriate education have generally included the provisions of placement options within the continuum of service options.

In the 1980's questions of segregation still remained, the human rights issues resurfaced, and the theory of inclusion was born. Lipskey and Gartner (1989) sustained:

While PL94-142 itself does not require the type of special education service system that has evolved, it is fair to say that what has developed by and large is in keeping with its direction. Also, it has clearly encouraged the state legislation and regulations that maintain separation. (p. 9)

They contended that by providing options in placement of students that include separate services, educators are still upholding the removal or alienation of students with disabilities. A statement prepared for the Council of Volunteers and Organizations for Hoosiers with Disabilities, Inc. in Indiana (1994) recounted this testimony and stated that the inclusion movement is based on the theory that an inclusive society cannot be created when the society “accepts and respects individual differences by perpetuating apartheid-based disabilities” (p. 1).

The full inclusion process is not a placement of students in special services outside the regular classroom, it is the provision of educational support services.
within the general classroom. Rogers (1993) described the process of full inclusion and stated,

This term is primarily used to refer to the belief that instructional practices and technological supports are presently available to accommodate all students in the schools and classrooms they would otherwise attend if not disabled. Proponents of full inclusion tend to encourage that special education services generally be delivered in the form of training and technical assistance to the "regular" classroom teachers. (p. 2)

Supporters of full inclusion name several advantages for serving students with disabilities in the general classroom. They maintain that inclusion removes biases and prejudices towards individuals with disabilities, reduces the mislabeling of students, eliminates the current dual system of education which is in itself discriminatory, and initiates the creation of a more individualized education for all students. Many proponents of inclusion process believe that a restructuring of the entire current educational system is needed.

Questions concerning full inclusion are embedded in the differing interpretations of the most appropriate educational program for all students. Professionals against full inclusion are concerned about the students for whom the complete integration into the regular classroom may not be the most appropriate setting. Lieberman (1992) asserted; "To be against full integration as public policy, or educational or school policy, is not to be for exclusion" (p. 15). He suggested that there remains a need to provide special services outside of the general classroom for some students when the full inclusion is not the least restrictive environment.
Full integrationists are advocating for a program, while the more important issue remains the needs of individual children....The resolution is choice. It is the ability to choose full integration in a regular classroom as a viable and appropriate placement for some disabled, and even some severely disabled children. The continuum of services must be preserved. There is a need for a range of service options because there is a range of disabled people with a wide range of needs, many of which cannot be possibly met in the regular classroom. (p. 23)

The lack of necessary support for students with disabilities placed in a regular classroom troubles professionals who are not in favor of full inclusion. Many fear that the inclusion process will not be providing the best environment for all individuals with disabilities. Shanker (1994) argued:

We need to discard the ideology that inclusion in a regular classroom is the only appropriate placement for a disabled child and get back to the ideas of a 'continuum of placements,' based on the nature and severity of the handicap. Make the ability to function in a regular classroom, given the necessary support services, a condition for placement there. (p. 21)

He maintained that the placement of students should be reliant on the individual students, not on the institution of a program.

Surfacing in the debates on placement services, is the necessity to center on the individual child and their specific needs in the educational system. In the revision of terminology in the enactment of The Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), focus was placed on the individual before the disability. As states struggle with the issues of human rights questions arise as to whether the focus on the
individual student becomes abandoned. Questions as to making placements on an individual basis for each student as opposed to placements of inclusion for all students emerge.

Lipskey and Gartner (1992) argued that the key to the educational reform is to place the student at the center. They declared:

Rather than focusing on the adult providers of educational services or the balance of responsibility among national, state, and local authorities, the formulation places the student at the center of educational reform. (p. 5)

They maintained that the student is the one who is responsible for the actual learning and suggested:

Giving students respect, building upon their knowledge, providing them control over the learning process and appropriate materials, helping them to see the connection between subjects, encouraging cooperation among students, these are necessary predicates to increases in student learning, the bases for school improvement that will produce enhanced school outcomes of substantial magnitude. (p. 5)

Lipskey and Gartner contended that the students become active participants in their education through discovery and by developing a higher level of thinking. They suggested methods of learning focus on cooperative learning strategies and peer tutoring.

In student centered curriculum development, the revision of teaching responsibilities should occur and education should focus on the parents and communities as partners in school reform. In this educational reform movement,
the role of teacher is that of enabler of learning. Interdisciplinary teaching and collaboration with teachers, parents, and the community facilitate the program.

Others believe a solution to the problems in education rests in the restructuring of our entire educational system so that there is no longer a separation between regular and special education. Presented first by Madeline Will in 1986, the Regular Education Initiative (REI) was created in effort to improve and coordinate instruction for students with disabilities. Leaders of the REI had several goals, the strongest being the merger of special education and regular education. Another goal to increase the success of the mainstreaming process. Stainback and Stainback (1989) explained that the movement bore the intent of merging the two separate camps into one learning environment. They suggested that the key element in integrating students into the curriculum is for all educational groups to work together. When discussing the present situation promoting inclusion for all students, they stated;

As this movement intensifies and progresses, it will be essential to remain cognizant that regular education is not at the present time structured or equipped to successfully meet the unique needs of all students. To gear up, special and regular educators will need to join together as one group with the purpose of organizing a strong and comprehensive regular system of education that can meet the needs of all students. (p. 42)

REI and inclusion are similar in that both aspire to provide equal educational opportunities for children with disabilities. Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) stated that a major difference in the two theoretical perspectives is underlined in the difference between social acceptance and academic competency: [W]hereas full
inclusionists would appear to measure integration success in terms of social acceptance, REI proponents' bottom line tended to index academic competence/success (p. 301). They explained that the REI leaders are concerned with students with mild to moderate disabilities and full inclusionists advocate integration for all students with disabilities, regardless of the severity. Varying beliefs on how to include and to what extent to include children with disabilities in regular education, as well as motivation for the necessity of inclusion exist. Rogers (1993) wrote:

Two different lines of reasoning have converged in the inclusion movement. The first line of reasoning is the civil rights argument that segregated education is inherently unequal and, therefore, a violation of the rights of the children who are segregated. The second line of reasoning is that empirical analysis of the outcomes from established special education programs indicate that they just haven’t worked. (p. 3)

She believed that in a successful inclusion program resources would be effectively utilized, students would learn to value diversity, and they would be provided with challenging learning environments. In successful inclusionary classrooms, teachers would work together in a supportive and enriching atmosphere.

The National Education Association (CEC, 1994) strongly supported appropriate inclusion. According to their guidelines, appropriate inclusion would mean: 1) a full continuum of placement options and services within those options for students with disabilities, (placements would be determined by the IEP team), 2) appropriate professional development would be provided as a part of normal work activities for administrators, parents, and other school staff members, 3) time
would be scheduled during the school day for collaborative planning, and 4) staff and technical assistance appropriate for student and teacher needs would be provided. The NEA judged that “Inclusion practices and programs which lack these fundamental characteristics are inappropriate” (CEC, 1994, p. iii).

**Preparing for Inclusion-Teacher Preparation**

As states and schools begin to institute full inclusion practices, with their experiences comes advice for others that plan to adapt full inclusion. Most proponents for inclusion suggest that if full inclusion is to be achieved successfully many things need to be in place prior to its introduction. Many of the advocates view inclusion as a process and warn that steps should be carefully taken before initiating inclusion. They believe the problem is not in the process of inclusion, but in the failure to effectively prepare teachers for the process. They suggest that successful inclusion takes time and should be incorporated gradually.

Many of the failures in inclusive education programs are embedded in the negative attitudes of the teachers towards the program and underlying fears they possess. Adequate teacher preparation needs to be provided. Strong support for the program should come from administrators and teachers who are dedicated to the principle of inclusion. Teachers should be allotted opportunities to develop confidence and flexibility before implementing inclusion. Mc Dowell (1992) explained,

Inclusion is a community concept, not necessarily an educational one.

But that doesn’t mean that students alone are included: it means that teachers and administrators are as well. The best schools have always been and
always will be the ones where there is a sense of community. (Bulletin, Very Special Arts Indiana: Art and Music Teachers’ Conference, October 20, 1992).

The inclusive school is built on educational reform. There is a need for educators to design new methods of instruction in order to help create schools that meet the needs of all children. As Sapon-Shevin explained (in O’Neil, 1994), it isn’t that a continuum of services shouldn’t be offered for students with disabilities, but that the services should occur within the regular classroom context. She maintained, “Again, we shouldn’t think of choosing between special education services and regular classrooms as they currently look, but to rethink, restructure, and recreate a different kind of regular education classroom” (p. 10).

Teacher collaboration is a primary element in the integration of successful inclusion programs. Barry (1994) explained, “The integration process appears to work especially well when the special education teacher works side by side with the regular teacher” (p. 21). He recommends joint or team teaching practices by special education teachers and regular education teachers within the class as opposed to placing students into separate groups. Personal development for teachers involved in the inclusion process should be afforded with adequate time and training to create comfort levels for them when assuming their new roles. In my study, the preservice art education student was afforded the opportunity of working with a special education teacher in the classroom. Although the arena for this learning experience was the special education resource room as opposed to an inclusionary setting, both the special education teacher and the preservice art education
participated in team teaching endeavors and were introduced to a collaborative teaching model.

**University Teacher Preparation Programs**

Relative to the passage of Public Law 94-142 discussed earlier, the federal government provided financial assistance to colleges of education to support them in the redesigning of teacher education programs regarding the preparation for future teachers to teach mainstreamed students during the years 1975 through 1986. Titled “Dean’s Grants,” these financial grants assisted colleges and university in developing teacher preparation programs for teaching students with disabilities. A variety of teacher preparation programs resulted: curriculum infusion models, the addition of required courses on teaching students with disabilities to the old program, or a combination of these two approaches (Askamit, 1990).

Askamit examined these approaches to teacher preparation programs. In her study, the participants were education graduates from a large midwestern university. The participating teachers completed a questionnaire in which they evaluated the programs in which they had participated. The results of the study indicated that the teachers believed they did not acquire the knowledge and skills needed to teach mainstreamed students. Their recommendations for improvement in teacher preparation programs supported a need for practice teaching experiences and a stronger curriculum infusion model in all present course offerings.

In response to her findings, Askamit (1990) evaluated the existing program options and proposed new ones. She dismissed the idea of a single course requirement stating
There is little evidence that such courses adequately prepare teachers to respond to the variety of curricular and instructional needs of handicapped and other at-risk students. Additionally, requiring a separate course is inconsistent with the concept of mainstreaming and reinforces the attitude that labeled children “belong” to special education.” (p. 27) She embraced the curriculum infusion model, however, she suggested that in order for it to be effective, it should include collaboration between regular education and special education faculty.

Askamit found much to like about the approach whereby students were provided with a knowledge base concerning disabilities at the beginning of their educational program, that was continued and developed through methods and practical courses. She explained that this approach supported team teaching methods between special education and general education. She also found this approach to be supportive of a dual major program, which would allow teachers to become more effective collaborators and to support consultation methods of teaching.

The final teaching approach Askamit examined actually merged elementary education and special education. She found it to be a viable program option, though she did not feel that successful education programs necessarily had to be so extreme. Askamit posited that the success of any preservice program model was dependent on “the ability of both general education and special education faculty to know what and how to teach and to structure relevant practice” (p. 28).

Several other studies examined practicing teachers’ conceptions of their preparation for mainstreaming in the context of their internal beliefs and actual
teaching practices. Schumm, Vaughn, Gordon, and Rothlein (1994) examined
teachers' beliefs about teaching mainstreamed students with learning disabilities, the
relationship of their beliefs to their teaching practices, and the implications from this
research for teacher education. Using a variety of research methods, they studied a
sampling of elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Findings of the study
suggested that when introducing teaching adaptations for students with disabilities,
the practices need to be practical and take into consideration class size, planning
time, and other obstacles that would inhibit adaptations. The teachers desired that
instructional adaptations should be instituted into teacher education programs.
The teachers also suggested that teacher education programs should teach preservice
students how to work collaboratively in the teaching environment.

Betancourt-Smith (1992) investigated high school teachers teaching
strategies for mainstreamed students with learning disabilities. She concluded that
the teachers were ill-prepared to deal with the mainstreamed students.
She explained, “Teachers made statements that indicated that they did not feel
adequately trained either through their pre-service or their in-service education to
teach LD [learning disabled] students” (p. 448). She contended that the results of
the study attest to the need for teachers to be trained to recognize the differences in
students' learning styles and be taught strategies to work with students
with disabilities.

Lyon, Vaassen, and Toomey (1989) investigated teachers' perceptions of
their undergraduate and graduate preparation programs effectiveness in preparing
them to teach students with disabilities. They surveyed a group of 440 regular and
special education teachers in grades one through seven. They found that the
majority of the teachers perceive that they were not prepared with effective and contextualized instruction in either their classroom instruction or in their practical teaching experiences. These teachers indicated that lack of consistent supervision from the university supervisors during student teaching assignments was one of the major flaws in their teacher preparation. The teachers also implied that the expertise they developed in teaching students with learning differences came as a result of their own private teaching experiences. After evaluating the data, Lyon et. al. advised that higher education examine teacher preparation programs and “begin to integrate theory and practice as we prepare our teachers, and do so within school setting and under the conditions that teachers will ultimately be faced with as they engage in the complex activities of their profession” (p. 169). As a collaborative partner and university representative for Jancy, I served as a constant supervisor and collaborative partner during the programs implementation. I assisted her in implementing lessons to address students different learning styles recommended in this study and provided her and the special education teacher with the opportunity to learn to teach together.

This collaborative teaching endeavor illustrated the need for practical experiences for teachers in collaborative team teaching endeavors and supported the contention that teachers learn from these experiences.

**Theories in the Field of Art Education**

According to information published by the Education Department’s 16th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the numbers of students with disabilities attending regular classes rose in 1991-1992 to 7.1 million (NAEA News,
December, 1994 p. 23). Inclusion implementation will result in an even larger number of students with disabilities being placed in the regular classrooms, and art classrooms are no exceptions. Research concerning art education teacher preparation programs (Fedoreenko, 1994; Pfueffer-Guay, 1993, 1994) indicated that present systems of preparation are perceived as inadequate. Pfueffer-Guay (1994) asked art teachers to report on their preservice preparation programs with regard to teaching students with disabilities. She concluded,

> The findings of this research are disturbing. They indicated inadequate preparation to teach art students with disabilities in integrated classes after experiencing a special education course, any variety of ‘other’ courses, and after experiencing the infusion of special education curricula into art education methods courses. (p. 54)

Art teachers are faced with problems of revising past practices and are faced with the challenges of providing effective instruction for all students. In another study conducted by Pfueffer-Guay (1993), she observed that art teachers expressed the need to become better prepared for dealing with students with disabilities. When reviewing the data, she concluded that preservice programs needed to provide opportunities for students that would better prepare art teachers for the process of mainstreaming. The art education preservice student who participated in my study echoed the concern the art teachers expressed. She believed the challenges she had faced when teaching students with disabilities in the art classroom during her previous student teaching assignment made her aware of her lack of preparation when dealing with special education students.
She contended that her participation in my study provided her with more confidence and a stronger knowledge base for future teaching.

As art teachers grapple with the mainstreaming process, underlying issues surface and several theoretical stands have emerged in the field of art education. Congruent with the perspectives that emerged from social and political theories and the issue of human rights, Blandy (1994) declared the need for a social reconstruction paradigm in the field of art education. He alleged that the past practices in art education incorporated teaching methodologies that placed functional limitations on what individuals with disabilities could be expected to create. He explained, “this phase concluded in art education with the functional-limitations model and its focus on categories of disabilities and with remediative strategies still firmly entrenched” (p. 140). Misconceptions about students with disabilities led to the creation of art that was “special” and did not promote equitable art programs. These misconceptions were responsible for the fact that art teachers focused on the abilities as opposed to the abilities of physically and mentally challenged students. Advocating for a focus shift in art education, one which stems from a sociopolitical angle of student equality, Blandy suggested a revision in art teaching practices to encourage nondiscriminatory learning methods and programs and to afford art educators the opportunity to become active participants in the reconceptualization of disabilities. He maintained that by reshaping the present belief systems towards individuals with disabilities, art educators can be active voices in the civil rights movement.

Theoretical perspectives in the field of art education are connected to the concept of normalization. Blandy (1989) stated:
This principle [normalization] demands that art educators must teach in a way which allows disabled students to act and appear in a way which is appropriate to persons of their age. “Special” curriculums and learning activities are restrained by this principle. Normalization also demands that art educators work within their education settings, professional organizations, neighborhoods, communities, and other larger social arenas to activate and realize normalizing circumstances of all citizens with disabilities. (p. 10)

Encouraging that art educators base programs on accessibility for all students, the normalization approach in art education repeats perspectives protected under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA), ensuring the rights of students with disabilities to learn in an educational environment that is as “culturally normative as possible” (Wolfensberger, 1979, p. 28).

Normalization strategies must be incorporated at the preservice level. Educators at the university level can help in determining and changing the attitudes, expectations and belief systems of preservice art education students. Pfeffeur-Guay (1993) concluded that normalization must be emphasized in preservice and inservice education for art teachers along with problem-solving skills and the techniques needed to promote individual art and aesthetic development in students with different abilities. Also, further research in normalized setting is needed to understand the art making art perceiving processes of students experiencing disabilities. Longer periods of observation at one site or randomized site
visits may add to understanding problems and teachers’ concerns regarding the integration of students with disabilities in normalized settings. (p. 230)

Through participation in my study, an art education preservice student was provided the opportunity to gain a knowledge base about students with disabilities through independent research I organized for her prior to the study. During the study, she was allotted the experience of working directly with student in a developmentally handicapped resource room. This art education preservice student had completed her student teaching assignment during which she realized the diversity of students that composed the art classrooms. She desired to gain a greater understanding of the abilities of the students she would find in her future art classroom. Her past course work in teacher preparation did not include a single course study in special needs, or provide opportunities for working with special populations.

To prepare her for her fieldwork experience in the special education classroom, the student teacher, Jancy, visited several special education classrooms at different sites. She also read literature prior to her visits to the school settings to enhance her knowledge base. Although the classroom context in which she worked in during the study was not a mainstreamed or inclusionary context, the isolated situation she taught in during the study permitted her to observe the varying degrees of students’ abilities within the specific category of disability service that she was involved in. This fieldwork experience prepared her for teaching in her future art classroom where students with disabilities will be included.

Throughout the reviewed studies several recommendations are given by teachers to assist future teachers in developing teaching techniques to work with
students with disabilities. In the second part of my literature review I examined literature related to previous suggestions for improved teacher training programs that include teacher training through the infusion models, improved methods of fieldwork experiences through teacher collaborations, university departmental collaborations, and university and community school collaborations.

**Curriculum Infusion - Special Education and Regular Education**

Several educational reform movements have called for the infusion of special education and general education. Supporters of the infusion of the two fields of education contend that the separation of the two areas further promotes the attitude that the special education student should be separated from the regular education classroom. The isolation of the two educational structures is echoed in the separation of the course work for preservice students. Trent (1981) concluded:

> research reveals that not only are regular teachers unprepared to teach handicapped children in mainstream settings, but educators in institutions of higher education have failed to prepare them. The separation maintained by the two groups of educators appears to have contributed to their distinct roles, which is a concern of many educators. (p. 194)

She cited the Education Dean’s Task Force, which investigated the effects of teacher training programs funded by the Dean’s Grants and found that, “Separate training programs for regular and special educators do not provide the answer to educating handicapped children in the mainstream” (p. 194). The Task Force identified a need for a restructuring of teacher preparation programs.
Stainback and Stainback (1987) asserted that the merger of special education and general education in university and college programs was the solution for preparing teachers to educate students with disabilities. They wrote:

Institutions of higher education have the opportunity to lead the way. Collaboration, which is well underway in many colleges and universities, and integration of personnel, programs and resources in special and regular education departments can facilitate the goal of developing a unified comprehensive regular educational system designed to meet the unique needs of elementary and secondary students. That is, colleges and universities can set the stage for merging special and regular education in the schools by their own merging. (p. 185)

They contended that by providing such an educational reform at the college level, teachers would no longer be faced with the separation of expertise and would become true educators for the individual students whom they teach. Their rationale for the merger of the two fields in education is that the faculty in higher education would be unified and would share the goal of preparing students to teach the diverse student population. They advocated that this sharing of knowledge would strengthen the teacher preparation program and would eliminate the separation of the preparation programs, which presently leads future teachers to categorize students as abled and disabled. This division directly opposes the integration of students in the schools. By merging the fields Stainback and Stainback (1987) reasoned, “Higher education could set the stage for preparing all educators to approach students as individuals who require education programs and services based on their unique needs, interests, and capabilities” (p. 186).
These studies implied that the merger of the special education and general education teacher preparation programs at universities and colleges would lead to mergers of the special education and regular education programs in the elementary and secondary school systems. This educational reform movement would require: the involvement of state organizations in replanning certification programs, a strong collaboration between special education and regular education, and a restructuring of the present programs at the college level. Stainback and Stainback (1987) contended that beginning this restructuring program at the college level and creating desegregated preservice programs would lessen the teacher biases the present separation situation has created intensified and intensified against students with disabilities. Information and familiarization about disabilities would demystify this aspect of education for future teachers.

Some educational professionals suggested that the restructuring of the educational system does not need to completely merge regular education and special education, but only to reconceptualize present teacher preparation. It is Pugach’s (1992) opinion that the traditional role of special education, a role that demands that teachers be taught unique techniques for teaching of students with disabilities, needs to be reassessed. She stated, “As long as the primary work of professors of special education is the isolated preparation of special education teachers, their claims for what should occur in the basic professional education of classroom teachers to ensure accountability are likely to lack credibility” (p. 257). She supported employing an infusion model to replace the existing separate curriculums. Instead of teaching in present departmental isolation, teachers in the
special education department might make substantial contributions to the core curriculum in the preparation of classroom teachers (Pugach, 1992).

**Collaborations**

The literature reviewed throughout this chapter often links teacher preparation to collaboration. Teacher collaborative programs may occur at different levels in the educational system. In any of these programs, collaboration requires the participants to become equal partners in the program. I reviewed literature associated with university departmental collaboration in relation to teacher preparation, teacher collaboration, and university and community school collaborations and identified their relationship to my study.

**Teacher Collaboration**

Interdisciplinary studies, inclusion, and the educational reform movements support an integrated model of learning all support teacher collaboration. As teachers make transitions in teaching styles and work towards collaboration, several issues emerge: controversies regarding curriculum, teacher responsibility, and territorial domains. The following review of teacher collaboration models will address these issues.

Education and special education research have supported a need for interdisciplinary curriculums. Interdisciplinary curriculums are often created through collaborative efforts of teachers and administrators. Weidmeyer and Lehman (1991) produced a study that instituted a collaborative teaching program with regular education teachers and special education teachers. At the completion of the first year of the collaborative program, the four teachers who participated agreed that the collaborative teaching program was of such a success that it threatened the
continuation of the original program in which the students with learning disabilities were frequently pulled out of their regular class and placed in the learning disabilities resource room. In this program of collaborative teaching, the collaboration meant that the special education teacher and the regular education teacher shared in planning and presenting the program. It was a cooperative and interactive process. The program was beneficial for the participating teachers and the students and required a redefining of roles, a negotiating of curriculum, and a flexibility on the part of the teachers.

Studies in general education and special education continue to support models of collaboration for successful teaching. The Council on Exceptional Children (1994) stressed the need for teacher collaboration in the inclusion process. In their investigation of inclusive schools, the CEC described collaborative teaching efforts as partnerships and maintained “All teaching partnerships require collaboration, compromise, and extensive communication. Many co-teachers refer to their partnerships as ‘marriages,’ implying a complicated nexus of issues and emotion” (p. 21). In this “marriage,” the general education teacher and the special education teacher share their expertise and learn from each other. Through the process of collaborative teaching, teachers learn to compromise, resolve disagreements, and work for the mutual benefit of the students they are teaching. The CEC found that the lack of personal space or territorial domain was sometimes a barrier to collaborative teaching and an issue that had to be resolved.

As the movement towards inclusive schools becomes a reality, the teachers need to work together in the process. The Council for Exceptional Children (1994) explained, “An inclusive school is a school where every child is respected as a part
of the school community, and where each child is encouraged to learn and achieve as much as possible” (p. 3). They advised that partnerships must develop between teachers to form this sense of community between teachers. They illustrated:

“Traditionally, teachers work in isolation from each other, each teacher confined to his or her classroom. Co-teaching requires teachers to give up that exclusivity in exchange for gaining a partner to share planning, teaching, discipline and assessment” (p. 11).

Often successful integration of students with disabilities into regular classrooms for students with disabilities is achieved through collaboration or co-teaching methods. Barry (1994) discussed her experience teaching in a classroom that integrated students with disabilities into her regular classroom through a team teaching approach. She stated, “My experience also convinced me of the value of collaboration among teachers. The class integration process appears to work especially well when the special education teachers work side by side with the regular teacher” (p. 21). With today’s increasing challenges in the classroom, teachers should be provided collaborative methods and experiences and as students prepare to become teachers, they should be given collaborative educational experiences that acquaint them with teaching students with disabilities in a regular classroom. My study supports this contention and provided the special education teacher, a preservice art education student the experience of collaboration through planning and implementing lessons together in the special education classroom.

As contended by the previous studies by the CEC (1994) this study illustrated the problems teachers face as they learn to collaborate. Throughout my study issues of roles, responsibilities and territorial domains surfaced. The preservice art education
student, the special education teacher, and I often struggled with defining roles and which were often influenced by our prior experiences as students/student teacher supervisors.

Diamondstone and Merriman (1992) collaborated to select textbooks and to teach a group of lessons on the cultural and ethnic backgrounds of the students in their classrooms. They described their collaboration research process and Merriman wrote, “We both have to be honest and give up certain facades, slide our egos to the side in order to work with one another. Collaboration means trust” (p. 198). Diamondstone noted, “Collaboration is not an easy dance - you have to want the growth that comes out of it in order to feel committed” (p. 198).

University Collaboration

At the university level, those who seek the unification of special education and regular education are promoting teacher collaboration between two separate university departments and student collaboration within the teacher education classes. The proponents also advocate for the unification of required core curriculum classes. Welch and Sheridan (1993) conducted a study of existing teacher preparation programs that address teaching students with disabilities. They investigated several educational partnerships that have implemented components of collaboration in their programs.

One partnership they examined was a program within the Graduate School of Education at the University at Utah. This teacher education program provided preservice teacher opportunities to establish educational partnerships between the special education and the education departments. Through discussions with the Department of Special Education at the university, the Department of Educational
Studies redesigned a core course requirement for preservice teachers which was basically an introductory course on exceptionalities. This original course became entitled “Educational Partnerships: Serving Exceptional Students” and was a requirement for both regular and special education preservice teachers. Welch and Sheridan (1993) reasoned, “This approach provides teacher candidates with a fundamental understanding of exceptionalities and adaptive mainstreaming techniques as well as a framework for establishing professional collaboration at the building level” (p. 39). Class activities centered around collaborative work between special education students and regular education students. This initial course also incorporated preservice teacher collaboration through joint participation in field based case study projects and collaborative assessment of mainstreamed and specialized educational settings. Students also collaboratively wrote philosophical statements discussing the role of educational partnerships in these settings. Another components of the program encouraged collaborative problem solving techniques by having the students co-design a curriculum for students with disabilities.

**Community School and University Collaborations**

Although viewed as two separate community organizations or institutions, the public school system and the university often work together in collaborative enterprises. Traditionally, the school and university collaborations are focused on teacher education. According to Daley (1985)

[A]rguments for cooperation and collaboration go beyond that. They include several needs: to raise the status and morale of public school teachers; to assist public school teachers in keeping up with rapidly expanding and changing fields of knowledge; to help college professors be
more effective teachers, to help students make more effective use of the years they spend in formal schooling; to reduce educational overlap and duplication; to provide a more effective transition between high school and college; to identify and assist both disadvantaged and gifted students at crucial points in their educational progress; to provide stimulation and motivation specifically for high school seniors and college freshmen; and to provide for all those engaged in education the benefits that cooperation and collaboration entail. (pp. 1-2).

School and university partnerships were also implemented in the Utah program previously discussed. This collaborative program, Site-Based Transdisciplinary Education Partnerships (STEP), was an ongoing partnership with the public school system. Welch and Sheridan (1993) described STEP as “a federally funded program that provides students from various professional preparation programs an opportunity to apply instructional techniques collaboratively during field experiences” (p. 42). The teacher candidates participating in the program were teams of students from the Departments of Educational Psychology, Educational Administration, Educational Studies, and Special Education. The teams of preservice students were assigned to the volunteering schools according to the needs of those schools. Strong communication between the university and the schools facilitated the placement of the transdisciplinary teams; and through a series of seminars the preservice students assumed roles of team teaching, established peer-tutoring programs, and created home-school partnerships (Welch & Sheridan, 1993).
This program, designed by the university, promoted student collaboration to prepare teachers for serving the diverse student population that they would find in their future classrooms.

Vivian (1985) discussed a program in New Haven that promoted a program that provided collaboration between university faculty and school teachers. The program was a joint effort designed by Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools. Established as The Teachers Institute, the program was designed to strengthen teaching in the humanities and sciences in the community’s middle and high school. Teachers from the public school system worked with the faculty members at the university on topics that were of interest to the teachers. Through the program, the public school teachers became full members of the Yale community and were listed in the directory as members of faculty and staff. Involvement in the program gave the teacher participants access to the university resources. This program was successful in bridging the gap between the university and the public schools facilities. In this collaborative enterprise, the university and the local school system developed the collaboration out of mutual interest in teacher education, both in the present and the future, by recognizing the need to assist present teachers in educational development, helping professors become aware of the needs of teachers, and promoting professional growth for practicing teachers and university professionals.

The Holmes Group, an alliance of educational leaders formed in 1983, supports the need for educational reform. Their publication, Tomorrow’s Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools (1990) defined their model program as a “Professional Development School—in essence, a new
institutions” (p. xv). The Professional Development School (PDS) is a model of university/community school collaboration that can be defined as “a school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession” (The Holmes Group, 1990, p. xv).

Six principles were designed to guide the model of the PDS. These were: (a) all the school’s students participate in the kind of learning experiences that allows them to go on learning for a lifetime; (b) schools and classrooms should create communities of learning; (c) schools should promote teaching and learning for understanding for all children; (d) there should be continued learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators; (e) participants should engage in thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning; and (f) the forming of a PDS involves inventing a new institution. (Holmes Group, 1990)

The universities involved in a PDS program seek to bridge the gap between theoretical teaching and the practice of teaching. The Holmes Group advised that teachers and preservice teachers become active voices in their own education. Through the PDS model they learn to make connections between disciplines and seek to make a community of learning. With regard to students with disabilities, the Holmes Group (1990) stated, “The legal and bureaucratic struggles for the educational rights of such kids often created barriers to creating good learning communities for them” and continued by claiming “In a Professional Development School, teachers and teacher educators will work hard and inventively to stretch the conventional academic spectrum so that it includes children who are severely impaired” (p. 23).
The Holmes Group contended that by forming a community of learning in the classrooms, the PDS supports a need for “teaching for understanding”. The program encourages classrooms to become democratic spaces where critical thinking skills are promoted and teachers become the initiators of collaborative learning environments for the students and themselves.

The Holmes Group (1990) also supported the collaboration of schools and universities. Their collaborative model was designed to improve the teaching profession “by linking experienced teachers’ efforts to renew their knowledge and advance their status with efforts to improve their schools and to prepare new teachers” (p. xv). Through collaboration with the schools, the Holmes Group hoped to aid the continuing the development of professionals and to research the needs of teacher development programs. To form a true partnership between the schools, one which is reciprocal, they advised that the PDS participants cultivate collaboration that promotes mutual learning opportunities. This collaboration should include professors, novice teachers, and teachers working together.

Several models of community school and university collaborations that exist link educational reform and teacher education. Fiorntino, Kowalski, and Barrette (1993) explained, “These attempts have been called coalitions, consortiums, partnerships, networks, or collaborations-terms which denote a different meaning to both institutional and individual participants” (p. 76). Levine (1992) defined models of professional practice schools and explained, “The term professional practice school refers both to the nature of practice in the school and to function of the site as a place where novices practice their skills and use what they have learned in preparing to become teachers” (p. 2). In professional practice schools, the goal
is to unite schools where the preservice teachers practice, the cooperating teachers at
the school, and the university professionals in collaborations concerning
educational reform.

From the previous research reviewed it is evident that a variety of
collaborative programs exist, at both the university and community school levels.
Each of the studies discussed supports the need for a mutual concern, a sharing of
leadership and a commitment to the endeavor. The collaborative experience is both
physical in the sense that groups or persons usually work together at an agreed site
and sociological in that the relationship between the partners is an important aspect
of the collaboration.

MacGregor (1993) described, “A collaborative partnership, as I define it, is
one in which each of two or more parties contributes to, and receives benefits from
an enterprise” (p. 4). These partnerships may exist between teachers, schools,
universities and communities. Clark (1975) expounded on the idea of true
collaboration and attempted to explain the differences between collaboration and
interaction. He contended:

True collaboration, collaboration that is a healthy, growing, productive
affair, is a transactual relationship. A transactional relation consists of two
or more parties who contribute as equally as possible to generate a totality.
An interactive relationship ends to emphasize the concentration of poser in
one sector at any one point in time. Interactive relationships are obtained
when both parties do not understand their parts in contributing equally to a
situation (p. 2).
In my study, as a university researcher, I designed and implemented a program that linked a preservice art education students with a community school special education teacher. Through this program, the special education teacher was introduced to a collaborative teaching program and gained experience in designing an interdisciplinary art focused curriculum. The university preservice art education researched her teaching methods for teaching students with disabilities. Together we investigated the processes of interdisciplinary planning and collaboration.

**Curriculum Revisions in Art Education and Special Education**

The field of special education and art education might offer an arena for collaborative inquiry and curriculum revisions by teachers. (Fedorenko, 1994; Wenner, 1976; Ozimo & Ozimo, 1988) The co-teaching methods supported by special educators as a method for successful inclusion can enhance art teacher preparation when dealing with special needs students in the art classroom. The addition of art in the special education curriculum may offer a new vehicle for learning for these students. Art can provide a nontraditional means of enhancing the learning process through as an alternate form of communication.

Art can be coordinated with other classroom learning experiences to help the child understand various concepts. When a child draws the subject to be discussed the concept is reinforced: this is especially true of those students who cannot use the memory aids of writing or verbalizing thoughts or ideas. (Krone, 1978, p. 2)

Art offers students with disabilities opportunities to increase their self-esteem. Omizo & Omizo (1988) studied the use of an art education curriculum with
adolescents with learning disabilities. They believe that traditional methods of learning that rely on high levels of cognitive abilities create potential failure situations for these students. They developed a program that integrated art into the special education curriculum. This program provided 12 art sessions lasting 45-60 minutes twice a week for six weeks. The classroom teachers were trained to facilitate the activities. The teachers reported students appeared to be better behaved and displayed behaviors that indicated high self-esteem as a result of the art activities. The teachers found the arts experience were rewarding to the students because they were able to achieve success in this area. Unsworth (1990) described a one-day workshop with students in a juvenile detention center. She found that students who participated left the workshop with a great feeling of success and a desire to draw more. It is her belief that if educators do not provide these types of experiences for students, they may be “opening the door to our drop-outs” (p. 14).

Art integrated into a special education curriculum may provide experiences for students with disabilities that will better prepare them for mainstreaming or inclusion in the art classroom. Goebel and Gowland (1982) designed a pilot program that integrated art into the special education classroom. Two special education teachers of children with learning disabilities and students with behavior disorders participated in the program. The teachers maintained that the inclusion of art within the special education curriculum served as a preparation for mainstreaming into regular classes.

The teachers reasoned that

[un]Unlike children in regular classes, most children Special Education have not yet been exposed to an organized sequential visual arts program, so
there may be a significant lag of skill development. Placing these children in a situation that produces self doubt and unfavorable comparisons is contrary to the general aims taken by Special Education Teachers. (p. 24)

Instituting such a program requires strong collaboration between the special education teacher and the art teacher. Traditional educational training confined these teachers to separate departments. The incorporation of art into the special education curriculum necessitates teachers building a community of learning as described by the Holmes Group (1990). In this type of community, the teachers focus on the education of individual students and collaboratively search for new methods of teaching for students.

Previously reviewed studies (Barry, 1994; CEC 1994; Wiedmeyer & Lehman, 1991) suggested that educational reform in the area of special education should involve collaboration between all teachers who are involved with these students. My previous study (Fedorenko, 1994) indicated that contact with the university initiated a successful collaborative study between a learning disabilities teacher and myself, an art education graduate student. Through this study, the special education teacher learned to collaborate with an art teacher in designing methods to successfully incorporate art into her special education curriculum. The multidisciplinary program initiated included looking at, talking about, writing about, and making art.

The process of integrating art into the curriculum for students with disabilities is a new concept and needs the support of the school community. Wenner (1976) stated, “Successfully relating the arts to all other subject areas requires strong administrative support, joint planning by classroom teachers and
specialist and staff development directed toward correlative problem solving and arts curricular activities in an interdisciplinary setting” (p. 8). As educational reform movements continue to examine the role of teacher collaboration the potential of the integration of art in the curriculum should also be examined. This study investigated both of these endeavors.

Through interdisciplinary planning, the teachers involved in the study incorporated art in the special education curriculum. We collaboratively planned and implemented this art focused program.
CHAPTER 3

DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I will discuss the qualitative methods I employed in this descriptive case study. I will describe action research; collaborative inquiry; descriptive case study; participant observation; and various methods of document collection including fieldnotes, interviews, and reflective journaling. Data analysis methods and issues of generalizability related to this study will be addressed.

Qualitative Research

As a subjective inquirer in this research study, I looked at the situation as a whole and relied on methodologies fundamental to qualitative research. The decision to utilize qualitative research methodology and associated techniques afforded me the opportunity to use multiple methodologies. Because of my active participation in elements of the research process, action research was a part of the methodology.

As this study was a descriptive case study, it permitted me to provide a rich description of the research through fieldwork techniques. “A case study is a detailed examination of one setting or one single subject, or one single depository of documents, or one particular event” (Bogdan & Bilken, 1982, p. 58).

Through ethnographic fieldwork techniques, the strength of qualitative research is empowered by the use of a variety of methods when collecting data. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) stated, “Qualitative research, as a set of interpretive
practices, privileges no single methodology over any other” (p. 3). I employed the practice commonly termed triangulation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) to insure rich description of the social situation that I studied. Methods used throughout my study included descriptive case study methodology, action research, participant observation techniques, interviews, and document collection practices (see Figure 1). Reinharz (1992) explained, “Multiple methods work to enhance understanding both by adding layers of information and by using one type of data to validate or refine another” (p. 201). The use of multiple methods insures a more solid data collection.

As a qualitative researcher, I looked at things as they happened and narrated what I saw occurring. In this narration I refrained from drawing generalizable conclusions concerning any situation other than those relative to my study. My purpose was to allow others to become aware of what occurred in this particular situation, to permit further questions to emerge, and to use a personal insight to describe the results of the study as I saw them.

**Action Research**

Several of the methods that are employed throughout this study are action research. Originated in the 1940s by Lewin, a social psychologist, action research is an inquiry process. This process is one in which the participants become self-reflective, and the research is collaboratively planned and implemented. Kemmis and McTaggart (1992) referred to Lewin (1940) who described action research “as proceeding in a spiral of steps, each of which is composed of planning, action and the evaluation of the result of the action” (p. 8).
Figure 1
Methodology
This research spiral is a continual process, one in which the participants plan, act on
the plan, evaluate the action through reflective processes, and revise the plan.

Through the reflective process, the researchers involved in the inquiry are
constantly revising and reconsidering the nature of the problem and actions that
occur throughout the research. Aims of action research essentially may feature the
link between theory and practice, through ideas in action. (Kemmis & McTaggert,
1992). Utilizing action research methods, teachers become active voices for
changes in curriculum, teaching practices, and other school related agendas.

Corey (1952, 1953) applied the use of action research to the field of
education. He maintained that action research is valuable in improving practice in
education settings. He recommended that researchers and teachers work together.
Describing Corey’s advocacy of action research in education, Oja and Schmulan
(1959) stated, “Cooperation among teachers and between teachers and researchers
increased the likelihood that participants would be committed to changing their
behavior if the study indicated change was necessary” (p. 4). His rationale is that
“I[instead of being subjects of an experiment, teachers become the experimenters”
(p. 4) and, as such, are personally convinced of the results of the study.

My study possesses elements of action research in that the primary
participants in the study (the special education teacher, the art education preservice
student, and myself) were active participants in the study. We planned the
program and held brief weekly meetings where we discussed our actions
throughout the program and revised our plans for the future based on our
experiences. In our journal writing, we were reflective about our participation in
the collaboration. At our group meetings we discussed our individual perceptions
of the program as it progressed and as a team made decisions concerning the plans we were implementing.

**Collaborative Inquiry**

Teachers involved in collaboration are reflecting and learning together. In my study, the collaboration among the special education teacher, the preservice art education student, and myself grew as we worked together revising the program and reflecting on the process. We shared an active role in the research in many areas.

Reason (1994) discussed the concept of participant inquiry and described the method of cooperative inquiry. He stated,

In cooperative inquiry, all those involved in the research are both co-researchers, whose thinking and decision making contribute to generating ideas, designing and managing the project, and drawing conclusions from the experience, and also co-subjects, participating in the activity being researched” (p. 326).

Participant examination of the same experiences gives greater validity to research (Reason, 1994). The reflective journals, the interviews, and our group meetings held throughout the study afforded me the opportunity to become aware of multiple visions of the same situation. Multiple participant perspective gave me different interpretations of collaboration.

**Descriptive Case Study**

Focusing my research on a specific site and what occurred in that site recommended the use of qualitative case study methods. As a component of qualitative research, case study methodology offered me opportunities for gaining
insight into all aspects of collaboration. According to Merriam (1988), “research on
discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied
offers the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge
base and practice of education” (p. 3). This case study can be described as
bounded in that it examined a specific program created out of my personal concern
for teacher preparation and the effects of collaboration for teachers and universities.
Stake (1988) explained, “What is being studied is the case. The case is something
deemed worthy of close watch. It has a totality, it has boundaries” (p. 286).
By using a single case or bounded system, I was able to do an in-depth exploration
of collaboration as it occurred in relation to planning an art integrated curriculum for
a specific class. Descriptive case study methodology enabled me to provide a rich
description of the setting, the participants, and the social aspects that occurred
within the setting.

**Participant Observation**

As the initiator of the study and a collaborator in the planning and
implementation of the program, my level of participation fluctuated depending upon
my role in the study at any time. Spradley (1980) illustrated, “The participant
observer comes to a social situation with two purposes: (1) to engage in activities
appropriate to the situation and (2) to observe the activities, people, and physical
aspects of the situation” (p. 54). As a participant observer, I often became an active
member of the setting, collaboratively designing and implementing the program
while observing the results. I worked closely with the preservice art education
student and special education teacher in both the creation and presentation of the art
integration program.
Through participant observation, I was provided the means of becoming a trusted member in the setting and became more familiar with that which was unfamiliar. At some points during the observations, I participated to a much higher degree than at others. According to Clesne and Peshkin (1992), where you place yourself in the involvement of the study depends on what you are investigating, the context of you study, and your own theoretical perspective. The study itself dictated my levels of participation. As my degree of comfort with the site and with the participants increased, my participation level increased also. Patton (1990) contended, “The ideal is to negotiate and adopt that degree of participation that will yield the most meaningful data about the program given the characteristics of the participants, the nature of staff-participant interactions, and the sociopolitical context of the program” (Patton, 1990, p. 209).

The main goal of participant observation is to understand the setting, the participants, and their behavior. It means learning from people rather than studying people (Spradley, 1979). Reinhartz (1992) noted; “In general, feminist observational or interview-based studies include a strong connection between the “researcher” and “subject” that develops during the course of the study and lasts beyond it, sometimes only in memory, sometimes in actuality” (p. 263). I and my two major participants in the research were female. I feel that our bond of womanhood and our people oriented approach to life contributed to the overall positive attitude and congeniality that existed during collaboration.

**Observations**

Adler and Adler (1994) stated; “For as long as people have been interested in studying the social and natural world around them, observation has served as the
bedrock source of human knowledge” (p. 377). Case study observation serves as a vehicle for enhancing understanding of the research environment. The purpose of observation is to describe in detail what has taken place in the setting, to provide a rich description and understanding of the participants, and to conceptualize what was seen through the eyes of the observer (Patton, 1990).

I used multiple methods to record detail the many aspects of our collaboration. I recorded information through the use of fieldnotes, interviews, and document collection. Fieldnotes were taken during observations of planning and presenting curriculum and included a description of the participation levels of the preservice art education student teacher, the special education teacher, and myself. Several interviews, structured and unstructured, with the primary participants of the study were also recorded, both by tape recordings and fieldnote methods. Document collection consisted of reflective journals written by the primary participants, samples of the implemented lessons, and student work examples. Written descriptions of curriculum considerations and photographic reproductions of the projects the students created enhanced the description of the study. During the collecting of data it was necessary for me to consistently examine the data to become aware of my own voice in the recording of the data, especially to note the biases I may have had towards the nature of the study. Patton (1990) warned:

It is important that the observer maintain a distinction between a description of what has happened in the program and reporting on the perceptions of participants about what has happened. The observer’s descriptions of a
program’s social environment will not necessarily be the same as a perception of that environment expressed by participants (p. 222).

When collecting data, one needs to raise one’s awareness of the entire situation. This process required me to use a “wide-angle lens” (Spradley, 1980) for observing all that occurred in each situation, making close observations of the physical and social aspects of the setting. The physical environment should be recreated in descriptive language allowing the reader to visualize the setting. I described the space and how it was used, and the elements particular to the setting, especially the classroom in order to establish a sense of place.

Observations of the research environment were not limited to its physical characteristics. Close observations of the social environment and the interactions of the participants enhanced my understanding of the collaboration.

Following Patton’s (1990) suggestions, I noted the way in which people organized themselves, communicated with each other, and interacted with each other. (Patton, 1990)

In my study, the initial observations of the site provided an overview of the physical environment of the study. These first few observations might be considered “grand tour observations” (Spradley, 1980). I produced drawings and noted descriptions of the room, its layout, and the seating arrangement of the students. I looked at the activities in which students were involved, the relationship the special education teacher had with the students, and her methods of teaching. As the study progressed, I included a full description of the school, including the physical characteristics and described the community it serves in terms of the student population, the teachers, and the surrounding neighborhood.
Bogdan and Biklen (1982) defined fieldnotes as “the written account of what the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study” (p. 74). This method of collecting data granted me a means to organize the observation information, to reflect on what I had observed, and to search for emerging patterns. This information was continually analyzed so that I could deliberate on the study’s progression and could make personal notes as they came to mind.

During the group meetings my observations focused on what the participants said, how they interacted, and the level of collaboration I felt was being reached. These group meetings were recorded in my fieldnotes and included personal reflections about the process through my eyes. All participant involvement, verbal and nonverbal communication, was observed.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) described the process of participant observation and stated: “As a participant observer, then, consciously observe the research setting; its participants; and the events, acts, and gestures that occur within them. In the process, note what you see, hear, feel, and think” (p. 45). I viewed the setting and the activities that occurred, and I collected information in the form of fieldnotes and informal interviews during the course of the study. I frequently conferred with the teachers and the students in the form of conversations or informal interviews to confirm or elaborate on that which I had noted.

Descriptive fieldnotes help to create a sense of being there for the reader.

**Interviews**

As a feminist doing research, I found the interview to be an important component in my data collection as women generally seek to make personal
connections with each other (Rienharz, 1992). The trust among the primary participants was strong because of our mutual gender identification as women and was strengthened by the use of the interview process. The interview process allowed me to create a connection between myself, the preservice art education student, and the special education teacher. James (in Reinhart, 1992) explained that through interviews and participant observation the researcher avoids “alienation of the researcher from the researched” (p. 20). Interviewing provided me with insights into collaboration, which had not occurred to me. Reinharz (1992) stated, “Interviewing offers researchers access to people’s ideas, thoughts, and memories in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher” (p. 19), thus allowing the participants their own voice in the research and personal contributions to it.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) described interviewing as “getting words to fly” (p. 63). In my study, I included the three types of interviews they described: (a) structured interviews, in which I used specific questions; (b) open interviews, where I was “prepared to follow unexpected leads that [arose] arise in the course of [my] your interview” (p. 92); and (c) depth probing, wherein I asked questions that required the interviewees to provide more information about that which had been previously observed.

Spradley (1980) defined a formal interview as one that “usually occurs at an appointed time and results from a specific request to hold the interview” (p. 124). At the onset of the planning stages, I formally interviewed both the preservice art education student and the special education teacher. In these formal interviews, I used depth probing questions in an attempt to gain an understanding of the
participants' beliefs concerning the goals of the program and how they saw their roles in the collaborative experience. Questions were open-ended to provide the informants the opportunity to become reflective.

I formally interviewed the principal of the school to gain a deeper understanding of the school community. Questions were directed to obtain knowledge of the school population, the school philosophy, and the principal’s opinions regarding the type of collaboration, which was the subject of my study. Through casual conversations, I informally interviewed several staff members of the school community. This type of interview process allowed me to learn directly from other members of the school community about nonobservable phenomena and to gain further insight into what I had seen. These informal interviews were done consistently through the study. The intensity and duration of each of these interviews was dictated by the participants. These informal conversations clarified what I saw occurring in the classroom and during the collaboration between the special education teacher, the preservice art education student, and myself.

**Reflective Journals**

Recent research (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988; McCutcheon, 1995) discusses the need for teachers to become reflective about their practices when making curriculum decisions. The process of reflection is action orientated if it seeks to make meaning of a social situation or to revise plans, or descriptive if “it allows reconnaissance, building a more vivid picture of life and work in the situation, constraints on action and more importantly, of what might now be possible, for the group, and for its individual members as actors committed to group goals” (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988, p. 14).
Reflective journal writing in this study was done by the primary participants in order that we might express our feelings toward the collaboration as it progressed. This method of document collection allowed us opportunities to become reflective about our practices, discussing what we saw, how we felt during the process of the program, and our personal opinions concerning the collaborative process. Journals afforded me the opportunity to gain access to thoughts that my collaborators not have orally conveyed to me. In my previous study, (1994) wherein I investigated the results of collaboration between a learning disabilities teacher and myself, both of us found that journal writing provided a valuable resource for self-review, introduction of new ideas, making connections between concepts, and revising program ideas. In addition to these benefits, in my latest research I found the reflective journals provided insight into our personal beliefs and changes that occurred as the research progressed. The journals enhanced my understanding of the process the participants underwent as they worked together and provided me recognition of biases I had previously held during my data collection.

Document Collection

Photographs of student work and activities were taken as the program progressed. I photographed the projects, the students, and the teachers as they worked together. Video tapes of student discussions supplied an instant replay of the event after it had occurred for me to review and scrutinize. These photographs and recordings provided me with concrete data for the analysis of the program and gave me the opportunity to hear and view reactions that I previously missed.
**Data Analysis**

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) explained; “Data analysis involves organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned” (p. 127). Interpreting the data collected in this study from the observational field notes, the interviews, and the journals was done consistently throughout the study. According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992); “data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds” (p. 127). They suggested, “consistently reflecting on your data, work on organizing them and try to discover what they have to tell you” (p. 127). As the field log develops, it is important to include personal memos. These reflections allow the researcher to recognize emerging patterns of behavior, begin making coding systems, and evaluate the study as it progresses (Glesne & Peshkin). I consistently made additional notes to my original fieldnotes, making connections with previous observations.

In a descriptive case study, it is important to develop an in-depth understanding of the participants and the case being studied. Patton (1990) maintained that “What is important is understanding the people being studied. Concepts are never a substitute for direct experience with descriptive data” (p. 392). Analysis of data included studying the stories of the collaboration told by a primary participant in her own voice.

As researchers gather data and categories emerge, rudimentary coding systems should evolve. Organizational systems may change and other categories emerge as the study progresses (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). My data display techniques include graphs and charts. Miles and Huberman (1984) described data
display as organizing information in a manner that visually shows what one knows and that assists in providing a format for future collection. I relied heavily on an ethnographic approach to data analysis, thus the final analysis of the data includes a descriptive written account of observations and interviews, work samples by students, and data displays. I referred to Spradley’s (1980) technique for participant observations when producing the written account of the case study.

**Generalizability**

In reference to the single case study, Donmoyer (1990) conceded that the generalizability of research is problematic in that the study of individuals within educational settings research suggest only possibilities. He suggested that the idea of generalizability needs to be reconceptualized for this type of research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) generated the term *transferability* which is applicable to case study research. According to them, transferability is reliant on the context: “The degree of transferability is a direct function of the similarity between the two contexts, what we call ‘fittingness’” (p. 124). This conception also suggests that there must be congruent contexts before a case study can suggest similarities. Donmoyer referred to the schema theory embedded in the Piaget idea that assimilation, integration, accommodation, and differentiation would provide a different way of viewing the generalizability. He maintained that in well-narrated case studies, the reader would be exposed to different situations and unique circumstances that help them to look at things in a new way.

I am not claiming that the results of this case study are generalizable. This study is a descriptive tale of collaborative inquiry and participant learning that occurred in a specific situation; however, it can serve as a model for further
investigative studies of this nature. It is my belief that this case study can enhance understanding of collaboration, teacher preparation, and curriculum revisions, and encourage future studies in these areas.
CHAPTER 4
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This research was designed as a case study of a collaboration between myself (an art education doctoral student), a special education teacher in a community middle school, and a preservice art education student to structure and implement a curriculum integrating art and special education within the context of a self-contained public middle school. The main focus of the study was the collaborative process itself. It was investigated in relation to teacher preparation, university and community secondary education partnerships, integration of educational fields, and curriculum revision.

Background and Preparation

As a university supervisor of art education student teachers in the autumn of 1995, I had the opportunity to observe the reaction of student teachers as they experienced their teaching of art to students with disabilities who were mainstreamed. I distributed a questionnaire during a 1995 seminar class towards the end of the students’ teaching assignments. It asked them to comment on their teaching experiences. Many of the student teachers voiced their frustrations about teaching students with disabilities because they did not feel they had been adequately prepared to do so. One student, Jancy, wrote, “The major stumbling block when teaching the mainstreamed students is that I do not know what is the best way or situation for them to learn.” She expressed a desire to gain more
experience teaching students with disabilities: “If possible, I would like some more information or at least be pointed towards helpful books, articles, or journals, and would like to make them connect to the teaching situation.” Her interest in gaining further field experience with special needs students became the impetus for my dissertation.

For Jancy’s role in this study she received independent study credits for two quarters. The quarter prior to the collaborative research study, I wanted to provide her opportunities to observe special education classroom settings and become familiar with the capabilities of the various groups of special students that are mainstreamed into the art classroom. Because the continuum of services for students with disabilities in many schools still includes resource rooms, I believed that she would learn much from observing students with disabilities in both mainstreamed situations and special education resource rooms. We agreed that her knowledge in the area of special education needed to be supplemented before she began the observations (see Appendix A). I provided her with large quantities of materials that would inform her about the learning styles of students with various disabilities. Armed with these resources, which included special education books and journal articles that addressed the capabilities and the needs of students with disabilities, Jancy extended her knowledge base. For five weeks prior to the observations, she delved the literature sources and recorded her findings in a journal.

I began searching for observation sites by tapping my teacher resources: teachers I had met while supervising student teachers; graduate students who were also practicing special education teachers or art specialists; and a learning disabilities
teacher with whom I had worked during my 1994 study, one which integrated art and a learning disabilities curriculum. My university contacts were an important connection to Columbus area schools of which I, as an isolated graduate student was unaware. I contacted teachers by phone and introduced the program we were hoping to implement with them. Based on teacher interest in the study, I comprised a list of available observation sites.

I felt it was extremely important that Jancy be instrumental in the selection of the specific site as she was going to be implementing the art program, and it was her teaching needs that would be addressed. I wanted her to have a voice in any decisions that were made thus I allowed her to select from the available observation sites which she felt would be the best suited to our collaborative study. She contacted the teachers at the potential sites and arranged times to observe them, and I adjusted my schedule so that Jancy and I were able to visit these sites together.

At this point in the study, Jancy and I met weekly to discuss the specific sites she would visit. Prior to these visits she read material that would give her background information about the specific student disabilities she would observe in the classroom. During the site visits we discussed the proposed program with the special education teachers and questioned them about their interest in participating in it. We searched for a teacher who would welcome our collaborative enterprise. We explained to the teachers our desire to promote a method of teacher collaboration, one in which all of us would play active roles in the program. During the entire process of preparation for the study, Jancy and I kept journals about the process of selecting the site, observations we had made at each site, and the conversations we had with the teachers.
The Site

After we visited several sites together, Jancy expressed a deep interest in working at a junior high school DH (developmentally handicapped) resource room in the urban area of Columbus, Ohio, located in close proximity to the university. The school is contained in a large 2 story dark brick building on the backside of a major city street lined with shops and eating establishments. Built in 1925, its facade incorporates elements of architecture related to the time of its construction. Gargoyle figures decorate several corners of the building and the main entrance to the school includes a porch area framed by pillars. The school houses four separate DH classrooms, and 10 special education units or resource rooms, which are sporadically placed in the school. Our site was the 6th grade DH resource room.

Noreen, our collaborating teacher, was discovered through a contact I had made with a fellow art education graduate student who taught in an elementary DH classroom in Columbus. As at the time scheduled for our study, this contact would be on teaching leave, she referred us to Noreen, another DH teacher in the community.

Because this study is directly related to the process of teacher collaboration, I felt it was imperative that the participating special education teacher to express a strong desire and willingness to take an active role in the planning and implementation of the program. Noreen appeared enthusiastic about the program from the start. Her personality and her teaching methods appealed to both Jancy and myself.

Following the initial contact with the teacher and the site, Jancy returned to the site to observe students in the DH classroom and in the art classroom in which
they were mainstreamed. She began formulating methods for teaching the students that would assist them in the transition into the art classroom. She also spoke with the art teacher to gain his insight into the students capabilities. She then arranged a meeting for herself, Noreen, and myself and I sent a letter to Noreen describing the program we wanted to implement (see Appendix A). The following week at this meeting the groundwork for the program was laid.

**The Participants**

Noreen has been teaching special education community public schools for 20 years. She has been at this school for five years, teaching math, health, and science in the DH classroom. She is an energetic teacher who focuses her curriculum for her students on issues that they encounter in their daily lives. She supports a curriculum that teaches the students about who they are and how to function in community life.

Jancy, the preservice art education student, was completing her last quarter at the university during the time of the study. Her previous student teaching assignments included teaching at an inner city elementary school and an area alternative high school that focused their curriculum in the arts. In each of these schools, she encountered students with disabilities. She often questioned methods that were being used to teach them. She was an exceptional student and was often self directed. Small in stature, she has a vibrant personality that emulates her joy of teaching and learning. She adapts quickly to new environments and makes friends easily.

The student participants of the study included 6 girls and 5 boys whose ages ranged from 12 to 14. They all had varying abilities and ethnic backgrounds.
Students placed in the DH classroom generally have IQ scores between 40 and 80. Usually performance level of the students correlates to IQ levels. Noreen explained, “DH students generally are performing at the level at which they have been previously identified” (personal communication, March, 1995). Diverse levels of intelligence were evident in this classroom.

Gaining Access

Access for the initial observations at the various sites was provided by the special education teachers. As final plans were being initiated within the selected site, the need for gaining access to the school and the specific classroom for the study surfaced. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) instructed; “If the study involves some sort of organization or agency, then you must first make contact with its ‘gatekeepers’ the person or persons who must give you their consent” (p. 33). In this study, the organization was the junior high school. Access was obtained through the principal. The special education teacher was an inside “informant” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) and provided the introduction to the principal. “Even public places like a school will usually require the permission of at least the principal and the teacher in whose classroom you will make observations” (Spradley, 1980, p. 49).

Noreen and I met with the school principal to obtain access to the site. At this meeting the special education teacher and I described the goals of the research in terms of their relationship to the school community and the students specifically. I explained the collaborative program we were designing and the role that we felt art integration would play in the special education curriculum. We also discussed the relationship of the program to preservice teacher preparation for
working with students with disabilities. He acknowledged the importance of
teacher preparation in this area and said he welcomed university students to his
school to teach in what he coined school “reality.” I interjected my desire to include
him and the school community in the development of the program and left his office
with a strong sense of acceptance.

Collaboration

Having obtained access to the site, the next step important in the research
process began with the initial design of the study through participant collaboration.
At our first meeting I clearly explained the goals of the collaborative program:
to provide stronger teacher preparation for Jancy to with students with
developmental handicaps; to design and implement an art program that is
integrated in the special education curriculum; and to promote university
involvement in the surrounding school communities (see Appendix B).

In this early stage of the research process, each of the primary participants
worked to define the role they would play in the study, clarifying the definition of
collaboration in this particular study. As a supervisor in the design of the program
and Jancy’s supervisor for her independent study, my part of the collaboration was
less complex and changed throughout the process. Noreen and Jancy worked
close together to plan and implement the program, sharing their expertise and
teaching responsibilities. The program itself dictated the roles, the amounts of
responsibility each of the primary participant assumed varied as the
program developed.

Wiedmeyer and Lehman (1991) defined collaborative teaching as “a
cooperative and interactive process between two teachers that allows them to
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develop creative solutions to mutual problems” (p. 10). Through the collaborative process, each of the participants learned from each other. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) cautioned

Collaborative inquiry, like qualitative research is evolutionary. It takes time to discuss individual learning and thereby arrive at general group learning. It takes time to develop the camaraderie and the trust needed to expose insecurities. It takes time to meet outside of class on group projects” (p. xv).

Time Frame

An important element in the development of the study was creating a time frame concerning the length of the study, the amount of days that would be involved, and the time of day it would be presented to a designated group of students. We worked out the schedule so it would not totally rearrange the planned program of the special education teacher and would work within the time constraints of Jancy’s university class schedule and my graduate teaching assignment. We concluded that the program would be implemented two consecutive days a week for two hours a day for ten weeks. By presenting the program more than one day a week, we felt that we might dispel any notion that the new art based curriculum plan was an add-on idea or a frill. We believed that the introduction of art might retain a more positive role in the curriculum, if it was introduced in progression. Selecting the specific class that would participate in the study was difficult because Noreen strongly believed that all of her students would benefit from such a curriculum revision. We decided to present the program to the
eleven sixth-grade students during the last period of the school day.

The format for the program was outlined, and we all looked forward to planning our curriculum.
CHAPTER 5
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter contains a descriptive analysis of the collaborative efforts between the primary participants of this study to plan and implement an art integrated 6th grade special education curriculum in a community school. This analysis was derived from data obtained through participant observations; formal and informal interviews with the special education teacher, the preservice art education student, and students in the classroom; and informal interviews with the principal and other staff members. Photographs and lesson supplements are included to enhance reader understanding of the lessons that were introduced. The results of the final questionnaires, which were distributed to the special education teacher and the preservice art education teacher, were used to support and analyze the data.

The Program

During a 10-week period Noreen, the special education teacher; Jancy, the preservice art education student; and myself, an art education doctoral student, collaborated to plan and implement an art integrated special education curriculum for students with developmental handicaps in a sixth grade resource room. The students were introduced to a variety of art concepts and materials. Teacher planning, collaborative teaching methods, student discussions, and art activities were all important components of the program. Curriculum design and the implications for interdisciplinary content were explored.
Preparations

Jancy and I were extremely excited about the new program we were initiating and greatly anticipated the first curriculum planning meeting with Noreen. Jancy expressed her anxiety about teaching a large group of students with developmental handicaps and about how to teach them effectively. Throughout her student teaching assignment, experiences with DH students had been minimal. She did not know what to expect in terms of the students’ abilities to grasp art concepts.

Early in the afternoon of February 27, we entered Noreen’s classroom to acquaint ourselves with the project space and the sixth grade students, the student participants in our program. Jancy and I were introduced to the students, after which Noreen asked us to participate in the class by sitting at the tables with the students and helping them with a math unit on the value of money. What Jancy and I perceived to be an observation become active participation!

The room was large, with six long tables placed strategically along its perimeters. Additional tables and shelving units shoved against the walls housed a computer, books, magazines, and student work. There were two long bulletin boards hanging on the West wall of the room. Corrugated, scalloped border printed to look like Kente cloth outlined student assignments displayed on the boards. The teacher’s desk was located in the far corner of the room, hidden behind a table filled with students’ work that was in-progress.

The six girls and five boys worked in groups of three to four students at each table. They had not been given specific seating assignments, but had separated themselves by gender. The two Caucasian students, a girl and a boy, were sitting at tables with African American students of the same gender. Noreen, Jancy, and I
moved among the tables providing assistance when it was needed. The students were studying printed menus from local restaurants. Working in pairs, they placed orders from these menus with each other; added the sums of the bills, and used play money to pay each other for their orders. Noreen explained that they were learning the monetary values of coins and paper money, how to make change, and developing their social skills by working together. She informed us that her curriculum focused on teaching the students skills to assist them to function within their community.

As Jancy and I worked with the students, we became accepted members in the classroom environment and we developed an awareness of students’ abilities.

Having observed in several urban special needs classrooms, I noticed that the students seemed similar to others in neighboring schools. Lucy was a bit talkative, but was a pleasure to have in class. She beamed with pride when she was praised. Karen was a bit withdrawn, but had a tendency to become rebellious at times. Humphrey tried to please the teacher, but was mischievous and hyperactive unless the teacher paid attention to him at all times. Andrew was another student who was eager to please the teacher and was very helpful. Lawrence seemed to be in a constant state of movement, talked constantly, loved to argue, but behaved well and did a good job if given some task to do.

Terrence had been identified as having attention deficit disorder and was normally very sweet, but became angry when he was punished or reprimanded for any reason. Another student called himself “The Boss” and was a self-professed drug dealer. Sheila, the only Caucasian female student in the class, was very shy and sweet, tended to disappear among the others who demanded attention, but warmed up to us as she grew accustomed to our presence. Another student, Rochelle, was so
invisible to us during most of the study that we had little in our notes to describe her. Jacquellen was a typical, giggling sixth grader and Jamie was a bit withdrawn, but both girls worked very well together as a team.

It seemed that all of the girls in the class worked well together, constantly trying to deflect the rudeness and harassing comments from the boys, who liked to provoke them for the attention. It seemed to be typical, adolescent behavior, observable in most middle school classes, to some degree. This type of behavior continued through the duration of the study, though Noreen, Jancy and I planned the lessons and activities to consider this behavior and attempt to reduce it.

At the end of class, Noreen, Jancy, and I met to discuss curriculum considerations for our first unit of study. Noreen related that her students had made painted stencil designs, decorated eggs, and made holiday cards; art projects that they really enjoyed. At this point, I felt it was important to clarify the art program that we desired to introduce and the theory behind it. Jancy and I described for Noreen the program we hoped to incorporate, one which utilized art criticism exercises. The class would look at and talk about art reproductions and do related studio projects. We explained the interdisciplinary aspects of this program and described how the art lessons could become integrated into the present curriculum.

As we redefined art education for Noreen, we suggested possibilities for the first exercise. We talked about encouraging discussion about art elements such as line, shape, color, value, and texture. Selected art reproductions would be presented to the class who would be helped to identify art elements within the works, asked to describe what they saw, and tell why they liked or disliked a work. Noreen interjected that it was difficult for her students to understand art images. She suggested, "Be sure to
use artwork that will be exciting or interesting to them, works or ideas they can relate to” (personal communication, 1996) and added that “hands on” art experiences should be provided to keep their attention. Jancy and I agreed with her recommendations. Together we designed the first unit to stimulate student discussion about contemporary art. Through the identification, description, and interpretation of art elements we planned to have students interpret meaning in art and afford them the opportunity to apply this knowledge and establish personal value decisions about art. We wanted the students to recognize how craftsmanship, creativity, subject matter, media, color scheme, style, and composition should support their personal decisions. Integrating the math unit on money, we planned to have the students buy and sell the artwork to each other based on the decisions they had made. During this introductory process, Noreen began changing her ideas about teaching art. Jancy reflected “Noreen seemed to have opened up a good bit. I think we need to get her thoughts as often as possible and then try to help her change her concept of art” (personal communication, Feb. 1996).

We talked about the initial classroom presentation and the responsibilities each of us would assume. Noreen was still unclear about her role in the process of the collaboration. I explained that we wanted her to be an active participant in the planning, the presentation, and the classroom discussion. During the beginning of the program, I defined my role in the collaboration process as the facilitator. I believed that my role was to act as an assistant in the planning process and to serve as a resource person for Jancy and Noreen. Jancy envisioned her role as a co-teacher with Noreen and me.
Jancy and I began gathering art materials for the program, rummaging through our personal possessions. Noreen contributed art materials she had available from previous art projects the students had done and we began creating an art area on one side of the room. Boxes filled with construction paper, scissors, rulers, and a variety of paints and brushes were accumulated. Throughout the program we made additions to our art area and other teachers in the school often contributed to it. We brainstormed during the initial meeting about the studio projects we would introduce and began to collect materials that we would need.

**Talking About Art**

At the initial planning session, Jancy and I agreed to meet two hours prior to each class presentation. We both gathered materials for the first day, looking for art images in a variety of mediums that would promote student discussion by virtue of subject matter relative to the students. Because Jancy and I had previously experience working together, we comfortably shared ideas and responsibilities. We utilized Noreen’s suggestions and focused our selections of art reproductions on unusual subject matter in an effort to spark the students’ interest. We selected works by both male and female artists from African American, Hispanic, and Caucasian cultures. To motivate discussion and provide hands-on art experiences we planned to introduce students to the game Token Response developed by Marilyn Stewart (see Appendix C).

The first day of teaching was exhilarating. Jancy and I spent two hours prior to the actual class meeting organizing the materials necessary for the presentation and discussing methods she would use to encourage student discussion. We were anxious about the first art discussion and asked Noreen to provide suggestions concerning its
organization. We encouraged her to become an active participant during the discussion. The art images we selected included William Wegman’s dog photographs, collages by Romare Beardon, a three-dimensional work by David Hammons, photographs of installation art by Sandy Skogland, and mural art by Diego Rivera. Noreen helped us design a bulletin board in the front of the room to display our array of selected art images.

The students excitedly entered the classroom and were immediately drawn to the art reproductions we had displayed. They laughed at Wegman’s dogs and moved closer to our exhibit to look all of the art images. Noreen joined the students in these initial observations and explained that Jancy would teach them more about the artwork. After the students settled in their places around the tables, Jancy began a discussion on several of the works, encouraging the students to identify and describe what they saw. She introduced them to the elements of color, shape, texture, and subject matter in each of the images and encouraged student discussion. She assisted the students in using these descriptors to interpret the meaning of the works and encouraged them to consider whether they thought it was art or was not art. Looking at Wegman’s dog photographs one student commented, “I’m not sure that I think a dog dressed up in clothes is art.” In response to a work by David Hammons, one student surmised “I think the artist is trying to talk about the problems of being Black.” “The Boss” who had appeared to be asleep, lifted his head off of the desk and paid attention for a moment. I assumed that perhaps he felt a connection to the discussion at that point, because the comment was about being Black.

Jancy broke the class up into small groups which were assigned an artwork to discuss, placing emphasis on the craftsmanship of the piece, the amount of time they
believed might be involved in the creation of the work, and the artist’s overall idea with regard to creativity. She asked them to place a monetary value on the work for each of these aspects and to assign a net worth on the piece by adding all monetary values together. Noreen left her previous location at her desk, seated herself with a group of students, and provided assistance in decision making. I relocated myself from my place as observer and became an active member of the group, situating myself at tables with the students. During this first lesson, the roles each of us had assumed became hazy and the collaborative teaching process began to result in role reversals.

Groups presented their conclusions about the images they had discussed and many insightful conversations developed. Noreen appeared enthusiastic about the students’ abilities to express ideas. She was surprised about how well they supported their decisions with concrete examples. The groups all displayed an interest in the works they discussed and freely shared their ideas with one another. They successfully added the total monetary values and developed strong arguments to support these assigned values.

Symbols were an additional component of the lesson. Using the game Token Response, students were introduced relating representational symbols for each of the areas they had discussed: craftsmanship, the time involved by the artist in creating the work, the idea that was conveyed by the artist, and how much they felt the artwork was worth (see Appendix C). To incorporate a hands-on component of the lesson, Jancy provided a variety of colored paper for the students and asked them create their own Token Response symbols. I rotated among tables and worked with them as they
drew their symbols. Noreen returned to her desk in the corner of the room to monitor student behavior.

Several problematic aspects of collaborative teaching emerged during this first experience. Noreen expressed confusion about her role in the collaboration and related it to her previous experiences with student teachers: her confusing triple role of observer, supervisor, and teacher model. At this first lesson I observed several times that her participation became more active during student discussions. I also deliberated on my role. During the discussion of the artworks, I often felt additional information that I interjected would enhance the discourse. In later contemplation, I wondered if these interjections invaded Jancy’s teaching space and created a sense of incompetence for her. Because territories were being crossed, questions of intrusion arose.

Jancy was learning more about the abilities of students with developmental handicaps. After the first presentation, she realized that she needed to better sequence her lesson presentation, use clear instructions, and provide strong structural directives when passing out materials. She concluded, “It’s like learning to teach all over again, and it took me three years to learn that at an acceptable level!” She remarked that she needed Noreen’s assistance to understand how to teach these students.

**The Second Day**

On the second day of teaching, we continued the discussion of art reproductions and utilized several new art images that illustrated several different media including printmaking, sculpture, drawing, painting, and silk screening. Students were introduced to the different art processes and materials used to create each of the images and they learned to recognize these differences. When they struggled with the representation of a three-dimensional art form presented as a two-
dimensional reproduction Noreen tried to clear up their confusion by explaining that the reproductions were not the actual artwork but photographs of the work. She related the sculptures the students had seen in a previous visit to the art museum to the sculptural images at which they were now looking at.

After the media discussion, Jancy wanted the students to continue making personal interpretations and value decisions about artwork. She gave the students the symbols from the Token Response Game that they had created in the prior lesson to use in evaluating the art images. Noreen advised us to have the students use only three symbols at a time: a heart token representing the artwork they liked the best, a money token relating to the monetary value they placed on the artwork, and a hand symbol denoting the craftsmanship they felt was displayed in the work. Each of these areas had to be reintroduced and were illustrated on the chalkboard to reinforce the students’ conceptual understanding. The students were placed in groups, given several artworks, and requested to make group decisions about each image. The groups’ decisions were supported by critical and interpretive decisions based on art concepts.

This discussion was led by both Jancy and myself. Again I questioned my role in the collaborative process. I had envisioned myself as an observer during the presentation of the lessons, participating at a low level when necessary. However, during this lesson, I initiated student discourse and was instrumental in the collection of new artworks. I began to feel my responsibilities were increasing. Noreen’s participation level was low during this class period, because she was called to the office during part of the class time.

Collaboration between Jancy and myself increased. Feeling intrusive, I asked Jancy if she felt that I was interfering with her teaching procedures and making her
uncomfortable. She expressed that she welcomed the additional information and believed that she was gaining more knowledge about teaching. She stated, “Whenever I got stuck you’d help out. There wasn’t such a gap between teacher and student”. Noreen assumed a less participatory role but made many suggestions related to the curriculum content. She thought the students were getting tired of not “making art” but thought that they really seemed to enjoy and learn from their discussions about art. She suggested that we introduce a hands on project during the next class meeting.

The students enjoyed the discussions and actively made decisions as a group. They learned to listen to each other’s ideas and to make strong connections between the description of elements of art, the interpretation of the artwork, and values they placed on them. Noreen was impressed with the students’ descriptive language and the how well they supported their decisions. She exclaimed, “I really didn’t know they had such strong ideas!” Noreen continued to develop a new concept of what art education was.

Jancy continued to grow in her understanding of teaching students with developmental disabilities. She began to recognize when her presentation was unclear and that she often needed to repeat instructions. She concluded, “I can see some of the areas where students are deficient; but it is just that they need more patience, encouragement, and structure in classroom presentation. I need to repeat directions. They need structure yet outlets to grow at the same time.”

**The First Studio Project**

Several of the artworks used in the classroom discussions illustrated printmaking methods. After class, Jancy, Noreen, and I discussed some ideas for studio projects related to the artworks the students had used in discussion.
We resolved to design studio projects that would afford students opportunities to work with different art materials. Noreen restated that the students previously had worked with stenciling and enjoyed the concept of duplicate imaging. We decided to introduce a project in printmaking techniques and connect this with their previous experiences in art and to artworks they had discussed.

Jacey wanted to introduce printmaking techniques that included printing with found objects such as sponge shapes, fruits, and other textural items; engraved etchings on Styrofoam plates, and raised relief printing with cardboard collograph plates. Noreen, Jacey, and I once again pooled our art materials resources. Noreen quickly volunteered to obtain needed art materials. Jacey and I once again rummaged through our personal stocks.

We concurred that the introduction to the studio project needed to be well structured. Noreen, Jacey, and I planned the set up of printmaking stations and reorganized the room to facilitate studio procedures. We decided to have students rotate from table to table in small groups, allowing them to experience each of the techniques. We placed one long table on each side of the room, creating four separate printing stations, one for each printmaking technique introduced. Buckets of water, Styrofoam plates of paint, and boxes housing the printmaking materials were placed on the center of each table. The curriculum incorporated the introduction of the art concepts of pattern, repetition, color, texture, and value.

Jacey began the lesson by referring to the elements of color, texture, and value in the previous art images the students had discussed. I freely interjected questions for the students during this discussion. Noreen related previous information about pattern and repetition learned in math prior to the development our collaborative art
experience. Jancy demonstrated printmaking procedures and explained how to experiment with materials. She discussed color mixing; demonstrated the various printmaking methods; and encouraged students to experiment with color creation, overlapping shapes, and repetitive patterns. Examples of these concepts were displayed and discussed. Students created several different experimental designs and at the end of class proudly displayed them on the bulletin board (see Figures 2 & 3).

Collaborative teaching was evident in our contributions to student questioning and studio procedures. Jancy stated, “You and Noreen chimed in with subjects and topics for me to include.” She felt that this was a positive aspect of working collaboratively for her. I continued questioning my active role in teaching. At times, I felt that I was assuming responsibilities I had initially assigned to Jancy, for example, the gathering of art materials and organizing classroom procedures. I often confused my previous role as her student teaching supervisor with my role as a collaborative partner. Noreen often offered suggestions for Jancy to assist in her teaching yet questioned Noreen’s level of participation as she vacillated between supervisor and contributor.

Jancy felt that the first studio project was a success. She recognized the need to reinforce ideas for the students through repetition and clarification of her objectives. She said, “I think I was more specific with my instructions about each printing process and repetition was a factor, too, which helped them remember.” She understood that the abilities of the students were enhanced through well-structured presentations, the repetition of ideas, and by enabling them to make connections to prior knowledge. She still struggled with problems when clarifying objectives for the students and she often assumed they understood her.
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This became evident when Jamie, a shy student, failed to follow directions and started to print randomly rather than looking for pattern and repetition. She needed individualized instruction, which Jancy recognized right away and intervened to assist her in producing a successful print. Lawrence became frustrated while Jancy was helping Jamie and poured black paint on his project. Noreen noticed his frustration and assisted him in starting over on a new piece of paper. It was at this time that I observed that Noreen seemed to sense from Jancy that it was appropriate for her to step in and become an art teacher.

Noreen began to make connections for students that were interdisciplinary. Her conception of art was changing and she saw methods of introducing studio projects within her curriculum. She learned to use materials for art projects that she previously had not considered using.

Students responded positively to the project. They made connections between printmaking techniques and the artworks they had seen. They understood the concepts of overlapping, pattern, and repetition as they created their sample designs. Their vocabulary increased. They frequently used the words overlapping and engraving when talking about their work.

The Second Printmaking Lesson

We wanted the program to be progressive. Noreen suggested that we continue printmaking during the next class meeting. The students began to collect an array of artwork and thus finding storage space for their work became a problem. To address the need to organize student work and to expand the printmaking project, Jancy and I decided to have each student print a patterned design on a white folder that could be used to store individual artworks.
Noreen believed the art concepts of overlapping, repetition, and pattern should be reintroduced at the beginning of the lesson because students with developmental handicaps often struggle when making connections between previously learned concepts and present ideas. Prior to the class session, Noreen, Jancy, and I met to design a list of objectives for the students’ art projects, providing them with written and visual illustrations of these objectives, to support the different levels of comprehension of the students (see Appendix C).

The second lesson in printmaking reintroduced the students to overlapping, texture, pattern, and color mixing. Jancy began the presentation by asking students to identify each of these elements in their artwork, their clothing, and in other objects located around the room. Students eagerly participated in the discussion, making positive identifications of each of the art concepts in both their artwork and other objects within the room. This enabled the students a clear understanding of previously learned terms through applied usage of them.

Jancy introduced the studio project; I set up the tables for the printmaking and distributed the folders. She explained to the students that they needed to combine the three types of printing previously learned in their folder designs and referred to the objective list we had designed. During this explanation, I recreated visual examples of repetition, pattern, overlap, and color mixing on the chalkboard to assist her in the clarification of the objectives for this project. Noreen sat at the tables with the students and helped them to recognize art concepts in their previous work during Jancy’s directions but returned to her desk during at onset of studio production.

When we were satisfied that the students understood the three printing procedures for printing we instructed them to move to the separate work stations to
begin their folder designs. Jancy and I circulated the room as the students worked, offering suggestions and assisting when necessary. Noreen joined in the teaching endeavor and sat at the different work areas with the students. Toward the end of class time, Noreen was called to the school office for a meeting. She asked us that we continue teaching. In effect, we were assuming her responsibilities as teacher. Noreen did not return until class was over.

Jancy and I began cleanup procedures despite the students protests that they wanted to continue working. We explained that they would be able to work on their projects during our next art session. With this promise, the students became very helpful and cooperative in the cleanup activities, explaining where materials should be stored, emptying the large water buckets we had used, and rearranging the room.

My role in the collaboration appeared to be similar to team teaching. I found myself consistently participating in the teaching role with Jancy; a role I more readily assumed over time. I believe I was willing to allow my role as a supervisor to erode and that I was enjoying my participation in a peer teaching endeavor. Noreen, on the other hand, still struggled with the role of peer teacher, fluctuating between an active participant and the role of a supervisor. Jancy commented, "I don't think Noreen knows her role. I don't know if she's afraid to insult me if she interrupts me" (personal communication, April, 1995). Noreen admitted her role confusion and asked me if she was to interject personal ideas during class presentation and discussion. The uniqueness of the program coupled with her previous experiences with student teachers caused her to continually question her role. She commented that she felt that the students were confused as to who the teacher was.
Staff members also were confused by our program. Noreen explained that the other teachers in the school were unclear about her continuous presence in the classroom with a “student teacher” and questioned why I, the supervisor of the student teacher, always accompanied her in the class. The principal illustrated his misunderstanding about the collaborative program by scheduling several meetings for Noreen during our visits.

Jancy gained knowledge about peer teaching and student learning. She realized the importance of structure in the presentation and implementation of studio activities, learned better methods of addressing different learning styles, and became more confident in teaching students with disabilities. She stated,

I thought today went great. I repeated myself a lot and that is becoming more natural. It’s not that these kids can’t handle these things like everyone thinks; they just can’t be rushed through anything. Time and patience is valuable to them (personal communication, April, 1995).

Noreen made strides in becoming a more active participant in the program, although she often questioned her participation. She began to respond more naturally to teaching with Jancy and me, made curriculum additions, and continued to observe methods of integrating art into the curriculum. She often assisted in collecting art materials.

The students made connections between previously learned material and the new lessons. They successfully combined printing techniques with design elements they had learned and they created organized designs displaying an awareness of these composition elements (see Figures 4 & 5).
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One student exclaimed, “Hey, I did a pattern!” Another student observed, “My pattern would make a neat dress!” They were excited about their creations and were eager to continue working on them.

**Final Folder Printmaking**

Noreen, Jancy, and I all participated in setting up the room for the final day of folder printing. We met together for lunch and contemplated ideas about the next project. Noreen talked about the need to make curriculum connections to the daily lives of the students and suggested that we develop an awareness of art related to something that they see every day. She thought that a printmaking project could be connected to money and suggested that the students could look at design elements in U. S. money and that of other countries. She proposed that we discuss how the process of making money is similar to the printmaking methods the students had explored. She produced a calendar, which she displayed in the classroom, that illustrated international denominations of money. Together we decided to implement a project to introduce students to images on various forms of money and guide them into a discussion of why specific images were selected for different countries. The art activity we planned to implement allowed students to design and print their own money with images that would have personal significance for them.

**Monetary Art Designs**

Jancy prepared for her presentation of monetary designs by visiting a community museum that had an exhibit of international money. She wanted to gain an understanding of the monetary symbols used in different countries. She collected a variety of coins and bills from other countries for students to examine and filled the bulletin board with the images Noreen had provided.
We set up the room for the printmaking tables and decided that the students would use on Styrofoam engraving techniques in this assignment. Jancy and I prepared examples for the students to look at and planned her introduction to the project. Noreen left for lunch and Jancy continued the preparations.

The students were eager to discuss the symbols they saw on the reproductions of the money and were excited about viewing money that was different. Jancy provided them with information about several of the international coins and bills, which she displayed, and a discussion of the use of the symbols ensued. Students talked about the portraits included on several coins and bills. They made suggestions as to the identities of the portraits and why the subjects might have been chosen. Relating the designs to previously learned concepts, we discussed pattern and repetition and asked the students to identify these art elements in the currency. We conferred as to how they might integrate personal heroes and repetitive patterns in their own designs. As the students began working on their own designs, Noreen, Jancy, and I circulated the classroom to aid students in drawing personal images. They created several different designs: one for each of the monetary values of five, ten, and twenty dollar bills. They printed three copies of each denominational image for a personal bank account to be used later in an exercise that involved the buying and selling of artwork. Noreen asked them to total the amount of money they had in their “bank accounts” and they successfully added the denominations of their printed money.

During the final 15 minutes of class, the vice principal and the school counselor came to visit. The students proudly displayed their work, explained the printmaking procedures they were using, and described the rationale they had used in
the selection of their images. As they cleaned up their work areas, Noreen conversed with the classroom visitors, clarifying how we were integrating art in the curriculum and the collaborative program we were implementing. She referred to previous student artwork and asked several students to show their work. The counselor complimented several of the students on their creations and appeared to be interested in our program. She observed, “They really are doing some nice things and appear to truly enjoy what they are making!” Commenting on the program, she said; “I think it is wonderful that you are making connections through art for the students” (personal communication, April, 1995).

Noreen, Jancy, and I worked as a team to encourage student participation by the discussion of monetary symbols and designs. The ease with which all of us assumed the teaching roles was improving and the collaboration, in terms of planning and implementing the lessons, became more of a group effort. I could see that Noreen was beginning to see the benefits of the program by the way as she enthusiastically discussed it with the administration who visited the classroom.

Jancy continued to be encouraged about her educational growth. She felt that she was learning more about working with students with developmental disabilities. She mused,

This collaboration has opened things up for me in terms of realizing resources, dealing with students, possible maturity, and has reinforced my own beliefs and strategies about teaching. I’ve really had to stop and think about my teaching style and the personality I want to represent to students instead of just following suit in someone else’s classroom.
The curriculum design began to make connections for the students between their personal life and learning through art. Jancy believed not only that she was learning but also that the students were learning. She expressed, “Overall, I think the program is going well. They [the students] are learning more about art than before and I’m learning more about how to deal with them, too. Collaboration is a major strength and so is the students’ attitudes” (personal communication, April, 1995).

Mid-Program Interviews

At this point in the program, I felt I needed to gain a strong understanding of the programs’ strengths and weaknesses through the eyes of the other participants. In separate personal interviews with Noreen and Jancy, I explored the issues of collaboration, professional development, and curriculum.

Noreen believed that the strengths of the collaboration were embedded in our sharing of ideas and hypothesized positive attributes of this program were directly related to the commitment Jancy and I had toward the program. She asserted, “The commitment that you and Jancy have to the program is what will make it successful. You do not always work with teachers who are so dedicated to a program” (personal communication, April, 1995). She also identified the chemistry of our personalities as an asset to the program. She elucidated that the program worked well due to the ease in which Jancy and I shared the teaching roles and responsibilities, and to the similarities in our teaching philosophies.

Jancy supported Noreen’s opinions. She perceived the collaboration between us was strong due to our flexibility, our comfort with each other, and our similar definitions of art education. She stated; “Our relationship, both professionally and personally, is strong. We can bounce off ideas together and support each other.
We have a mutual understanding without discussing it” (personal communication). According to Jancy, Noreen’s expertise was also a program asset. She believed that throughout the collaboration, all of the primary participants served as strong resources for curriculum development.

Noreen explained that collaboration may often be confusing for teachers because as, “It’s new and no one really understands it. There is frequently the question of who is in charge, and other teachers who might participate in such a program would not always understand the shifting of roles” (personal communication, April, 1995). She remarked that not all teachers would be flexible and willing to participate in collaboration. She believed that questions of equity arise and that many teachers might question what was in it for them.

Noreen illustrated her confusion about our roles as she discussed her personal disciplinary concerns. She expressed that she did not want to be “the police” in the collaboration and did not want the disciplinarian role she had assumed. Again, I explained the importance of sharing her feelings and beliefs with Jancy and me to avoid fostering resentment or working against anyone’s convictions. By communicating our feelings, we could avert possible conflicts that could sabotage our collaborative efforts. She also confessed that she was not comfortable with journal writing. She felt other teachers might react to it negatively also. She explained verbal communication was much easier and less time consuming.

Jancy identified the problems she had with collaboration as due to the novelty of this process and the personal confusion surrounding her identity as a recent student and a new teacher. She explained her expectations of collaborative teaching were her understanding that all the teachers would teach together. She believed Noreen’s
participation was gradually increasing but that Noreen often identified Jancy’s role as that of student teacher and hers as a supervising teacher.

I believed that our collaboration was constantly redefined by the primary participants. I perceived my role as researcher overlapped and became interconnected with teaching responsibilities. The acceptance of my changing role was often difficult and I questioned whether my classroom responsibilities exceeded those of the other members of the group. I was encouraged by the growth of personal learning I observed in both Noreen and Jancy with regard to interdisciplinary content in the curriculum and by Noreen’s increasing participation in teaching with Jancy and I. Although Noreen perceived her involvement in the program as the primary disciplinarian, she began to relinquish some of that role to Jancy and changed her participation level to become more actively involved in the teaching process. I realized the territories we had established in relation to our previous teaching experiences slowly diminished. I accepted that making the changes in territorial domains would take time. The flexibility we developed in changing roles was a strong asset to the program.

**Community Connections-Our First Field Trip**

The school was located in an architecturally rich community environment, yet we ascertained the students’ awareness of the these beautiful Victorian structures was weak. Noreen was interested in designing a program which would help the students to develop a sense of pride in their community and would encourage them to look more positively at the world around them. Jancy found an art lesson that introduced students to architectural elements through a neighborhood walk. The walk would be preparation for a studio project. We discussed the possibilities of having students
identify architectural design elements during a walk through the neighborhood with the aid of a worksheet provided by the lesson plan Jancy had discovered. Noreen was supportive of the worksheet to supplement the activity as she knew that her students would need structure during activities that took place beyond the school boundaries. She volunteered to make the necessary school arrangements for the trip. Jancy offered to investigate the layout of the neighborhood and plan an architectural tour. The duplication of the worksheet and the design of a supportive map of the area that outlined our path became Jancy’s responsibility (see Appendix C).

Disciplinary problems and lack of parental permission limited the size of our group for our architectural field trip, but the six students that were permitted to participate were extremely excited about our venture. Jancy distributed the worksheets and discussed the illustrations of the architectural features that they were to look for on our “Scavenger Hunt.” Noreen informed the students of behavioral expectations and out the door we went.

As we stepped out the school door, I asked the students to turn around and look closely at the school building for any of the architectural elements on the worksheet. The students scrutinized the building. One by one the students located the first element on the list; a gargoyle on the upper corner of the building (see Figure 6). While talking with the school art teacher about the upcoming architectural hunt I was informed of the rarity of gargoyles on buildings in this particular area. I shared this information with the students who were proud of their new found knowledge about their school. We continued our trip throughout the neighborhood, the students referring to Jancy’s map and guiding our course. Noreen, Jancy, and I assisted the students in identification of window designs, columns, roofs, and structural elements.
of brick, stucco, and frame materials listed on their worksheets. The students made close observations of buildings that they walked past every day (see Figure 7). At the end of the tour students had successfully completed their worksheets and were proud of their accomplishments.

Upon returning to the classroom, the students talked about their experiences and discussed the variety of building structures that existed in the area. Jancy had students use the last half hour of class time to design their own buildings. They combined several of the architectural elements they had observed during their walk. During this drawing assignment, Noreen encouraged the students to use rulers and to measure the windows and doors. Jancy noted later in her journal that even the students who showed signs of having low self-esteem had made great progress and felt like they had experienced success that day. Their excitement towards their finished work and the trip were evident. The students were reluctant to leave their designs behind at the end of class.

The collaboration continued to grow. We each accepted responsibilities during the planning and implementation of the neighborhood walk. Noreen believed that the journey the students had made in their own community increased their knowledge and awareness of their surroundings and also heightened their skills. Jancy noted that the students reacted positively to the assignment. Both Jancy and Noreen contended that the strengths of this lesson were related to the organizational qualities of the unit, which she credited to Jancy's lesson plan find. Noreen stated, "I really think that the worksheet and the map were important for the students. These student need structure and clear objectives and the supportive materials provided that."
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Community connections for the students were an important factor of this curriculum. Noreen felt that our community walk was successful in relating students to their community. She explained, “Keep in mind that teenagers, (especially DH) are very interested in themselves, school, friends and community. I think they really liked the Scavenger Hunt because it was a game and they got to relate it to their community.”

Building Collages

Prior to the next class meeting, Jancy and I met to discuss the studio project we wanted integrate in our study of architecture. We decided to have the students design building structures created by collage methods. This decision was based on the inclusion of previously learned pattern concepts, the incorporation of math related measuring components, and student observation of collage exemplified in a work by Romare Beardon that had been previously discussed. The materials for the collage project were readily available through our collection of art materials that continued to grow through our donations and those of other teachers in the school.

We decided the use of multiple media exemplars would encourage student discussion to differentiate the array of media artists use and teach them to recognize how collage methods incorporate mixed media techniques. I volunteered to collect images to introduce the project because I had access to related art reproductions; collages by Romare Beardon, watercolor paintings of cityscapes, and photographs of urban life. We planned to include the photographs I had taken of the buildings the students observed during our walk. Jancy offered to make color copies of images she had by Beardon, Picasso, and Braque.
We met with Noreen to discuss this idea and she was enthusiastic about having the students experiment with mixed media. She suggested that we provide a worksheet for the collages to clearly state and visually illustrate objectives for the students. This worksheet could additionally serve as a future checklist to assist students in evaluation of their projects. We brainstormed to create a worksheet that would require the students use a variety of materials including magazine photographs and implement drawing techniques in their design (see Appendix C).

Jancy and I created a visual display on the bulletin board. On one area of this display entitled “Buildings on Our Walk,” I placed the photographs from our field trip. The students were delighted to visually revisit this walk and they shared information about the photographs with students who were not able to participate in the field trip. Jancy led the student discussion to relate the architecture they viewed in their neighborhood with urban dwellings depicted in the reproductions of artworks that we had selected. Continuing to integrate concepts the students had previously learned, Jancy encouraged the students to identify art materials, discuss the craftsmanship of the work, and make decisions about the time factor involved in its creation. During the discussion Noreen and I located ourselves at the tables with the students and actively participated, asking questions of the students with Jancy, encouraging student decision making, and supporting student involvement.

When the students broke into small group discussion areas and were given individual art images to discuss, Noreen returned to her desk and began to grade papers while Jancy and I rotated between groups of students, to aid them in making group decisions. All students contributed to the decisions about the art at which they
were looking. After their small group discussions, they reassembled as a large group and reported their findings, which were strongly supported with examples.

Jancy believed that the students had learned to transfer previous knowledge during the discussion. She was excited about the way the students became active participants and surmised that they understood the concepts of collage. She remarked, "They talked for a whole hour about types of art, collage, how it is done, its materials, craftsmanship, and the time it took to make it." She summarized, "They seem to be retaining the topics and concepts that we've talked about previously and their articulation when talking about art seems to be improving. They're pointing out things that I maybe hadn't seen or thought of."

Noreen supported the belief that the students learned a great deal from the discussion and were able to draw relationships between the artwork and what they had seen. She was impressed by the ease with which students relayed information. She concluded, "The students actively participated and made connections to their community because you and Jancy made it relevant to them and for them and there is comfort in knowing."

### Studio Day

Jancy became ill and was absent for the initial studio day for the collages. She called me to inform me of her illness and we discussed how she wanted me to introduce the project. It was decided that I should review the images we had discussed, distribute the collage worksheet, and clearly identify for the students the objectives of the lesson. I arrived early that day so that I could talk to Noreen and explain the change in roles that would take place. Informing her of Jancy's absence, I encouraged her to assist me in facilitating the studio project. She appeared confident in
assuming a shared teaching role with me and together we planned the implementation of the lesson. She offered advice about classroom organization, assisted me in organizing the room, and explained to the students why I was going to be "the teacher" instead of Jancy.

I reviewed concepts of collage for the students and explained each of the components on the worksheet we had given them. Noreen physically placed herself in the front of the room with me and reinforced the concepts that I introduced. Referring to the images that we had displayed she asked the students, "What kinds of materials did the artists use in these pictures? What kinds of shapes do you see?" Following the questioning exercise, Noreen and I distributed materials to the students. They worked on drawing their buildings and selecting art materials that would enhance the textural qualities they wanted to recreate. Throughout the class period Noreen continued her role of team teacher and assisted me by working closely with the students as they began their designs. She was impressed with the students' abilities to relate the objectives of the project to their individual work and declared, "The worksheet is something that allows them to understand what they are supposed to be doing. I am glad that they keep referring to them as they work."

In this lesson, several issues concerning role assumption in collaboration emerged. Noreen assumed a strong role of teacher in this situation. In Jancy’s absence our emergent relationship appeared to be characteristic of peer teaching and I found myself validating Jancy’s notion that she was often perceived as a student teacher by Noreen. In this lesson, I became the primary teacher and although I enjoyed being the "teacher" for the day I continued to question my role and my responsibilities. My reflections continually surrounded territorial issues.
Some flexibility in each of us gradually assuming different responsibilities was evident, yet I felt we had created new limits as to what those responsibilities were.

The students expressed concern about Jancy’s illness, but they easily accepted the role change I had assumed. The active class discussion and studio production illustrated their interest in the subject matter and their excitement about creating art! They referred to the photographs of our walk, the worksheets that outlined the objectives of the lesson, and the “Scavenger Hunt” sheet in the creation of their designs.

Jancy returned the following day and was still not feeling well. She asked me to begin the lesson for her and said she would participate as much as she could. Noreen assumed the role as my assistant again and together we distributed materials to the students. I continued the collage project and reviewed for the students the requirements; mixed media techniques including the incorporation of photographs, inclusion of textural elements, and overlapping of objects. As the lesson progressed Jancy became a more active participant and I relinquished my role as teacher. She reviewed the worksheet with individual students and provided them assistance to construct their artwork.

Noreen continued to work with the students and helped them select materials. She guided the students in problem solving and constructing their work. She frequently complimented the students and encouraged them with her praise.

The students were excited about their new project and accumulated their own private collection of materials. They physically separated themselves by moving to different areas of the room to work. Jancy observed, “Both Tonya and Jean were pretty excited about the project and they were aggravated when anyone tried to get
them off track." She continued; "Lori really wanted to stray away from the goals of the project at first but now it is good to see her enthusiastic."

The completion of the projects illustrated the students' understanding of art concepts and the objectives of the project (see Figures 8 & 9). They compared their work to the collages which we had initially displayed, and successfully completed the checklists for their projects. One student exclaimed, "I have all of the things in my collage that I should, just like that Beardon person!" The students were proud of their work!

**A Community Artist**

The school was located in an area that was populated with art galleries. One block from the school I noticed an open lot that exhibited large steel sculptures created by Chris Moehler, a local artist. Through personal conversations, I learned that a friend of mine knew the artist very well. As a steel fabricator whose previous business location had been connected to Chris' studio, he often supplied the artist with scrap material for his creations. He provided me with the necessary information to contact the artist and suggested that I inform Chris about our friendship. I was excited about the potential introduction of the students to an artist who creates artworks in their own community!

After several conversations with the artist, I made initial plans for him to visit the classroom. I explained the program we were instituting and specifically described the student population. I informed him of our interest in promoting awareness about community art for the students and he expressed a desire to participate in our program.
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Prior to making arrangements for his visit, I shared this newly found community resource with Jancy and Noreen. Familiar with the sculptural works of this artist, Noreen was pleased with the contact and informed me that many of the students walked to school, and passed the location of these artworks. She concluded that the students were oblivious to the artwork and was excited about developing an awareness of its’ existence for students. I made final arrangements for a class visit with the artist.

In preparation for his visit, we wanted the students to become familiar with the artist’s work. Noreen made the necessary arrangements for our field trip, and all of the students received the necessary parental permission to participate. Jancy, Noreen and I planned the discussion we wanted to provide for the students during their observation of the artworks and designed questions to encourage the students to make applications about the concepts of shape, pattern, repetition, color, and texture to the sculptures.

The students were eager to look at art in their own neighborhood and gleefully exited the classroom. As we walked toward the sculptures one student announced, “Guess what? I looked for these yesterday after you told us about what we were going to see. I walk this way everyday and I never noticed them before.” The students were encouraged to move close to the works and they circulated around the lot that housed seven large steel sculptures. They touched the sculptures, moved inside several of the larger pieces, and became involved with the art forms! (see Figures 10 & 11)
Figure 10
Community Sculpture

Figure 11
Students with Community Sculpture
We discussed the materials that were used and several students noted that the artist used old objects; pipes, car parts, and other found metal objects and combined them into large pieces of art. Noreen asked the students to identify the shapes they saw, and we introduced the concept of objective and nonobjective shapes. Noreen, Jancy, and I presented questions to the students asking them about subject matter and design elements. Students were encouraged to ask questions and a wide variety of questions emerged. As we began our journey back to the classroom, Jancy, Noreen, and I decided to have the students list questions they wanted to ask the artist about his work. They were enthusiastic about his impending visit and we wanted them to learn as much as possible from this artist about his work.

The Visit

Anticipating the artist's visit, Jancy and I arrived early to make preparations while Noreen went to lunch. As we conferred about the program and the artist visit in particular, several other teachers joined us in the classroom. The industrial art teacher asked questions about the visit and shared information about several projects he did with the students that used found objects and sculptural forms. Another DH teacher in the school commented, "The students are looking forward to the guest that is coming and told me all about the sculptures they went to see. What a great idea!"

The principal joined us and told Jancy and me about a college art class in which he had created art from found objects. It was apparent to me that the staff of the school shared our excitement about the community artist and were making their own personal connections.

The students rushed into the classroom looking for the "artist" and took their seats eagerly awaiting the presentation. When Chris presented the slides of his work,
the students recognized several of the pieces they had seen during our neighborhood walk and were ecstatic! They asked questions such as “What is it supposed to be?” and “Why is it in that empty lot?” He explained the role of imagination in his art and how his work evolved from combining found objects and scraps of steel. He emphasized the ecological aspect of his work that of recycling materials. For him, the location of the works in the lot was important because it allowed the viewer to become actively involved in the artwork.

After the slide presentation, the students asked some of the questions they had previously collected. Excited about meeting a “real artist”, the students asked, “When did you become and artist”, “Is that all you do”, and “Do you have a family?” The students made personal associations as they learned about the artist. One student, who often felt discouraged about his work, asked “When you make something you don’t like, do you break it?” Chris’ reply proved encouraging for the student as he explained that if the piece was not satisfactory, it would be changed or altered as opposed to being destroyed.

When the students did not present questions, Noreen and Jancy prompted the students by asking leading questions. Noreen appeared to be interested in making career connections for students and actively participated in the discussion. She asked, “Why did you become an artist?” This question stirred the students toward further questioning.

The integration of a community artist into the curriculum was extremely beneficial for the students. They learned about the relationship between artwork and choice of materials used and the intent of the artist in relationship to subject matter. The artist enabled the students to make connections between art and their community.
During the next class session, we reviewed the artists’ visit. The students felt privileged to know an artist but wondered, “Why did he come here?” They wrote letters to thank him for coming to their school. One student declared, “(I) come to the arts festival and maybe see you, and I thank you. I like your sculpture. Why didn’t you go to other schools?” They asked career related questions such as, “Did you go to artist school and I like your sculpture. Did you get your idea from art school?”

Noreen believed that the integration of a community artist in our program was extremely beneficial for the students. She explained the importance she placed on students learning from positive role models. She felt community resources we provided assisted the students to develop a more positive relationship within their community.

Jancy learned how to integrate art, make community contacts, and establish connections with outside resources. During the artist’s visit she facilitated discussion and often assisted student participation by indirectly leading them to the questions that they had formulated prior to his visit. She observed the students’ positive acceptance of a community focused program.

The Studio Project

To relate the final studio project with the sculptures created by the visiting artist Noreen, Jancy, and I decided that the students should experiment with found materials by creating sculptures. We wanted to emphasize environmental issues by using recycled objects, and to introduce students to creating art in three-dimensional form. We supplemented our collection of materials with wood scraps, cans, recycled containers, and other found items. We created a found object box for the students to use as resources for their sculptures. Realizing this was one of the final days of our
program, we decided this project must be completed in one class meeting to allot time for a program summary with the students and provide a structured closure.

Jancy introduced the project and encouraged the students to discuss how Chris Moehler found his materials. This discussion related Chris’ materials in his art with our own found objects. I explained that their designs should emerge as they combined materials and I associated our found objects with the objects employed in the Moehler sculptures. One student remembered, “he said that sometimes his ideas just happen!” and another chimed in, “We have to use our imagination!” The students eagerly began their constructions and experimented with different combinations of objects (see Figure 12). As the pieces evolved, students began to identify known objects and titled their formations. Noreen, Jancy, and I participated in helping students achieve balance in their forms, often by simply offering suggestions. The activity produced many unusual forms and students were anxious to take their creations home.

The Final Day

At an earlier meeting, Noreen had suggested the students create a class yearbook, as financial difficulties often did not allow the students to purchase the school yearbooks. It was her contention that the students spent considerable time during the year together in a group thus creating a sense of camaraderie. Jancy and I supported this contention and decided to create a book for both students and Noreen to serve as a remembrance of our art focused program. Jancy and I created a “Memory Book” for the students. As we worked on the final design, we both felt emotionally torn about leaving the site.
Figure 12
Students working on Found Object Sculptures
I believed students had been exposed to a new way of learning, and that I had made invaluable connections with a community school. Jancy felt a sense of attachment with the students and developed a level of comfort with the school and the program. When reviewing projects and lessons together, we recollected the positive moments of the program and were excited about preparing a visual remembrance for the students and Noreen. (See Appendix D)

On our last day, Noreen and the students planned a surprise for us. When we entered the classroom, the students were seated around their tables with mischievous smiles painted on their faces. One student, acting as a representative for the class, had prepared a speech for us. He thanked us for helping them learn more about art and presented us with a gift of a coffee mug decorated with hearts from the class. The class broke into applause and Jancy and I experienced a feeling of pride in our endeavor. We were encouraged by the positive attitudes students displayed towards our program. Noreen added, "We were lucky to be a part of this wonderful art experience. We all learned so much!"

We distributed our yearbooks, the students eagerly browsed through the pages and recollected memories of the projects and personal experiences. We had included a signature page and students excitedly exchanged their books with each other and Noreen, Jancy, and me. I had created additional yearbooks with color reproductions for Noreen and Jancy. Saying good-bye to the students and Noreen was a bittersweet experience for Jancy and me. Afterwards we reflected on our personal memories and learning experiences. We carried with us the fond memories of the students and the school. We were encouraged by the positive feedback from the students and Noreen expressed concerning the program we introduced. Though this was our last day with
this particular teacher and class, the lessons we had learned about educational

collaboration and art integration of a DH curricula would serve all of us in the future.

Our experience with this program encouraged our growth as teachers, as art educators,
and as friends.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter I will review the findings of this study. I will present implications for the fields of art education, special education, and teacher preparation based on these findings. Suggestions for further research in the areas of teacher education, collaboration, and interdisciplinary curriculum development will be given.

Findings

Throughout the descriptive tale of the program presented in Chapter 5, data was presented and analyzed with regard to the process of collaboration, teacher learning, student learning, and interdisciplinary curriculum development. At the completion of the program I asked Noreen and Jancy to complete a questionnaire summarizing their beliefs concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the program (Appendix A). The review of these questionnaires, journal entries from Jancy, my personal fieldnotes, and notation of conversations with Noreen, Jancy, and other staff members contributed to my understanding of the benefits and impediments of the program.

Collaboration

The complexities of the collaboration between teachers are illustrated by issues that emerged for the primary participants during this study; defining of roles,
willingness in accepting new responsibilities, and re-adjusting teacher territorial domains (See Figure 13). This collaborative experience encouraged the teachers to share teaching roles with each other and work together when planning and presenting a new curriculum. At the onset of the program, Jancy, Nureen, and I attempted to clarify our individual roles and responsibilities. It was my contention that Jancy and Nureen would become team teachers by combining curricular territories and sharing knowledge. I proposed that their levels of participation would be congruent. I envisioned my role as the navigator and observer of the program; aiding Jancy and Nureen in the collaborative planning of the curriculum and in teaching. I initiated the program and visualized my role as the university representative for Jancy within the community school.

Strengths of Collaboration

Many of the strengths of the program were reliant on the strong relationship between Jancy and myself. When designing the art components of the program, our mutual beliefs in a comprehensive art program enhanced the curriculum development. Together we support common goals and objectives of the program. Our personalities displayed a strong willingness to accept new responsibilities and freely make additions or changes to each others’ ideas. The degree in which our personalities, goals, objectives, and commitment to the program were congruent was an important aspect in this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANCY</th>
<th>NOREEN</th>
<th>MYSELF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think Noreen thinks of me as a student teacher. She is afraid to</td>
<td>It’s new, and I am not sure I really understand it. I am not sure what</td>
<td>I am not sure I really understand how much I should participate. I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach with me. She lets me present the lessons we plan.</td>
<td>my role is.</td>
<td>that sometimes I step on Jancy’s territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think Noreen, you, and I are doing well in trying to define our</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel like a police for student discipline. I’m not sure</td>
<td>As I start teaching more I think that I am taking too many responsibilities from Jancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles. It is nice to have you speak also. If one person isn’t</td>
<td>how much you really want me to help Jancy.</td>
<td>Jancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinking of a certain way to explain things maybe another can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this time my role in the collaboration is pretty clear. I</td>
<td>I was the classroom teacher so I think that I provided the rest of the</td>
<td>I at first saw my role as the initiator and supervisor of the program. Now I feel more like a team teacher with Jancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project our ideas through teaching what we’ve all come together to</td>
<td>team with information on the children, insight into their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan.</td>
<td>personalities and content being taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the collaboration is going better. You and Noreen both are</td>
<td>I am learning how to use art in the class. At first I thought that</td>
<td>The collaboration is growing. I think Noreen is participating more. The flexibility with which we are assuming different roles is improving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helping me present my ideas. I am feeling more like a peer than a</td>
<td>three teachers was unrealistic but now I see that it is okay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peasant student teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13

The Collaboration Process
Noreen’s participation in the collaborative process developed over time. The program was new to her and she was unsure as to her participating role as a teacher, but her participation level increased as I encouraged her to actively teach with Jancy and I.

Noreen, Jancy, and I gradually became comfortable with each other and we consistently revised the curriculum together and assumed new responsibilities. We redefined our roles during this process and the ease with which we accepted our new roles grew as the program progressed. (See Figure 14) The growth of collaboration was a result of a mutual dedication to the goals that promoted an interdisciplinary curriculum incorporating art in the special education curriculum, teacher professional development for Noreen, Jancy, and myself, and our commitment to the students.

The flexibility each of us possessed was one of the greatest assets to the program. We were willing to learn new ideas, accept new responsibilities, and act as resources for each other. Noreen expounded, “The strengths of the program I found to be in the good planning, good ideas being shared, flexibility, and dedicated people.” She suggested that she had reservations about the program at its onset as she believed there were too many adults as teachers and multiple teachers were confusing for the students. She later contented, “I now feel that it was okay and that it worked well because of the personalities we had.”
null
Weaknesses of Collaboration

Problems in collaboration were a result of the newness of the program for both Noreen and Jancy evidenced in their misunderstandings in role identification, previous territorial issues, and the underlying questions of equity. Although attempts were made throughout the program to clearly define the individual roles and responsibilities for the participants, it was evident that collaboration was an evolutionary process that required the participants to redefine their roles and to become more flexible in accepting changes in previously conceived roles.

In this collaborative process, Noreen stated she was often unsure of her responsibilities in regard to collaboration. In her prior experiences with student teachers she had relinquished all of her teaching responsibilities to the student teacher in her classroom and she often transferred these same procedures to this experience. She struggled with the acceptance of Jancy as a “peer teacher” and her preconceived procedures as a supervisor often stifled her participation in the teaching process. She stated, “I am still not sure how much you want me to help Jancy when teaching.” She frequently made additions to Jancy’s class presentations yet she often questioned this participation.

In the beginning of the program, Jancy observed problems Noreen experienced in accepting her as a peer teacher. She stated, “I think Noreen is not sure what to do. Sometimes I think she treats me like a student teacher. I wish she would participate more.” As Jancy identified the hierarchical structure she evidenced, she explained that this structural barrier was eliminated over time.
Near the end of the program she contented, “I think Noreen is understanding the program more, I feel more like a peer than a “peasant student teacher”.

I struggled with my role in the collaboration. Having previously been Jancy’s supervisor during her student teaching assignment, I contemplated the amount of assistance I should provide for her. I wanted her to continue her growth as a teacher through additional teaching experiences, yet I believed we were partners in this program and that I should share many of these responsibilities with her. I deliberated,

I felt that I was doing much of the preparation for Jancy and I was confused about my role. I wasn’t sure it was a good idea for me to assume a lot of the responsibilities. As a collaborator with Jancy I sometimes feel that I am still her supervisor.

I found that as the program progressed I more comfortably assumed teaching roles with Jancy and Noreen and my previous role as observer and supervisor was altered.

Noreen eluded that not all teachers in community schools may be willing to participate in a collaborative program unless they feel that they are going to benefit from their participation. She contended that the time commitment, the uniqueness of the program, and the revision of an established curriculum may cause teachers to shy away from participating in collaborative endeavors. She expressed that the personalities of the participants of the program would dictate the success of the program and that all teachers may not be able to collaborate together.
**Teacher Preparation**

Jancy participated in the program to learn more about teaching art to students with developmental handicaps. The addition of this collaborative experience to her teacher preparation program allowed her to learn techniques for interdisciplinary curriculum development, experience methods of collaboration, and gain knowledge about students with disabilities. (See Figure 15) She acquired information concerning the placement of students in special education services and the implications for teaching art to these students in a community school.

Jancy had felt unprepared to teach students with disabilities. Her prior experiences with these students were minimal and she wanted to develop an art curriculum which would address their abilities as opposed to their disabilities. She was concerned that her previous teaching experiences neglected to teach her methods of teaching students who were mainstreamed in the art classroom and this neglect had caused her to develop biases against these students. She believed that her student teaching assignment did not encouraged her to work with students who were “different” and she needed to explore new methods for teaching them. Jancy explained, “It’s like learning to teach all over again. I can see some of the areas where students are deficient but I don’t really think about it in a classroom.”

Through the practical experiences provided by this program, Jancy learned to better sequence her lessons, to provide clarity when presenting objectives, and to improve the structure of her class presentations. She affirmed, “I really learned that the students are no different than any other of the ‘average kids’. It just felt like they needed more patience and encouragement than the average kid.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learned more about DH kids.</td>
<td>I learned to make connections with their math unit</td>
<td>I gained more self esteem in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gained more confidence in teaching students with disabilities</td>
<td>I learned to look at community resources.</td>
<td>I learned how to be flexible in my ideas with collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned to sequence my lessons more</td>
<td>I really think our discussions went well</td>
<td>This collaboration has opened up for me new resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can see some of the areas where the students are deficient but I don't really think about it in the classroom anymore. It just feels like they need more patience and encouragement.</td>
<td>Noreen really helped me with making interdisciplinary connections</td>
<td>I feel like a major player in this process I am becoming more like a &quot;peasant student teacher&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I improved my problem solving skills.</td>
<td>I think the flexibility in our curriculum changes was beneficial.</td>
<td>My teaching style is better defined. My teaching style is better defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I developed more tolerance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15

Teacher Preparation
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Although Jancy completed student teaching prior to her involvement in this program, she lacked confidence in her teaching abilities. She contended that the additional teaching experience provided through her participation in this collaboration greatly increased her confidence, better defined for her the teaching style she wanted to embrace, and enhanced a sense of professionalism. She expressed, “This has been much more rewarding than student teaching. I felt like a peer and that totally changed my outlook, confidence immediately!”

At the beginning of the program, Noreen supported the contention that art teacher preparation programs need to better prepare teachers for the realities of the art classroom. She was enthusiastic about Jancy’s desire to learn more about her students. She believed that her students were often neglected when mainstreamed in other classes and “fell through the cracks” instead of learning in the art classroom. She suggested that problems students with developmental handicaps experienced in the art class were embedded in the curriculum choices of the art teacher and the teaching techniques used to present the material. She believed that this program was beneficial for Jancy with regard to teaching. Noreen stated, “Jancy learned through experience. She was learning to think more about the specific students when teaching.”

Jancy was learning methods of collaboration. This collaborative model encouraged team teaching techniques and promoted interdisciplinary curriculum planning. According to Allen-Mearse & Pugach (in Winitsky, Sheridan, Crow, Welch, & Kennedy, 1995) problems in implementing an interdisciplinary program for students are related to the practice of universities in preparing preservice
education students in isolation of each other. Winitsky et al. (1995) contended “We must model for students the capabilities we want them to develop and provide opportunities for them to try out new skills in the field” (p. 112). Through this study, Jancy gained experience in team teaching and collaborative planning.

**Learning About Art - Noreen**

Noreen began to redefine her concept of art education and her original methods of teaching art were changed through the interdisciplinary program we developed. Her prior inclusion of art in the classroom was project orientated with no connection to her curriculum content. As Jancy, Noreen, and I designed an interdisciplinary curriculum, Noreen became aware of possibilities art possessed to become integrated into her lessons. She was encouraged by student dialogue when talking about art and believed students had acquired improved language skills.

Through this art focused program, Noreen was introduced to a community based art education program which created connections for the students to the community in which they lived and she strongly supported this endeavor. She learned methods of utilizing community art resources when designing programs that were interdisciplinary and observed methods of relating art to her traditional curriculum through these endeavors.

When discussing her personal growth as a result of the program, Noreen felt she had learned methods of incorporating art into her program, became familiar with collaborative teaching methods, and developed an awareness of community resources for art based programs. She ascertained that as the program progressed
she developed a more positive attitude towards the program, gained insight into the positive attributes of the program for the students and herself, and “learned a great deal!”

**Student Learning**

At the beginning of the study, students were encouraged to identify and describe art elements in artwork, and transferred this knowledge to interpret meaning in works of art. They often made reference to art concepts when discussing their own work. Remarks included, “I think I used too many patterns” and “I picked the sandpaper to make the texture of my house like stucco”. They related mathematical concepts to art when discussing pattern and repetition.

They made value decisions about what art was based on their interpretations and personal beliefs. The students displayed a clear understanding of art terms and made art related decisions supported by concrete ideas and through interdisciplinary curriculum design they assigned monetary values to these beliefs.

They observed art in their own community and formed a more positive awareness of the world around them. They learned to look at local buildings as art and related architectural styles and structures to their own personal artistic creations. When creating a collage of buildings, they often refereed to the architectural terms of pillar, sash windows, and dormers as they worked. One student exclaimed, “I put two different dormers on my buildings” while another explained, “I am designing lintels over all my windows.” Students developed a sense of pride in their work and eagerly displayed their artwork on the class bulletin board.
Curriculum Development

Noreen complained that many of the art programs that her students are exposed to focus on adaptive art, assuming students disabilities hindered them from being actively included in the art classroom. She believed that such programs are a digression from the rationale for inclusion.

By sharing our areas of expertise Jancy, Noreen and I developed and implemented a community focused, interdisciplinary program for students with developmental handicaps. The introduction of the program encouraged student discussion of artworks that were culturally and socially relevant to the lives of the students. We infused math concepts from the traditional special education curriculum into an art based curriculum. Through the community extensions of the program we promoted a sense of pride for the students in their local community. Noreen was encouraged by methods we developed to teach art and believed our curriculum supported her contention that students with disabilities should be afforded opportunities similar to their peers in the art classroom.

This integrated art program was the result of teacher collaboration through the sharing of ideas and goals for the individual program areas; the special education math and health units Noreen had planned to implement, and the comprehensive art program that Jancy and I wished to present. As the program developed we shared responsibilities in both the preparation and the presentation of the lessons.

As our program evolved several of the lesson we implemented utilized community resources: architectural structures in the neighborhood; sculptures
displayed in the community; and a classroom visit from the local artist who created them. These community based art lessons afforded students the opportunity to develop a more positive relationship with their community. London (1994) advocated, “Curriculums that acknowledge and make use of the association between the child and the community create a productive foundation for the cultivation of self-esteem” (p. 44). These community focused lessons became an important component of the curriculum.

Implications of the Study

The research findings of the study supported my original convictions supported by the literature presented in Chapters 1 and 2; that a collaborative program between an art education preservice student, a special education teacher in a community school, and a university researcher and teacher promotes interdisciplinary curriculum revisions, improves art teacher preparation for teaching students with disabilities in the art classroom, and provides an arena for collaborative experiences between universities and community schools.

Previous studies (Fedorenko, 1994; Krone, 1978; Ozimo & Ozimo, 1988) supported an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrated art in a special education curriculum. Through these experiences students with disabilities were provided alternate methods of learning that enhanced their understanding of their traditional curriculum content. This study illustrated these previous contentions; students improved their verbal language skills when discussing art works, and they developed self confidence through talking about their personal art work. They were
proud of their accomplishments. They successfully applied math related concepts to artwork and their confidence when working with monetary figures increased.

The health unit addressed in this classroom focused on student self esteem and encouraged students to develop a sense of personal pride towards their community. This integrative art program often focused on community-based art education and promoted positive attitudes for the students concerning their community. They were excited to learn that art existed in their personal world and they eagerly shared this newly found information with their fellow students.

Literature previously reviewed (Blandy, 1994; Pfeuffer-Guay, 1993, 1994) contended that art teacher preparation programs have not adequately prepared teachers to teach students with disabilities they find mainstreamed or included in the art classroom. This study provided a preservice art education teacher fieldwork experience in teaching students with disabilities. Results indicated that the preservice student increased her confidence when teaching students with disabilities, assisted in the removal of her frustrations and biases concerning the abilities of these students, and introduced her to methods of interdisciplinary planning through collaboration.

As inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom increases, studies support collaborative teaching. (Barry, 1994; CEC, 1994) They advised that development of partnerships between teachers encourages teachers to integrate curriculum methods that address the needs of students with disabilities. They suggested that providing teachers with experiences in collaborative programs they may develop confidence and be willing to undertake such an endeavor again.
In this study, all of the primary participants were introduced to collaborative teaching. Results indicated that at the onset of the program the teachers involved in this study often experienced problems related to unfamiliarity with collaboration, territorial domain issues, and the flexibility necessary in exchanging teachers’ roles and responsibilities. As the program progressed, the teachers became more willing to share responsibilities, to cross previous territorial boundaries, and to participate as team teachers. Through this collaborative experience teachers developed flexibility and were more comfortable in collaborating together.

Suggestions for Further Research

Implications for the fields of art education, special education, and teacher preparation and suggestions for further research will be presented in the following section. Teacher preparation, teacher collaboration, university and community school collaboration, and curriculum revision will be addressed.

This study examined art teacher preparation with regard to teaching students with disabilities and supports previous studies that suggest preservice programs should provide students with fieldwork experiences in teaching special populations. (Blandy, 1993; 1994; Pffueffer-Guay, 1993) As inclusion of special needs students in the art classrooms increases, art teachers need to develop confidence when working with these students. In this study, the preservice art education student believed she was ill prepared to deal with special populations. She felt additional fieldwork experience provided in this collaborative program increased her confidence and removed her prior fears towards teaching these students. This study supports the belief that universities need examine their present regular
education and art education programs and should investigate program models that promote teacher preparation in the area of special education.

My study relied on the collaboration of a special education teacher, an art education preservice student, and myself, an art educator and university researcher. Previous studies (Fedorenko, 1994; Gobel and Gowland, 1992; Wiedmeyer and Lehman, 1991) indicated that the incorporation of art programs into special education settings are successful when there is strong collaboration among the teachers of the two specialties. My study contended that the effectiveness of collaborations may be reliant on several key issues; mutual initiation of the program, a sharing of leadership, and a strong commitment to the endeavor. In the investigation of the collaborative process, this study implied that teachers need to learn the process of collaboration. Further studies that promote opportunities for collaboration between teachers might assist in developing teacher flexibility and confidence in such endeavors and encourage them to support future collaborative teaching methods.

This study also advocated that teachers, preservice students, and educational researchers can benefit from collaboration between community schools and local universities. From my previous research (1994) I know that local university contact provides opportunities for collaborative teaching and researching. This program illustrated that university personnel can and should conduct research that promotes a sharing of knowledge with public school teachers. Additional studies may included the investigation of collaborative endeavors between university researchers and community schools.
In this study, the special education teacher gained more confidence in working with art materials and began to redefine her previous conceptions about art. She learned how the concepts of art criticism, aesthetics, and historical content might initiate active student discussion and stimulate alternate methods of learning for students with disabilities. The art education preservice student learned to revise the art curriculum to relate to the special education curriculum. Both teachers revised their traditional curricular practices through collaborative planning. Future studies might investigate the possibilities of incorporating art in a curriculum for students with disabilities through collaboration.

Although not a initial aspect of the research, much of the interdisciplinary program we introduced focused on art within the local community. This community based art education component of the curriculum encouraged students to become active members of the physical community in which they lived. This evolutionary emergence illustrated the positive effects of community based curriculum. Future curriculum studies might include investigation of community art resources and their inclusion in interdisciplinary programs for students.

In my collaborative study, I, as a university researcher supervised a program that linked the university with community schools. I was able to observe educational theories that support collaboration being applied to teaching practices. My study afforded the special education teacher in a community school an opportunity to learn art methods applicable to interdisciplinary teaching through curriculum planning with the preservice art education student and myself. In turn, the special education teacher became an invaluable resource for the preservice
student by providing insight as to the abilities of the special needs students. This study suggests many avenues for further research in the areas of teacher preparation, collaboration, and curriculum revision.
Dear,

I thought it might be helpful to you to explain the program Jancy and I are involved in so that you can decide whether you want to participate in our exciting venture. As a previous art teacher in the school system in Chicago for fourteen years, I had many opportunities to work with special needs students who were frequently mainstreamed in my class, however the preparation I received to do so was through independent research and on hands experience. Being aware that as art teachers we will be involved with the education process of special needs students, we are concerned about the preparation of teachers to work with these exceptional students. My recent research projects included working collaboratively with a learning disabilities teacher, instituting art into her program. The benefits for both of us, as well as the students, were tremendous. Jancy, in turn is concerned with her preparation for teaching exceptional students and is interested in working with both the students and the special education teacher.

In order to plan and prepare for the venture of teaching art to exceptional students, Jancy and I felt that it was necessary to observe classroom situations and to spent time talking to the special education teacher and myself in group collaboration in order to effectively implement art into the classroom. It is our desire that the art program we introduce is well planned, is integrative and is of benefit to all of those involved; the art education preservice teacher, (Jancy), the special education teacher, and myself(a Ph.D. student and teacher of art education for special needs students at
Ohio State). We hope that through this venture we will all grow and learn from each other. Jancy's responsibilities are to observe and develop lessons that will be of benefit to the specific student population she will be teaching and I will also play an active part in the planning and implementation of the program. Our hope is to begin the actual implementation of the art program in early April, working closely with the special education teacher to select the length of time and start of the actual program. Our schedules during that time are open and can be created around the convenience of the special education teacher. Before that time, meetings to plan and arrange the program would be done around the schedule most convenient to the special education teacher as not to burden them with extra meetings and time commitments.

Beth Gainer was instrumental in connecting us with you, although I was not sure how much information she was able to give you about our program design. Because both Jancy and I both felt it was invaluable for her and I to gain an understanding of the capabilities of the special population she and I would be creating and implementing lessons for, we have the desire to create strong communication between all those involved. We thought that through initial observation we would gain a clearer understanding about the specific students and the program you are using. These observations would provide insight into how to prepare, what to prepare and insure that the program would be beneficial for all. We truly hope that such a program would be of interest to you and would love to find some time to discuss it with you further.

Jancy was selected to be a part of this innovative program on the merit of her scholarship, her dedication to teaching, and her desire to work with the special needs population. Having supervised her in her recent student teaching assignments I find her to be an exceptional student. She is innovative, knowledgeable and dedicated to
educational growth. The program conception was designed by myself and I will be an active player in all aspects of its development.

I truly thank you for the opportunity to observe in your class and the time you have given to share expertise with her. I look forward to meeting you and discussing the program ideas further, and hope that we can all work together in planning and implementing a program that would meet the desires and needs of all of us. I will contact you and address questions you might have and see if you are interested in further involvement in the program. Feel free to call me at any time if you have questions concerning our plans, or if you feel you would not be interested in making a commitment at this time. It is hoped that we can all work together but I understand time constraints that may of be concern to you.

Thanks again,

Jan S. Fedorenko

(h) 890-7855
(w) 292-7183
May 1, 1995

Dear

First of all I would like to thank you for participating in our exciting venture, integrating art into the special education curriculum, participating in a collaboration teaching experience, and learning together how to design an integrated art program. During this process I am reviewing the methods of collaboration, how it develops, and what each participating party gains from the experience. In order to fully understand the process of collaboration that we are engaged in I have asked each of you to keep a personal journal as well as the journal I have been keeping myself. Through this process I hope to gain insight as to your personal beliefs and experiences that I cannot observe. Previously I had not guided you as to specifics I would like you to include in the journal, and at this time I would like to suggest some guidelines for journal entries that would help in developing a better understanding of the collaborative process, the integrative art program we are initiating and the reflections or concerns you have as the program develops. I have listed below areas that I would like you to write about in your journals so that the information that is collected can be reviewed reflecting our different voices in the same process.

1. The program- In your journals discuss the effectiveness of the program from your own personal beliefs. What do you see as the strengths and the weaknesses of the program for yourself and the students? Discuss the benefits, or what you have gained from the experience in your own professional growth? What did you learn from each other and from the experience itself? This would be helpful if it was done at the end of each teaching session, so that the reflections are fresh in your mind. Talk candidly about the process as you see it, and how you feel about it.

2. Collaboration- While you are reflecting on the program and the process in which it was designed, talk about your role in the collaborative experience. How do you see yourself contributing to the process, how you feel about your role in the process, and changes you see in the collaborative experience. What do you see as your role and how do you think it changes?

These personal reflections will help in the evaluation of the program and allow me to gain insight as to changes that would be made in future programs. I would greatly appreciate your time and consideration in making frequent journal reflections, as the insight that I will gain from them will help in developing an understanding of the program we are all participating in.

I would also like to formally interview within the next few weeks to discuss the program further. I would appreciate the time to discuss with you how you feel about the program. I will talk to you about setting up this interview at your convenience.

Thanks for you time and dedication
June 5, 1995

Dear Participant,

First of all I'd like to thank you for your participation in the collaborative teaching experience we have all been involved in. In order for me to fully evaluate the success of the program, describe the program for further research possibilities, I would like you to take a few moments to answer the following questionnaire regarding your individual experiences during the program. Please feel free to add additional information or concerns you might have about the new teaching process we have been investigating.

1. How long have you been teaching? How long have you been teaching in this school. What is your teaching assignment?

2. In this experience the teachers worked together collaboratively. What do you feel was your role in this collaboration? Identify problems and concerns you have about the collaborative teaching in this program. What could have been done differently?

3. What do you feel were the strengths of the program?

4. What changes would you make if you were to participate in a similar program in the future?
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5. With regards to the students, what do you feel they may have gained from this experience?

6. What have you personally gained from the participation in this program?

7. Please add any additional comments you may have concerning the program.
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PROGRAM OUTLINES
Independent Study
Special Education and Art Education

Student
Contact number

Responsibilities:

1. Review literature which provides an introduction to special needs students. Keep a record of personal reflections relative to the readings.

2. Keep a personal journal that will record your own ideas about expanding your knowledge about special needs students. It should be in a diary style, reflecting ideas that you have about how you would like to expand your knowledge base.

3. Observe in a special education classroom once a week. These experiences should provide a variety of learning situations. A classroom that utilizes full inclusion should be included in these observations. Refer to the list of possible teacher contacts I have provided for you. Inform me of your observation sites before the observations are made. I would like to be included in some of the sites whenever possible. Contact the teachers involved to arrange the site observations. I have been in contact with them and they are expecting to hear from you. During these observations keep a detailed account of the teaching strategies used, the disabilities the students experience, specifics about the school and classroom that you are observing. Allow time for teacher contact to discuss the students and the classroom. Discuss the methods the teacher might use art with his/her students or their interest in doing so.

4. Meet with me once a week for a brief period of time to discuss the focus of your study. Together we will collaborate to set up observations that will meet your needs, provide opportunities for group collaboration and begin to set up future programs that will provide field experiences that will allow you to collaborate with a teacher to introduce art into their classroom.

5. By the 8th week of the quarter begin planning curriculum decisions for the site that is chosen for spring quarter research and experience.

6. Keep me abreast as to what you are planning and when you are planning your visits.
THE INTEGRATION OF ART IN THE SPECIAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM THROUGH UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL COLLABORATION

Explanation of the program: This program will be designed as a collaborative effort between a special education teacher, a preservice art education student, and an art education graduate student. Through a series of meetings the participants will together design and implement a program that utilizes art as a vehicle for learning in the special education resource room.

The goals of the program are:

1. To provide the art education student the opportunity to work with students with developmental handicaps in effort to improve her preparation when dealing with mainstreamed students in the art classroom.

2. To promote a collaboration between all teachers involved in which they learn from each other sharing their expertise.

3. To design an art program that is integrative in the curriculum in that it is relative to what the students are learning in other areas.

4. To increase the university involvement in the surrounding school community.

5. To examine the alternate ways in which art can be related to the existing curriculum.

6. To examine the methods that can be used to make curriculum relationships through art.

7. To develop a strong relationship between the school community and the university representative, in this case the graduate student.

Collaborative decisions to be discussed:

1. The role each will play in the collaboration.

2. Time elements involved, including meeting times, teaching times

3. Curriculum decisions in the design and implementation of the art integration

4. Decisions of outside community involvement in the program, i.e.: field trips, guest artists etc.

5. Participant concerns.

6. Awareness of the program for the school community, other teachers, principal and staff

7. Responsibilities of teachers involved, journals, materials, planning and presenting.
APPENDIX C

LESSONS AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
TOKEN RESPONSE GAME

The Token Response Game introduces students to dialogue in art through exercises in art criticism and aesthetic questions. This game allows students to express their personal judgments about artwork. Students use the following 8 tokens to represent their decisions about artworks:

The HEART token represents the work they like the most.

The BLUE RIBBON token indicates the work they feel is the best.

The HAND represents the work they feel displays the best craftsmanship.

The HOUSE indicates the work they think would look best in their house.

The DOLLAR symbol indicates the work they think is worth the most money.

The CLOCK symbolizes the work they think took the most time to create.

The LIGHT BULB represents the work they think displays the best idea.

The YUK token indicates the work they like the least.

Students are directed to defend their personal decisions based on prior discussions related to the artworks. They may be asked questions such as: If it is worth the most money is it a good work of art? Just because you like the art work is it worth the most? Is it possible to display the best craftsmanship and not like it?

Reference

Printing Checklist

In your work you must:

1. Overlap ✧
2. Texture ***
3. Pattern
4. At least one \( R+G=\textcolor{green}{V} \)
   mixed color \( R+Y=\textcolor{cyan}{O} \)
   \( B+Y=\textcolor{magenta}{G} \)

Check your work.
When you find all of these in your art you are finished.

1. Think about your art!
   Plan it!
2. Print it!
HandOut

Architectural Detail Hunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sash windows</th>
<th>Palladian window</th>
<th>Casement window</th>
<th>Dormer window</th>
<th>French doors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="sash-windows.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="palladian-window.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="casement-window.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="dormer-window.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="french-doors.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doric column</th>
<th>Ionic column</th>
<th>Corinthian column</th>
<th>Gabled roof</th>
<th>Mansard roof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="doric-column.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="ionic-column.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="corinthian-column.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="gabled-roof.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="mansard-roof.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gambrel roof</th>
<th>Brick</th>
<th>Fieldstone</th>
<th>Clapboard</th>
<th>Stucco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="gambrel-roof.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="brick.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="fieldstone.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="clapboard.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="stucco.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cupola</th>
<th>Finial</th>
<th>Steeple</th>
<th>Turret</th>
<th>Quoins (decorated corners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="cupola.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="finial.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="steeple.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="turret.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="quoins.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lintels</th>
<th>Wrought iron</th>
<th>Carved wood</th>
<th>Gargoyle</th>
<th>Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="lintels.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="wrought-iron.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="carved-wood.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="gargoyle.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="door.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take this sheet on a walking tour of a neighborhood. An in-town neighborhood is a good choice. Check the boxes as you find the architectural details listed below. The @ face indicates a detail that may be a challenge to find. The last two boxes are for you to fill in.
Do you have:

- more than one building
- magazine pictures
- different materials

8 Things from our Worksheet

- Texture
- Pattern
- Overlap
- Thin lines
- Thick lines
- Small Shapes
- Large Shapes
APPENDIX D

STUDENT YEARBOOK
Our class learned all about art. We looked at art, we talked about the time involved in making art, how much art is worth based on the ideas artists use, the craftsmanship involved and why we liked certain artwork.

We compared different artwork. We learned about symbols and what they mean.
We learned about texture, pattern, and overlapping in our prints. We also mixed colors in our found object printing.
We practiced different printing methods.

Ms. M. gave us a checklist for our projects.
On our architectural detail hunt we looked for details on buildings. We saw the only gargoyle in Columbus!
On some buildings we saw things that weren't even on our list!

We learned about lintels, turrets, dormer windows, spindles, and much more. We also learned about the different ways buildings are made!
We talked about art and collage. We learned about the artist Romare Bearden.

We worked on creating our building collages using a checklist to be sure we followed the directions.
We used many different types of materials like fabric, wood, paper, beads, wallpaper, and many more in our mixed media collages.

It was fun looking for different materials.
When we were finished we had wonderful works of art!

We measured our buildings and proudly displayed our work.
We looked at art in our community. These sculptures are made by Chris Moehler and are on High Street.

We identified shapes in the artwork.
Page 174 does not exist
A Visit from a Local Community Artist

Mr. Moehler visited our class! He talked about how he made his sculptures from recycled steel.

We asked him questions from a list we had made.
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