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INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

Genealogy

Roots

I wanted to be an artist. My parents saw things differently and my desire to devote my life to minutely detailed pencil drawings was not as strong as my desire for them to finance my education. So I did the respectable thing and became an art teacher upon graduation from college. It was the early seventies, budget woes were pervasive, and art jobs were the first to go. Only two of us from that graduating class got art teaching jobs that year.

Armed with a B.F.A., a minor in education, and the knowledge that, by family standards, I had made the right decision, I set off to teach eager school children the mysteries of pencil and paint.

Although I was assigned to teach art to grades one through twelve, my primary assignment was middle school. It was at the middle school that I met my first class of students experiencing disabilities. This special education class was a catch-all consisting of students who didn’t
quite make it in regular education. The special education
teacher was responsible for all of their instruction,
including art, music, and physical education, as well as
their supervision during lunch and recess.

I was a convert to teaching and filled with zeal and
Lowenfeldian ideals (1957); I offered to teach art to the
special education students. Their teacher was thrilled and
the principal was willing. I cut my teeth on that
experience.

My offer to take on the special education group did not
win many popularity votes for me in the teachers' lounge.
The music and physical education teachers felt pressured to
follow suit; they were not pleased. Many of the regular
education teachers already thought the special education
teacher had an inequitably light load, with only ten
students. But worst of all, rather than working within the
existing system, I had created my own rules. I did not
understand, nor had I considered, the ripple effect my offer
would have.

My "colleagues" soon became the least of my problems.
I quickly discovered that good intentions and zeal were not
adequate preparation for teaching this diverse group of
students. The group consisted of a mixture of children who
would now be identified by law as developmentally
handicapped (DH), children with an I.Q. of 80 or below and
concomitant deficits in adaptive behavior; orthopedically
handicapped (OH), children with physical disabilities;
severe behaviorally handicapped (SBH), children with serious
and extended emotional and behavioral problems; and specific
learning disabled (SLD), children with disorders in one or
more of the basic psychological processes involved in
understanding or using written or spoken language or doing
mathematical calculations. The class took an incredible
amount of energy and a disproportionate amount of planning
time. In spite of my hard work and determination, the class
would have been a disaster for both the students and me
without the continual consultation and support from their
teacher.

That experience had a maturing and lasting effect on
both my personal and educational philosophies. Although
I've taken the scenic route, I've been on the crusade for
equal access to quality education for all children ever
since.

Other crusaders have taken a more direct route. In
1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-
142) which assured children experiencing disabilities a free
public education, was passed and signed into law.
The sky is falling, the sky is falling!

The tale of the fabled fowl, whose narrow and short-sighted interpretation of an event was accepted and acted upon, has served as a symbol of both myopia and mass hysteria for generations. However, many of us in "regular" education responded the same way when Public Law 94-142 was enacted in 1975. This equal educational opportunity law and its least restrictive environment clause resulted in an influx of children experiencing disabilities into regular schools and classrooms. Some of us hid our heads, some cried doom and gloom, and others responded with prescriptions and panaceas. And, although the initial panic and flurry of activity have somewhat subsided, fifteen years later we are still concerned with and responding to issues resulting from the interpretation and application of this milestone legislation.

The Acorn

In 1975, PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was passed by federal legislators. This law required that each state establish procedures to assure all children experiencing disabilities a free public education in the least restrictive environment appropriate to each child's unique needs. According to the law, least restrictive environment (LRE) means that to the maximum
extent appropriate, children experiencing disabilities are to be educated with children who are not experiencing disabilities. Also, separate classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children experiencing disabilities from regular education should occur only when the nature and severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aides and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (PL 94-142, 1975). In compliance with the public law, Ohio's 111th General Assembly enacted Amended Substitute House Bill 455 in 1976 to assure that all school-age children experiencing disabilities in Ohio would be provided with an appropriate public education. The Ohio Department of Education developed procedures for the identification, placement, and instruction of children experiencing disabilities in order to implement the law. *Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children* (1989) require that all programs and services offered to children without disabilities be made available to children experiencing disabilities including art, music, and physical education. Ohio Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Education require art instruction in grades kindergarten through six and in grades seven and/or eight (1983). As a result of the federal and state legislation and the subsequent rules and regulations, elementary and middle school/junior high school art teachers
no longer teach children experiencing disabilities by choice but by mandate.

So from which sky did PL 94-142 fall?

Neither laws nor educational movements develop in a vacuum and therefore must be examined within the context from which they come in order to develop substantive understandings and thoughtful responses. In the case of PL 94-142 that context is the principle of normalization.

In western-European cultures throughout the ages, individuals with disabilities have, for the most part, been classified as deviant, possessing qualities that are viewed as being negatively value charged, and have been assigned social roles consistent with this view. "When a person is perceived as deviant, he is cast into a role that carries with it powerful expectancies. Strangely these expectancies, not only take hold of the mind of the perceiver, but of the perceived person as well" (Wolfensberger, 1972, pp. 15-16). Among the more commonly accepted deviant roles have been the person experiencing disabilities as a subhuman organism, a menace to society, an object of dread, an object of pity, a holy innocent, a diseased organism, an object of ridicule, and an eternal child (Wolfensberger, 1972, pp. 16-24). This perceived lack of human attributes permitted society and caretakers to
ostracize, abuse, or segregate those experiencing disabilities without suffering moral conflict or outrage. The most seemingly benign of these treatments was the institution.

Following centuries of fear, mistreatment, and aversion, institutions were viewed as safe environments in which "deviants" could be protected from themselves and society. Locking people away, however, did little to change public perceptions and often reinforced these beliefs. Residents of institutions were frequently thought of and treated as insensate and were denied basic physical comforts and intellectual stimulation. Aversives, rather than rewards were used for behavior modification. Placement in an institution was most frequently not an intervention, but a life sentence. It was out of these practices for the mentally retarded that the philosophy of normalization grew.

Bank-Mikkelsen, a former head of the Danish Mental Retardation Service, took a different view and challenged his Scandinavian colleagues, in 1959, to accept the humanity of mentally retarded individuals and permit them an existence as close to normal as possible. His influence was felt in Sweden where, in 1967, major provisions and services for the mentally retarded were developed. However it was not Bank-Mikkelsen, but Nirje, the executive director of the Swedish Association for Retarded Children, who
systematically stated and elaborated the principle of normalization in Scandinavian literature. In 1969 he described this principle as: "making available to the mentally retarded patterns and conditions of everyday life which are as close as possible to the norms and patterns of the mainstream of society" (cited in Wolfensberger, 1972, p. 27). Nirje's writings had a major impact on a wide-range of human management systems, however he was primarily concerned with the implications of the normalization principle for residences for the retarded (Wolfensberger, 1972).

Wolf Wolfensberger, a respected research scientist in the field of mental retardation, became intrigued with the research, writing, and program changes occurring in Scandinavia and went there to investigate. He became an advocate for normalization and it is to Wolfensberger that the normalization movement in the United States is attributed. Wolfensberger refined the normalization principle to state: "utilization of means which are as culturally normative as possible, in order to establish and/or maintain personal behaviors and characteristics which are as culturally normative as possible" (1972, p. 28). He cautioned against normalization as a process only, a shortcoming he found in Nirje's application. He firmly believed that systems evaluated in terms of the degree they embody a process, may or may not be effective, and that
evaluation must be based on outcomes, evidence of achievement of goals. He wrote, "It is for this reason that the proposed reformulation [of Nirje's principle of normalization] implies both a process and a goal, although it does not necessarily imply a promise that a person who is being subjected to normalizing measures and processes will remain or become normal" (1972, p. 28). He stressed that his use of the term "normative" was intended to have statistical, rather than moral connotations and that normative behavior was typical or conventional behavior for a specific culture. Cultures vary in their norms, therefore according to Wolfensberger, the normalization principle, must be culture specific and to be effective, it must be applied throughout the culture. He explained this application of the principle by constructing a schema suggesting action in two dimensions (interaction, interpretation), on three levels, (personal, social service systems, societal systems).

Normalization, a 2 (dimensions) x 3 (levels) mixed design?

Normalization, as defined by Wolfensberger's adopted and adapted philosophy and subsequent model, was not something achieved through simple application of a formula or research design. He believed that individuals are not deviant, but that deviancy is culture specific and in the
eyes of the beholder; therefore, human management personnel must attend to limitations in a person's repertoire of potential behavior, as well as those characteristics and behaviors that mark a person as deviant in the sight of others. He also believed citizens need to broaden their range of what is considered to be normative and that teaching, preaching, modeling, or whatever necessary must be done to convince the public that deviancy is of their own making and often harmless. To achieve these goals, Wolfensberger pushed for integration on all levels. He believed that neither normalizing residential programs and facilities nor physically placing persons with disabilities in community settings was enough. Persons considered deviant should be served by generic agencies, rather than special services. Work and social activities should be highly integrated to encourage modeling of "valued" behavior; and, as much as possible, children with disabilities should be educated with children without disabilities. Wolfensberger wrote, "If we are serious about working for the goal of preparing a person toward independence and normative functioning, then we must prepare him to function in the context of the ordinary social contacts which he is expected to have and to handle adaptively in the future" (1972, p. 45). Basic to his premise of normalization is the belief that behavioral
deviance can be reduced by minimizing the degree to which a person is treated differently from "normal" persons. Efforts and achievements toward physical and social integration for and by individuals, social service agencies, and society are not the milestones by which the success of normalization can be judged. Wolfensberger believed that neither the humaness nor normalization of persons experiencing disabilities, devalued persons, will be acknowledged or achieved until significant numbers of valued members of society are willing to share their lives with them (1972).

Wolfensberger did not rest on his words. He helped Nebraska develop community service systems, behavior shaping programs, and community residencies which were consistent with the principle of normalization. As a result of the commitment of Wolfensberger, Nirje, Bank-Mikkelsen and others, the normalization principle became a pebble dropped into the pool of social consciousness.

The Ripple Effect

Wolfensberger, Nirje, Bank-Mikkelsen and others brought the normalization principle to public notice in the late sixties with the publication of their theories (Wolfensberger, 1972). The climate was right. The Kennedy administration had laid the groundwork by bringing the
discussion of disabilities out of the closet. The Vietnam War and the civil rights movement brought social issues to the forefront and normalization struck a chord. Nirje’s definition and Wolfensberger’s reformulation were frequently referred to and accepted definitions in the special education literature of the early 1970’s. In 1971 President Nixon proclaimed that the return of retarded individuals to useful lives in the community as one of the nation’s primary goals (cited in Pomery, 1974). Deinstitutionalization soon became associated with normalization.

Although theoretically there was acceptance of normalization, resistance came when the principle was interpreted to encompass life outside institutional walls. This thrust toward deinstitutionalization was met with caution and concern (Budde, 1972; Kokaska, 1974; Mesibov, 1976; Payne, 1976; Roos, 1970; Smith, 1970; Vitello, 1974). However, landmark court cases in 1971 and 1972 in which people experiencing disabilities were given the right to an individually appropriate education (Forsythe & Jellison, 1977), as well as the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Funk, 1986), subdued the detractors. The discussion soon focused on how to make deinstitutionalization work (Arkell, Thomason, & Haring, 1980; Barton, Brulle, & Repp, 1982; Bellamy, Sheehan, Horner, & Boles, 1980; Bock & Joiner, 1982; Coffman & Harris, 1980; de Silva & Faflak, 1976; Kraus
In 1975 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142 was enacted and signed into law by President Ford. Ford signed reluctantly; he cautioned that the law promised more than the government could deliver. In one sense he was wrong. He questioned the ability of the government to legislate social reform. One of the major successes of the legislation was the assurance of a free public education to children previously denied access. By the early 1980’s procedural safeguards were in place throughout the nation and the educational rights of children experiencing disabilities were guaranteed and accepted (Singer & Butler, 1987).

In another sense he was very right. Proponents of normalization pinned their hopes on the least restrictive environment provision that children experiencing disabilities must be educated with their non-disabled peers to the fullest extent possible. Social integration was the expected outcome. Legislating integration as a condition of everyday life proved to be much more difficult than removing architectural barriers and mandating programmatic change.
Although social integration was one of the intended outcomes of PL 94-142, supporters of the legislation have focused on civil rights concerns and have left social integration to chance. Little attention has been paid to this objective, to quality of life issues, to quality of the least restrictive environment or to the evaluation of intended outcomes. There is little evidence that PL 94-142 has done anything to change the social climate for persons with disabilities.

**Bees fly because they believe they can.**

Formerly institutionalized individuals are now living in the community, have voting rights, and many hold jobs. Today children experiencing disabilities are provided a "free public education" (PL 94-142). Even though negatively charged labels have been dropped or changed, attitudes have not. Mainstreamed children are not easily accepted into the social environment of the classroom and school; adults experiencing disabilities participate in segregated social and leisure activities, if at all (Katz & Yekutiel, 1974; McDevitt, Smith, Schmidt, & Rosen, 1978; Hendrix, 1982; Gresham, 1982; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984; Nietupski, Hamre-Nietupski, & Ayres, 1984; Gresham and Reschly, 1986; Funk, 1986; Lignugaris/Kraft, Salzberg, Rule, & Stowitschek, 1988; Walker, 1988). The newspapers and television report
regularly on the inhumaneness of many group homes. For example, people experiencing disabilities can get an education and job training, but not transportation to work (Stephens, 1991). A student reports that since he began using a wheelchair people don't touch him anymore and on the rare occasions in which they direct comments to him, speak in a loud, slow voice (S. Bee, personal communication, May 1987). Newscasters laughingly report that the campus slang for "dumb people" is "mouth breathers" (WCMH, 1991).

Wolfensberger wrote that the success of normalization must be evaluated on its outcomes, not the extent to which its process is employed. The very legislation that was hoped to foster normalization at times undermines it. The required labels schools bestow on children are far from badges of distinction (Neufield, 1982). In Ohio, students who are exempt from mandated testing because of their label do not always appreciate the "special treatment" and report it reaffirms their "devalued" status (personal communication, SLD class, April 1990).

In terms of intended outcomes, normalization has not fully succeeded. People experiencing disabilities now have access to culturally valued means such as functional curriculae, community education, integrated public education, community living, job training, and even plastic surgery (May, 1988) to achieve normalized lives. Ramps have
gone up, doorways are being widened, and affirmative action is being taken (Barrier Awareness Project, undated). In 1990, the United States congress approved anti-discrimination legislation protecting people experiencing disabilities. Dollars and manpower are pumped into maintaining these opportunities, and once again the public feels its moral and social obligations have been met. However, there is general agreement that acceptance and "culturally valued lives" have not been achieved; negative attitudes, the invisible barriers to normalization, still exist (Barrier Awareness Project, undated). Ken Chep, a community college counselor, writes in response to these barriers: "It is disheartening to think that we cannot get past looking only at the missing limb, the guide dog or cane, the student accompanied by an interpreter, crutches, wheelchairs, or the inability to process information quickly and accurately the first time before we pass judgment and limit an individual's potential to succeed. It is not the designation that hinders a student's development—it is what we do with it that binds the wings of the bumble-bee" (1989).

The Acorn Grows into an Oak

Normalization established roots in the educational system with the passage of PL 94-142 (Cassidy, 1988).
Advocates for the law not only believed that all children have a right to an education, but also that providing that education in a "normal" school environment would promote integration. They thought if children experiencing disabilities attended regular schools and were given opportunities to be educated and to socialize with "normal" peers, academic improvement and social integration would occur. While the law refers to education in the "least restrictive environment" and does not use the term "mainstreaming," mainstreaming has become synonymous with the integration of children experiencing disabilities into regular education classes. Although there seem to be as many definitions of mainstreaming as there are school districts, educators believe it is here to stay.

"Least restrictive environment" is often taken as a physical location, rather than as a set of conditions that promote normal social interactions and academic growth among students of different abilities, and that location, in many settings, is taken to be art, music, and physical education class (Atterbury, 1990; Hock, Hasazi, & Patten, 1990). Physical proximity to peers as a primary criteria for placement does not always result in a good educational fit. Unfortunately the very goals proponents hoped to achieve through the law have often been undermined by such impoverished interpretations (Chandler, 1986; Gottlieb,
PL 94-142 has had direct implications for teachers of the arts as a result of mainstreaming and placement practices. An investigation of least restrictive environment in art education would be incomplete without examining how PL 94-142 has affected all of the arts.

Veneer

Drama/theatre organizations and troupes have made concerted efforts to make performance accessible to people experiencing disabilities through structural modifications of facilities, audio description, and signed performances. In addition, performance/production opportunities are gradually increasing for adults experiencing disabilities (S. Anderson, personal communication, March 1988; Shaw, 1981). However, there are few children experiencing disabilities receiving drama education in the schools. Although drama education has a fairly secure niche in secondary schools, research shows that less than 10% of children experiencing disabilities participate in elective arts courses (Gavin, 1983) as compared to 27% of the general school population (OAAE, 1989). At the elementary level drama education primarily occurs in the language arts classrooms. For these reasons, mainstreaming has not been a
major issue in the literature and the concerns of children experiencing disabilities are primarily addressed in descriptions of "special" programs, as seen in the writings of Blumberg (1976), Goodwin (1985), Jeffreys (1986), McCaslin (1984), and Wagner (1976). Crain's resource listing (1989), the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's curriculum guide for students with exceptional educational needs (1990), and the Texas Education Agency's guide to accessible programs (1984) represent the few sources addressing issues of integration in the educational milieu.

Dance education is just emerging in the schools and Ohio is one of the few states where dance educators have gained a toehold through certification. In the handful of districts, in Ohio and across the nation employing dance educators, children experiencing disabilities are mainstreamed for dance; however, the literature is only beginning to reflect these changes. Nancy BrooksSchmitz (1989) from Columbia University has led the charge. Writers, such as Crain (1980), Hottendorf (1989), and Samuelson (1981), primarily focus on the benefits of integrated programs and most other writers describe therapeutic and instructional techniques for "special" learners (Crain, 1982; Duehl, 1979; Lloyd, 1978; Riordan, 1981). Until dance education becomes integrated into school
curricula, mainstreaming issues will not be of prime concern.

Even the National Committee Arts with the Handicapped (NCAH), which initially addressed educational concerns and the topic of integration (Model sites, 1983; Thompson, NCAH, 1981; Harvey, Kaplan, & Lehr, 1980; NCAH, no date; Smith & Perks, 1978), evolved into Very Special Arts (VSA) and has offered little to address mainstreaming concerns. The VSA publication, *The Role of the Arts in the Education of Individuals with Special Needs* (1988), is an annotated bibliography of related literature, however the programs VSA promotes are primarily "special" activities for "special" people (VSA Hawaii, 1987). Regionally efforts have been made to focus attention on the arts and children experiencing disabilities. The Art Educators of New Jersey (1976), Kingsley and Michaels (1980), the Miami Valley Regional Center for Handicapped Children (1981), the Pennsylvania Arts in Special Education Project (Kearns, 1985), Pfeuffer and Kingsley (1982), and the Ohio Department of Education (undated, a and b), all published documents related to "special needs" children and the arts. Several offer information on disabling conditions and needed adaptations, some describe adapted activities and programs, most all promote the value of the arts. But with the exception of Bailey’s article (1980) few discuss the
ramifications of normalization and mainstreaming on instruction.

for children experiencing disabilities, offers information on disabilities and suggestions for adaptations but reinforces stereotypes through activities specified to types of disabilities. The issue of appropriate placement and instruction within integrated settings is not addressed.

Music for Every Child, Every Child for Music

The literature in music education initially reflected this same pattern. "Music for every child, every child for music" has been music educators' hue and cry since it was coined by Karl Gehrkins in 1922 (Taylor, 1982). The benefits of music for all children and methods of teaching vocal and instrumental music to children experiencing disabilities have been consistently expressed in the music education and therapy literature (Thompson, 1990). When White surveyed music teachers in 1979 most were enthused by the new opportunities brought by mainstreaming. However in a five year follow-up study of the same group of teachers, White found that there were three times as many attitude changes to the negative as to the positive (1984). The realities of mainstreaming were beginning to sink in.

Most issues in education either disappear in a few years or are integrated into school programs where they become little discussed facts of life. Neither seems to be the case with mainstreaming (Thompson, 1990, p. 31).
Mainstreaming continues to be an important issue for many educators, including arts educators, because children experiencing disabilities have not consistently been successfully integrated into regular education classes. Music teachers have served children experiencing disabilities in programs for years, however, such experience with disabilities does not always translate into successful mainstreamed classrooms (Damer, 1979). The wide variance that often occurs in such classrooms presents new and different challenges to teachers.

In spite of the continual challenges of mainstreaming, music education has made significant progress over the past fifteen years (Thompson, 1990, p. 32). Music teachers are more aware of unique needs and better able to provide experiences; children with a wide range of abilities attend general music classes and perform in ensembles. Many states now require training in special education for certification and the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) program description and standards contains statements specific to the instruction of children experiencing disabilities (George, Hoffer, Lehman, & Taylor, 1986). Since 1977 MENC has had a special learners committee or network, at both national and state levels, to promote a continual flow of information. Three separate issues of the Music Educators Journal have focused on students with special needs, a topic
which has been consistently presented in the journal and at conferences over the past fifteen years. Also the handbook *Tips: Teaching Music to Special Learners* (1988) has been compiled and distributed (Schaberg, 1988; Thompson, 1990).

Atterbury (1990), Thompson (1990), Lehr (1982) and others have continually risen to the challenge of mainstreaming and have worked over the past fifteen years to define the problems and to formulate solutions. They have no quarrel with the intent of the law (PL 94-142) only with the interpretations and applications of it that make mainstreaming a major issue for arts and physical education teachers.

Thompson, Harvey, Kaplan, and Lehr (1980) and Atterbury (1990) suggest that misguided mainstreaming practices have occurred because administrators do not understand music education programs. Music education has not established curricular credibility among administrators and other educators. "Music for every child" rings in the ears of administrators as they attempt to comply with the perceived least restrictive environment mandate to place children experiencing disabilities into regular classes. Frequently children who have difficulty learning in regular classrooms and who receive additional daily academic instruction are placed in music classes as though they are able to learn similarly to their peers (Atterbury, 1990, p. 55). In Tune
with P.L. 94-142 was one response to these concerns (Thompson, Harvey, Kaplan, & Lehr, 1980). This Music Educators National Conference (MENC) publication identified issues in the education of children experiencing disabilities and presented model syllabi for preservice and inservice courses to address them. The authors argued that it is the responsibility of the music professional to determine appropriate music-learning experiences for students experiencing disabilities and to identify the means through which those experiences can best be acquired in the least restrictive environment. They wrote, "Until music educators are trained to accept these responsibilities, the wholesale 'dumping' of handicapped students in music classes in the name of mainstreaming is very likely to continue (p. 6, 1980)." Atterbury's recent book, Mainstreaming Exceptional Learners in Music (1990), supplements the work of Thompson, Harvey, Kaplan, Lehr, and addresses Rasor's concerns by providing music educators a comprehensive text, which provides an historic perspective of the problem, as well as contemporary solutions, to use in preservice and inservice courses.

Attention Deficit Disorder

Music educators and researchers and physical education teachers and researchers (Jansma & Decker, 1990; Lavay &
DePaepe, 1987; Loovis, 1986; Loovis & Melograno, 1988;
Melograno & Loovis, 1991; Rasor, 1988) have addressed issues of least restrictive environment, mainstreaming, and the physical education and the music education teachers' roles in placement and instruction in numerous articles and studies. Rasor discovered in her 1988 comparison of MENC standards with current practice in general music that "dumping" is still prevalent in Ohio. Seventy-eight percent of the music teachers are left out of placement decisions, that music achievement as a primary criteria for placement occurred only in 7% of the cases, that 64% of the teachers had no training in special education, and that placement patterns increased class size 29% of the time. Melograno and Loovis found in their study of Ohio physical education teachers that 29% had no coursework, only 14% had contributed to the IEP, and 49% received no administrative support (1991). Both studies came to similar conclusions; change must occur in the music and physical education instruction of children experiencing disabilities. Atterbury, Decker, Jansma, Lehr, Loovis, Melograno, and Thompson, among others, are trying to make that change happen.

Art educators have been less attentive to these issues. If change is needed, the issues must first be defined. An assessment of current practice and teacher preparedness in
the visual art instruction of children experiencing disabilities is long overdue.
CHAPTER II

Trouble in River City

Road Apples

The Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children (Ohio Department of Education, 1989) state: "each school district shall insure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of handicapped children for special education and related services" (p. 42). This continuum of services provides the least restrictive environment (LRE) options for children experiencing disabilities in a school district and may range from full time home instruction to full time regular education, depending upon which environment best promotes learning, achievement, and social normalization for the individual child. The term "mainstreaming" is commonly used to refer to the education of a handicapped child in the regular classroom and is one option in a continuum of LRE options. Unfortunately mainstreaming is often confused with the concept of LRE. Mainstreaming is neither the wholesale placement of handicapped children into regular classes, nor is it synonymous with least restrictive environment (Stephens, Blackhurst, & Magliocca, 1982). Over the past several years, however, many school officials have
misinterpreted LRE and have felt compelled to mainstream children experiencing disabilities, systematically placing them into art, music, and physical education classes primarily for socialization (Gresham, 1982; Salend, 1984; Stephens, et al, 1982). Art, music, and physical education were selected for mainstreaming since these subject areas were perceived to be less cognitively and behaviorally demanding than other subject areas (Atterbury, 1989). It has now become common practice for students experiencing disabilities to be mainstreamed into art classes as an initial foray into the world of regular education.

Consideration of class size, course content, child needs, or teacher preparedness is often not taken into account.

As a result of the misguided mainstreaming, art teachers became frustrated. Many were already teaching large numbers of children, often spread among several schools, without adequate instructional time or facilities. They questioned whether they would ever meet the needs of these students experiencing disabilities. They were not alone; music teachers were equally overwhelmed (Mercer, 1990). In 1980 a task force was convened by the Ohio Department of Education to investigate teachers' concerns. In response to the recommendations of the task force, the State Board of Education created an Arts for Handicapped consultant position, in 1981, to provide leadership and technical assistance to teachers and districts serving
handicapped students in arts education classes.

That position was created approximately nine years ago, and I served in that position from 1987 to 1990. I discovered that art teachers continue to be frustrated and no better prepared than in the early days of PL 94-142.

The arts for handicapped consultant position requires statewide travel. During these trips through major cities, small towns, and rural counties, I had many opportunities to speak with administrators, teachers, parents, and psychologists, among others involved in the education of children experiencing disabilities. The districts, their staffs, and the children they serve are quite diverse. However, there are also commonalities across districts. One such commonality is the frustration and bewilderment of the art teachers who are instructing children experiencing disabilities.

According to the Ohio Department of Education January 1990 child count there are 201,223 identified handicapped children, ages 0-21, in Ohio, an increase of 2184 over the past five years. Of these, 197,292 are school-aged children receiving full education services; 186,696 are served in public schools. In addition, the Regular Education Initiative, a movement which promotes the education of all children except those experiencing the most severe disabilities within the regular education program (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989), and Inclusion, a movement which promotes the
integration of all children regardless of disability in regular education (Biklen, Lehr, Searl & Taylor, 1987), have support and are influencing practice in Ohio. Data from the December 1989 child count show decreased enrollment of 949 children at county boards of mental retardation and an increased enrollment of 964 in public schools. There were 593 more multihandicapped, 321 more severely behavior handicapped, and 50 more orthopedically or other health handicapped children in Ohio's public schools in the 1989-1990 school year than the year before' (Ohio Department of Education, 1990). School year 1991-1992 will see the first stream of "crack babies" entering the system (J. Potter, personal communication, July 1991). Therefore, as the number of students experiencing disabilities served in separate facilities decreases, the number of children experiencing severe disabilities served in public schools increases. Children are going to public school in Ohio, today, in ambulances with life-support systems, and in special "behavior buses" from hospitals and special facilities. These children are present in schools not only for the special education teachers, but for the art teachers as well.

At the same time as art teachers continue to be challenged by the manifold needs of the student population, they are faced with increased curricular expectations. The Ohio Department of Education (Tollifson, 1987/1988) promotes
a balanced comprehensive art curriculum which includes the study of aesthetics, art history, art in society, criticism, and production; the Ohio Art Education Association (1989), the National Endowment for the Arts (1989), the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (1985), and the Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts (1990) all recommend a balance of aesthetics, criticism, history, and studio/production. Many districts are adopting art texts, beginning with the primary grades, and courses of study are being revised to include aesthetics, art history, and criticism along with the traditional studio/production. Art teachers must follow the same course of study for all children unless a school district has a written supplement or an alternative course of study for learners experiencing disabilities (Ohio Department of Education, 1983 p. 52). Many art teachers are currently challenged to teach aesthetics to children experiencing mental retardation, studio to children experiencing physical disabilities, art history to children who cannot see the images, and criticism to children who have difficulty reading and writing.

IEP (Individualized Education Program) teams dictate art class placement for each child experiencing disabilities. However, it is the art teacher who must provide an environment which will promote learning, achievement, and socialization for each child. To do so certain conditions must exist, including art teacher
involvement in placement and planning. Making appropriate placement decisions and instructional choices requires training in teaching children experiencing disabilities, facilities which accommodate the physical and educational needs of all children, resource materials and adaptive equipment, reasonable class size, adequate instructional time, cooperation and support from the special education team, and possibly, an adapted course of study.

Unfortunately, based on the complaints, concerns, and requests for information and in-service workshops conducted during my three year tenure with the Ohio Department of Education, these conditions are not being met in the schools. Based on these requests and my conversations with teachers, the most frequently expressed concerns include:

* lack of communication between the special education team or teacher and the art teacher;
* placement decisions made for art education without input from the art teacher;
* placement of children experiencing disabilities based on teacher needs (planning time, etc.) rather than on student needs;
* inadequate preservice and inservice training for placement and instruction of children experiencing disabilities in art classes;
* courses of study written without adaptations or consideration of students with special needs;
lack of appropriate resource materials and model programs;
* entire special education units being placed into existing regular education classes;
* two or more special education units grouped together for instruction;
* unreasonable class size; and
* inadequate instructional time, planning time, facilities, and adaptive equipment.

These expressed concerns fall within the three primary obstacles to successful mainstreaming that are identified within music education literature: lack of teacher preparation, lack of administrative and instructional support, and lack of participation in the placement process.

participation in placement decisions. Their studies found between 76% and 89% of public school music teachers have never participated in the placement process.

According to these music studies and the oral reports of visual arts teachers, arts teachers have little control over who is in their classes and how they get there, and little preparation for instruction once they are in the classes. Is it time to upset the apple cart?

Closed Windows

Adler (1982), Down (1989), Eisner (1987), Fowler (1989), Gardner (1983), and Greene (1990) have written and spoken so eloquently that the arts are basic to education. The arts have unique characteristics, are alternatives ways of understanding the world, help students overcome the humdrum and experience life more deeply, and provide windows to our own and other worlds. Howard Gardner's research and theory of intelligences (1983) extends this philosophy by insisting that intelligence is not one singular measurable thing, and that individual intelligence is comprised of multiple factors (or intelligences) which are developed to different degrees in different individuals. Therefore, an individual deemed as being of low intelligence by current measures of intelligence, which emphasize linguistic and logical/mathematical abilities, may be quite intelligent, and capable of learning in other ways. However, under the
placement and instructional practices outlined earlier, certain windows may be closed to that individual. In spite of these practices, students and teachers have survived thus far. But is survival enough? Will opening more windows make any difference in the lives of students?

Handicapping the Handicapped

According to Mehan, Hertweck and Miehls (1986) how students are educated does make a difference. In their book, Handicapping the Handicapped, they examined the role of the school in developing a career handicapped individual. Although they do not mention arts or physical education classes in specific, they note that the educational opportunities offered to students make a significant difference in their lives. They believe socioeconomic status is a function of background socioeconomic variables and factors independent of background variables, including education and individual achievement. When students are assigned to ability groups and curriculum is organized differently for students within these categories, the teacher is providing different educational opportunities. Wang and Lindvall (1984) believe this is compounded by the student’s self-worth being threatened by the belief that his value as a person depends on his ability to achieve. Our society highly values individual achievement because it is seen as the primary vehicle to achievement of one of our
nation's fundamental ideals: social equity. Although schools may value human achievement, they seem to do little to encourage it for students experiencing disabilities. Blandy (1991) concurs and writes that what disables a person is not the disability itself, but society's inability to adapt to that individual. Arts and physical education teachers are unwittingly contributing to the development of handicapped career individuals through passive acceptance of substandard educational practices and through instruction geared to the disability and not the learner.

Social Construction Work

If Mehan, Hertweck, Miehls, Wang, Lindvall, and Blandy are right, the placement process has a significant affect on the future lives of students. Art teachers' roles in that process, either active or passive, would therefore contribute to those future lives.

Placement decisions are made by a committee, known in Ohio as the IEP team. This team reviews data which has been assembled and makes a determination of where and how a child will be educated. The assemblers of data are also a team, some of whom may serve on both committees. The evaluation team's responsibility is to gather data, sift through it, select relevant facts, and combine these into an assessment of the students. Therefore, by the time the IEP team receives the assessment, it is far enough removed from the
student to have developed a life of its own. In addition, the IEP team has prior knowledge of program availability as well as organizational constraints. Therefore a single factor, such as space availability, may outweigh all other factors in the decision making process. These constraints and prior knowledge lead educational decision makers to reduce the range of alternatives (Mehan, Hertweck, and Meihls, 1986). "These everyday practices (classroom activities, standardized testing, [staff] routines that place students in different programs or course of study) and the decision making process that is embedded in the organizational routine, create certain educational career paths (Mehan, et al, 1986, p. 171)." Students are sorted and stratified in such a way that different educational opportunities are made available to them. Therefore stratifying is not always based on students' measured abilities or their background characteristics, but decisions are made on the basis of particularistic considerations and the press of bureaucratic constraints (Mehan, et al). Mehan, Hertweck, and Meihls call this process social construction work.

Constraints are not all internal. School districts must abide by federal and state rules and regulations and the availability of funds. Availability of funds can limit programming (districts that don't have funds for an SBH unit, often do not have identified SBH students) or
encourage categorization (a minimal number of classified children is required to support a funded unit) (Reynolds, 1984). So while the law enshrines the rhetoric of least restrictive environment, the subsequent rules and regulations guarantee separations in attitudes, resources, records, and responses (Sayer, 1991, p. 56).

Due to the organizational constraints, teachers often lose sight of the fact that the existing reality of placement and options is only one of many possible alternatives that could exist. Melograno and Loovis (1991, p. 34) write that an IEP is only effective to the extent that the education is carried out within the least restrictive environment and insist that establishing a continuum of placement alternatives is crucial.

Reynolds believes the system is flawed in that "schools have delegated the practical problems of categorizing children to psychologists, physicians, social workers, and other professionals whose abilities to suggest approaches to instruction tends to be limited (p. 88, 1984). Reynolds also submits that classification should be based mainly on progress in curriculum and oriented strictly to problems of instruction. Wang and Lindvall (1984) suggest that effective schooling involves the design and implementation of learning environments that enable students to achieve desired outcomes. Gardner (1988) adds that although developmental factors may set a kind of upper limit on what
can be mastered at any particular time, the crucial factor in learning is the quality of the education.

Literature and practical experience support Mehan, Hertweck, and Miehls' (1986) contention that the educational experience affects the lives of students. The literature also suggests that organizational constraints, including federal and state laws and finances, affect the educational choices made for kids. What does this mean for the teacher?

Reform School

Many teachers are beginning to feel as if they have been run over by the Mack truck of reform. Everyone has a notion of how to cure our "ailing" school system, and most of these solutions include reforming teacher education.

This reform movement has promulgated reports (Bennett, 1988; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986; National Governors' Association for Policy Research and Analysis, 1986, 1989), commissions, and development of instruments to measure outcomes (Finn, 1989). President Bush, acting on his pledge to become the "education president," called an historic meeting of the 50 governors in 1989 to set education goals for the nation. A panel of these governors has now established six goals for education and has conducted hearings on these goals in regional sites around the nation. James believes that this trend of involvement by governors has many implications.
Educational goals will now hinge on the struggles between the governor and the legislature, and be subject to pressure from state and local constituents (1989). James foresees state control continuing to grow.

Politics and the reform movement have been very evident in Ohio. In 1989 the legislature directed the State Board of Education to recommend changes in graduation requirements. Pat Smith, then board president and an advocate for arts education, seized the moment and established an arts commission to look at the status of arts education. The simultaneous study of arts education and graduation requirements led to a side bar to the graduation requirement recommendations that legislators did not anticipate: a one-half unit requirement in the arts. Legislators were supportive and the state board members were convinced the arts requirement was secure (P. Smith, personal communication, December, 1990). However in the current battle between the new "education" governor and the legislature over budget and control of the Department of Education, it appears that the recommendations to change graduation requirements will be disregarded (R. Mohan, personal communication, June 1991).

Public schools continue to be scrutinized both within and without these political considerations, and teachers are frequently at the core of the discussion. According to Cruikshank and Cruz (1989) three megatrends emerge from the
plethora of reform movements: a movement toward the involvement of classroom teachers in planning and administration of school based and university based programs; a movement toward improving preparation programs for teachers; and, movement toward improving the teaching force. Within this emphasis on teachers, their role and preparation, there is no consensus on what form the teacher role or the preparation of teachers should take. Cruikshank and Cruz (1989) describe these trends as a call for the identification and documentation of the knowledge base required for teacher preparation (1988). However, in addressing the education of students experiencing disabilities, the Carnegie Foundation report (1986) found that only 56% of the teachers are involved in decisions about whether students are tracked into special education and the Holmes Report was even more specific, according to MacGregor (1987), and recommended that course work regarding students with special needs should be taken by prospective career professionals.

**Buds**

Studies, opinions, and programs addressing the needs and methods of teacher education have grown out of the reform movement.

Many states now require course work on disabilities for certification and recertification (Thompson, 1990).
Specific data on state requirements is not documented, however some state requirements were top-down manifestos and some a response to pressure from teachers' organizations (J. Potter, personal communication, July 1991). Maine's new requirement, enacted in 1989, was a result of teachers clamoring for better preparation, according to George Lyons, director of the Professional Development Center at the University of Southern Maine. As a response, the state now requires not only preservice preparation, but also course work for recertification. In addition the courses offered by colleges and universities, to fulfill this requirement, must meet specific criteria including information about laws and regulations, characteristics of exceptional students, learning styles and instructional strategies, classroom management, supportive services and resources, as well as practicum experiences (G. Lyons, personal communication, June 1991).

In England, they are also grappling with the issue of preparation of teachers for instruction of children experiencing disabilities and have targeted both preservice and inservice education programs. The Advisory Committee on the Supply and Education of Teachers recommends that subject specialist teachers be equipped to take account of special education needs in the planning and development of their curriculum. As a result teacher training programs are revamping their curricula and money is being spent to
develop and implement inservices focusing on pupil needs and their implications for the mainstreamed curriculum (Povey & Abbots, 1989).

A need for teacher preparation which addresses the needs of students experiencing disabilities has been expressed in recent literature (Jansma & Decker, 1990; Lyons, 1991; MacGregor, 1987; Melograno & Loovis, 1991; Povey & Abbot, 1989; Rasor, 1988; Thompson, 1990). Although there is some consensus on what teachers need to know, there is not consensus on how to teach them to apply this knowledge in their classrooms. The problem is how to teach both the teacher and the students (Berney, 1990).

Teaching to Teach

In terms of what teachers need to know the Warnock Committee in England has defined teacher training objectives which encompass the expressed needs of both arts and regular educators (Povey & Abbots, 1989, pp. 160-161). According to this Committee the aims of the "special education element" in teacher preparation should be:

1. to develop an awareness that all school teachers, whatever the age group of their pupils or level of their work, are likely to be concerned with helping some children who have special educational needs;

2. to enable teachers to recognize early signs of possible special educational needs;
3. to give teachers knowledge of the part which they can play in the assessment of a child's educational needs and in the execution of any special measures prescribed;

4. to give teachers knowledge of what special education is like, together with knowledge of the range of various forms of special educational provision and of specialist advisory services;

5. to provide some acquaintance with special schools, classes, and units;

6. to give teachers some understanding of how to communicate effectively with parents and an awareness of the importance of appreciating parents' anxieties and encouraging their continued involvement in their child's progress; and

7. ABOVE ALL, to give teachers knowledge in general terms of when and where to refer for special help.

Another issue that teacher educators, as well as commissions and government agencies, are struggling with is even if specific objectives and a body of knowledge are agreed upon, how can that information be delivered to teachers and prospective teachers in a way in which they will use it in their own practice and to affect change in current practice. Calderhead (1988) believes that knowledge bases are not readily translated into classroom action and that models of professional learning fail to address the division
between academic knowledge and practical knowledge.

Studies currently indicate the single most influential aspect of teacher training is the field experience, and within that experience, the cooperating teacher. New teachers tend to teach like their cooperating teachers (Beyer, 1987). Experienced teachers tend to see courses as "theoretical" by which they mean "vague and impractical", whereas they view field experience as concrete and more real. Because of this, articulation between course work and field work has been extremely difficult and results in new teachers following the "practical" model (Joyce, 1988).

Researchers have been exploring ways to increase the articulation between classroom and field, a problem which has been identified by many of the reform reports in their push for teacher involvement in all levels of instruction and preparation. Researchers at University of Chicago and Teachers College, Columbia University devised courses to attempt to teach a variety of teaching strategies. Their instruction was based on studies from Stanford and other universities which demonstrated that certain instructional systems could enable teacher candidates to learn and control skills. The instructional model used had four components:

1. study of each theory model including reading, discussions, and examination of research on the teaching practice;
2. demonstrations conducted with participants and
with children;

3. practices in simulated and classroom teaching sessions; and

4. self-feedback and team coaching.

They made several discoveries: 1. external feedback contributes the least to skill development and use; 2. knowledge of generic skills did not facilitate acquisition of specific skills; 3. about one dozen practices are necessary to develop the level of skill that will sustain independent classroom practice; and 4. the theory-demonstration-practice-coaching complex appears to be necessary for mastery (Joyce, 1988).

Sayer, Povey, and Abbots would support Joyce's contention that skills should be taught during the acquisition of modes of teaching. Sayer (1991) cautions that the separation of special education from the mainstream of instruction results in outmoded attitudes toward disabilities. Too much emphasis on students experiencing disabilities as an additional, rather than integral, part of subject teaching, tends to reinforce the notion of the separateness of such pupils. A curriculum-led approach, adopting integration, is likely to provide a firmer basis than the "apartheid" approach (Povey & Abbots, 1989, p. 170).

Therefore educators are saying there is a need for teacher training to prepare for instructing children
experiencing disabilities, there is some agreement on the information teachers need, and there are some models of instruction which may work better than others. How can this knowledge be transferred into practices which can help reform the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities in Ohio?

Efforts to rectify the problems in the instruction of children experiencing disabilities will require the cooperative effort of a significant number of individuals. These may include: the state departments of education, appropriate institutions of higher learning, school practitioners, state education associations, the state PTA, the state principals’ association, and the state school board, according to Melograno and Loovis (1991, p. 41). In addition, Conley believes that although the arts and education sector have been inconsistent partners in the past, that by working together they can provide leadership for change (1989).

United We Stand

If deficiencies exist in the visual art instruction of children experiencing disabilities, they need to be remedied on a state-wide basis. Such a remedy will not only require a commitment to art education for all children and a commitment to the preparation of teachers for the instruction of children experiencing disabilities, but also
a partnership effort by educational organizations, the state
department, arts councils, and the legislature. Conditions
exist now in Ohio to make that partnership and change
happen.

In the state of Ohio initial efforts have been made to
address the issue of arts instruction for children
experiencing disabilities and to unify organizational
efforts. A survey was recently conducted by the Ohio
Alliance for Arts Education on the status of arts education
in Ohio's schools (1989). It found that in only 58% of the
districts surveyed, art teachers have had input into
placement decisions. Later in 1989 the State Board of
Education established an arts education commission with the
mission to develop recommendations for improving arts
education in Ohio schools. Members of the commission
included art educators, artists, and representatives of all
the educational associations in the state. Consultation was
available from the Department of Education staff, the Ohio
Arts Council, and the Ohio Alliance for Art Education.
Recommendations required consensus and were based on input
from commission members and available data. Data from the
1989 Ohio Alliance status survey on arts education in Ohio's
schools (OAAE, 1989) were included. Among recommendations
made by the commission were some which addressed teacher
preparation including, "Arts specialists should be required
to take course work in exceptional populations for
certification" (Arts Education Commission, 1989). In addition, the philosophy published in the resulting document (Arts Education Commission, 1989) has been adopted by educational organizations throughout the state as well as the member organizations of the Ohio Citizens Committee for the Arts (OCCA), an arts lobbying organization.

In 1990, the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education (OAAE) sponsored an advocacy retreat for representatives of its member organizations, with a grant from the Ohio Arts Council (OAC), which has shown increased support of arts education. This support has been through funding and support of Arts-in-Education programs, inservice and such planning efforts. The outgrowth of this meeting was the development of implementation strategies for the Arts Commission’s goals and the establishment of an on-going advocacy committee. OAAE is currently in the process of long-range planning and will consider data from this study when establishing education goals.

In 1991, the Ohio Art Education Association (OAEA), OhioDance, the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA), and the Ohio Theatre Alliance (OTA) were given seats on the board of directors of the Ohio Citizens Committee for the Arts and are now represented on the long-range planning committee of that organization. In addition, the efforts of these new member organizations are credited with saving the Ohio Arts Council budget during the recent budget wars (W.
Lawson, personal communication, July 1991). The Ohio Art Education Association, however, has not focused all its energies on state policy. In the spring of 1991, the OAEA received a grant to support the publication of research which is currently underway to develop criteria for basic and quality art programs in Ohio. Data from this study will be examined for relevance to that project.

The Ohio Department of Education has not let the power struggle with the governor paralyze their efforts and has responded to pressure from educational organizations and is supporting the Arts Commission’s recommendation for the establishment of an advisory committee to oversee implementation of their recommendations. Franklin Walter, state superintendent of schools, has recently appointed a state arts advisory committee with the mission "to advise the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction in matters of policy and procedures relevant to arts education" (personal communication, August 1991). Data from this study, as well as Rasor’s (1988) will be discussed within this committee for relevance to state goals.

Concurrently The Ohio State University, which has established leadership in art education, has joined forces with the Holmes Group and will begin implementing recommended changes this school year. This will include increased involvement of cooperating and classroom teachers
in teacher preparation and a course in the Department of Art Education on exceptional populations.

As a result of these individual and cooperative efforts, Ohio arts educators and advocates have established a strong leadership position and are respected by other education groups, the Department of Education and State Board, and key members of the state legislature. In this climate educational change is possible.

**Nuts and Bolts**

This study sought to identify current practices in art education in the placement and instruction of children experiencing disabilities in Ohio, and to analyze this data for patterns of placement and program strengths and weaknesses. This was done in order to define critical issues and to make recommendations for future practice and change. The overarching research question was: What is the status of art education for children experiencing disabilities in Ohio, grades K-8?

As educational coaches, trainers, and referees, the Ohio Department of Education, The Ohio State University, and other educational institutions and organizations have a responsibility to know where the problems and inadequacies lie in art education in order to develop responsive and responsible policies, procedures, and programs.

In order to address this issue the following research
questions were formulated:

1. How are placement decisions in art education made for children experiencing disabilities?

2. What preparation do art teachers have to teach children experiencing disabilities?

3. Does school district art curriculum affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

4. What factors besides placement, teacher preparation, and curriculum affect the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

5. What are the critical issues that need to be addressed and further researched in art education for children experiencing disabilities and the art teachers who are teaching them?
CHAPTER III

Gone Fishin'

Something Borrowed

Music educators have identified three major areas which directly affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities. Although their research is based on music instruction and learning, the areas of concern transcend the subject matter. Teacher preparation, administrative and instructional support, and participation in placement decisions could influence the instruction and learning of children experiencing disabilities in other disciplines as well, including art education. The identification of barriers to and prerequisites for successful mainstreaming has not solved all the problems; however, music educators can now focus their efforts. It is to this end that an investigation of existing conditions in the instruction of art education for children experiencing disabilities is aimed.

For the past fifteen years art educators have used a shotgun approach to addressing problems related to the instruction of children experiencing disabilities. As a result, much of the literature reads like a collection of...
owners' manuals for different disability models. It is time to gather baseline data on the instruction of children experiencing disabilities and to define issues so that art educators can also focus their efforts.

If the Shoe Fits

This study sought to identify current practices in art education, in Ohio, in the placement and instruction of children experiencing disabilities, to analyze this data for patterns of placement, program strengths and weaknesses, and to make recommendations for future practice. The overarching research question was: What is the status of art education for children experiencing disabilities in the public schools of Ohio?

Such "what is" questions are usually answered by means of descriptive research which involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of conditions that exist (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985). These conditions are discovered by collecting data through various methods. A traditional and accepted form of descriptive research in education is the survey method, which was used for this study. Survey research is used to describe specific characteristics of a large group of persons, objects, or institutions. Survey research is most commonly used when the researcher is interested in specific facts that describe
a large group and the present condition of that group, when groups that are of interest are well defined, and when the obvious way to get the desired information is to ask the right people (Jaeger, 1988). Surveys may be conducted by telephone, personal interview, or mail. Each of these methods has specific strengths and weaknesses:

1. Face-to-face interviews are personal interviews conducted by the researcher or a trained team of interviewers. This method allows versatility in both the order of questions and length of responses, provides the researcher an opportunity to ask follow-up questions and to collect data for non-responses, and has a high per-contact response rate. On the other hand, face-to-face interviews may encourage socially desirable responses and can be susceptible to interviewer bias. Interpretation of responses and choice of follow-up questions can lead the respondent and lack of anonymity can influence responses. Locating respondents is often difficult and time consuming, requiring frequent call backs. In addition, this method is highly cost-intensive due to the extended time frame needed for training and conducting the survey.

2. Telephone surveys have some of the same advantages and disadvantages of face-to-face interviews. The time frame for collecting data is more easily controlled because interviews can be stopped whenever the sample size is
reached. Open-ended questions can be asked and information about subjects who refuse to participate obtained. Telephone surveys also have high return rates due to one-to-one contact, but can also be cost-intensive. Telephone surveys, however, reduce the effects of interviewer distortion and socially desirable responses by removing the interviewer one step away from the respondent and making it easier for the interviewer to work from a script. A major disadvantage of the telephone survey method is its inability to obtain a representative sample due to the difficulty in obtaining phone numbers.

3. Mail surveys have more potential to reach a representative sample than telephone surveys and a much higher likelihood of accurate, non-biased responses than either of the other methods. They also have the distinct advantage of being able to reach a large, widely spread sample at comparatively minimal cost. This method, however, has several disadvantages as well. Due to the lengthy time required for the mailing and return, it is difficult to extend the sample size if the return rate is small. The "sales pitch" cannot be geared to the individual, therefore response is fairly dependent on individual interest and motivation. The expected response rate of mail surveys is the lowest of the three, and therefore requires a larger beginning sample. And although they permit the respondent
to ponder the questions and carefully formulate responses, surveys conducted through the mail require the questionnaire to carry the burden of clearly explaining the directions and intent of the questions, and can be subject to misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Follow-up questions cannot be asked to clarify responses. In addition, information on non-returns cannot be obtained; the researcher does not know if the subject did not receive the survey, if the subject was not an eligible member of the population, or if the subject just plain refused to participate (Dillman, 1978).

This study had specific requirements: a) state-wide population, b) simple random sample, c) easily quantifiable data, d) a two month data collection period, e) anonymity for respondents, and f) limited cost. Conducting a face-to-face survey would require either an interview team or state-wide travel. Both would be time and cost intensive. The data gathered would be difficult to quantify and might be subject to extensive bias. A telephone survey could reduce the bias and time-line somewhat but not the cost. In addition, subjects would have to be contacted at school where there is frequently neither adequate time nor privacy to respond to a telephone interview. The mail survey offered the ability to contact subjects throughout the state in a cost efficient manner, to offer anonymity to
respondents and reduce interviewer/respondent bias, to control the data collection period, and to provide easily quantifiable data. Therefore the mail survey became the method of choice for this study.

Bait

An eloquently introduced and attractively presented mail survey which captures the interest of its audience can lose them quickly if it requires considerable time and energy to complete. For that reason the construction of the instrument is critical.

One characteristic of a user-friendly survey is a short, simple easily quantified question format. However it is also crucial that the questions are structured so that they elicit the data required. To provide this structure the survey questions were grouped into four major categories, based upon music educators' considerable research on mainstreaming and the instruction of children experiencing disabilities: demographics, curriculum and instruction, teacher preparation, and placement decisions. Questions about administrative and instructional support, teacher preparation, and placement decisions were asked, as well as questions about least restrictive environment and curriculum.

Questions about the IEP team, involvement in placement,
placement criteria, least restrictive environment options, and placement patterns were developed to collect data in response to the question: How are placement decisions in art education made for children experiencing disabilities? It is important to know how placement decisions are made and the art teacher's role in those decisions, however the availability of options also affects placement.

Jansma and Decker's work with Project LRE/PE, Least Restrictive Environment Usage in Physical Education (United States Department of Education, 1990) provides a model of least restrictive environment options from which to draw and was used to formulate questions about placement. Their model is based on a nationwide study, of public schools, state education agencies, and institutions of higher learning involved in the preparation of adapted physical education teachers. They collected data on the types of least restrictive environment placements in use, the types of placements that should be in use, the incidence of use of identified placements, and factors necessary for successful movement of students from one LRE level to another.

The question: What preparation do art teachers have to teach children experiencing disabilities? was addressed through questions about university course work, inservice workshops, course content, and personal experiences.

Curriculum and instruction questions addressed planning
time, content taught, materials used, available resources, strategies, and student characteristics. A teacher whose curriculum is predominantly history and criticism may have different kinds of problems and successes with children experiencing disabilities than a teacher whose curriculum is primarily studio production. Responses to these questions address the question: Does school district curriculum affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

Demographic data were also collected. The demographic questions were used to elicit personal information (highest degree, number of years taught) and building information (grade levels, numbers of students, type of classroom, and locale) in order to develop both a teacher profile and to help answer the question: What factors beside teacher preparation and curriculum affect the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

After the questions were developed, answer options were chosen. Closed-option questions were mainly used for the thirty-two questions in this study (Appendix B) because this format can facilitate recall through the listing of possibilities and provides primarily factual information which can be more easily quantified and generalized than open-ended responses. Response choices were primarily generated from personal experience and Jansma and Decker's Project LRE/PE (1990) and were listed in alphabetical order.
to avoid response bias. In order to cover all possible answer choices, "other, please specify" and "I don't know" categories were included. Following each group of questions, a space was provided for respondents to offer written comment.

Considerations

"Generalization of findings is central to all research but is the essence of survey research (Jaeger, p. 324). Researchers "must build an inferential bridge between the particular groups of people whom [they] studied directly and those other groups concerning whom [they] wish to generalize" (Shulman, 1988, p. 10). The ability to generalize to a population from a sample is dependent upon more than sufficient sample size.

A study must be both valid and reliable. Validity has often been referred to as the ability of an instrument to measure what it is supposed to measure. More recently, however, the definition of validity has shifted to the defensibility of the inferences researchers make from the data collected through the instrument (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990).

Reliability is the degree of consistency with which a instrument measures whatever it is measuring (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990). An instrument can
be reliable without being valid, but it cannot be valid without first being reliable. A study which measures ear size to determine ability to match pitch could provide consistent results in measurement and would be highly reliable. However, since there is no theory or research that supports the premise that ability to match pitch is linked to ear size, it is likely invalid.

Reliability is affected by random error, which are factors that will result in discrepancies between scores in repeated administrations of an instrument. In the case of the ear size, if on repeated use of the instrument the results were consistent, the instrument would be said to have a high degree of reliability. However, if on one day a measuring tape was used and on another a piece of string which was then transferred to a ruler, the results might not be consistent or reliable. It is important for the instrument and its administration and scoring to be consistent.

Validity is concerned with the use of the data collected by the instrument. Are data collected the data intended and can the information be used to make inferences about a target population? Again, in the case of the ears, the information collected had no direct relevance to what was being measured, the ability to match pitch. However, an instrument which required the subject to listen to a
recorded voice and vocally match the pitch, may be a valid measure.

Validity and reliability are frequently established by pretests of the instrument. Dillman (1978) recommends pretesting by three types of people. The first group is professionals who have similar training to the researcher, who understand the study's purpose and can evaluate the instrument in terms of whether it will accomplish the objectives. The next pretest group consists of potential users of the data. They evaluate the usefulness of the questions and the prospective data. The third pretest group is made up of members of the target population who are not members of the sample being studied. This group answers and evaluates the instrument in terms of clarity of questions and instructions, ease of response, time required for completion, and additional questions which would increase its usefulness. Data from the pilot tests are then evaluated and used to make any necessary revisions in the instrument.

Guinea Pigs

Members of the pretest groups for this study were contacted by phone or in person to request their assistance. The first pretest group was special education and arts education university faculty, and they made no
recommendations for change in the instrument. The second pretest group consisted of the Ohio Department of Education Arts for the Handicapped Consultant, an art education doctoral student doing research in teacher education, and an inservice education consultant with a Ph.D. in art education. Feedback from this group resulted in some minor format changes and clarification of language. The survey was then given to the third pretest group which was made up of two elementary art teachers and one middle school art teacher, all of whom teach children experiencing disabilities. This group completed the survey prior to evaluating the instrument. These teachers responded that the survey required approximately fifteen minutes, which they felt was reasonable and falls under the recommended twenty minute maximum (Dillman, 1978), was easy to understand, user friendly, and asked the needed questions. They did, however, make several suggestions for extending the answer options. Once these additions and changes were made the survey was ready to be mailed to the sample.

The In Crowd

In survey research it is essential to have an explicit definition of the target group. There can be no question whether an individual is or is not a member of that group.

In surveys, research data are collected from part of a
population for the purpose of describing one or more characteristics of all of the population. This smaller group is called the sample and is selected from a sampling frame, a list that defines the operational population of a survey, using a table of random numbers. Selection of a sample in this way assures that every element in the population has the same chance of being sampled, and that the selection of one element does not influence the selection of another. This procedure, simple random sampling, is considered to be the best method to obtain a sample that is representative of a large population (Scheaffer & Mendenhall, 1986).

In the case of securing information about the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities, K-8, art teachers who teach in schools with special education classes are directly involved in that instruction. They are a specific, well defined group, so it made sense to direct the questions to them.

Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the population was defined as certificated visual art teachers in Ohio, teaching K-8 art classes in public schools in which at least one special education unit is located.

Conclusions made about a population, based on data collected and analyzed from a sample, can never be absolutely certain since researchers cannot be positive that
the sample is perfectly representative of the population. However, if the sample is randomly selected and of sufficient size, these differences are likely to be relatively insignificant and incidental (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990).

The question of what constitutes sufficient size is not easily answered. Size alone will not determine representativeness of the sample. The more heterogeneous the population, the more representative the sample. Researchers recommend that the sample should be as large as can possibly be obtained with a reasonable expenditure of time and energy. For statistical accuracy, a minimum sample size of one-hundred is recommended for descriptive research (Ary, Jacob, & Razavieh, 1985; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990).

The sampling frame used for this study was derived from Ohio Department of Education records. A computerized mailing list of Ohio art teachers was requested and received from the Division of Computer Services, the Ohio Department of Education. This list was chiseled down by eliminating high schools, vocational schools, and special education schools. High schools and vocational schools were eliminated because art is not a required subject at the secondary level and students who are in art classes are there on an elective basis. This study was not examining elective art programs. The homogeneous, segregated art
classes of special education schools are not representative of the study population and were also eliminated.

The next step was to correlate art teacher building assignments with the location of special education units. Since the information on special education units is also available from the Ohio Department of Education, the proposed plan was to have this correlation done by their computers. Unfortunately they did not have the means to do this type of correlation.

Two Steps Forward, One Step Back

The fall-back plan required considerable effort. The data on unit placement were like apples and oranges. Data were listed by county and district; the mailing list was organized by school buildings and zip codes. The first step required the compilation of a county by county listing of district zip codes. The Ohio Educational Directory (Ohio Department of Education, 1990-1991) contained this information. Each address on the mailing list was then cross-referenced to the county zip code list and to the county listing of special education units. Buildings in districts that did not have special education units were eliminated. This operational population was then numbered and two-hundred numbers were chosen at random using a table of random numbers (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, pp. 430-433,
Kit and Caboodle

In addition to Dillman's three recommended pretests and subsequent revisions, several steps were taken to increase the reliability of this survey. Each teacher from the sample received an identically produced survey packet in the mail. The packet included the required signed cover letter explaining what the study was about, why it was useful, why the respondent's answers were important, and why they should take their valuable time to help someone living the fat life in graduate school (Appendix A), a signed survey form (Appendix B), and a stamped, addressed return envelope. A business-size envelope was used for the mailing with computer-generated mailing and return address labels. To draw the subjects' attention, each envelope was hand customized with a color graphic. The number coding used for random selection remained on the address labels and an identical code was placed on the address of the return envelope. As returns came in, surveys were separated from envelopes to assure anonymity, and the envelopes were then used to check off schools from which a response had been received. In addition to the responses, one envelope was returned with "school closed" and five envelopes were returned marked "no art teacher at this address." This was
unexpected and should not have happened if the mailing list was accurate. The Division of Computer Services was contacted to see how current their data on teacher assignments were. As it turned out, the notion of a specified mailing list was a charade; they really didn’t have that data. They generated the requested list by printing "Art Teacher" above the name and address of each school building in the state. This information would have been more helpful, and more cheerfully received, at the time of the request. At the time of this distressing discovery there were seventy-nine returns. Could the remaining 121 all be schools without art teachers?

At this point the telephone became the method of choice. The easiest way to verify the teacher information was to call the schools from which there was no response. A research assistant would have been a prized asset at this juncture. Each building on the list had to be identified by district and cross referenced in the Ohio Educational Directory (Ohio Department of Education, 1990-1991) to find a phone number. Each of these buildings was then called, using a script (Appendix C), and asked if they had both an art teacher and a special education class. Twenty-nine of the buildings had either no art teacher or no special education classes. It was intriguing to note, however, that of the buildings without art teachers the response was
consistently, "art is taught by classroom teachers" rather than "we don't have an art teacher." (Perhaps the education police had recently been afoot!)

Combined with the five returned envelopes, thirty four of the buildings had to be eliminated from the sample, leaving an adjusted sample size of one-hundred sixty-six. Adjusting the sample to reflect truly eligible subjects is common practice and provides a more direct indication of a method's response rate (Dillman, 1978). A second mailing was sent to the eighty-seven buildings remaining in the sample from which there had been no response. The format remained the same with the exception of a revised cover letter. The new letter reminded them that they had received a survey within the past month and strongly encouraged participation (Appendix D). Eight weeks from the date of the initial mailing were allotted for return. The initial seventy-nine were returned within the first three weeks, the rest straggled in over the following weeks. A total of one-hundred one surveys were returned. Of the non-returns only four of the sixty-six could be clearly accounted for. Four of the responding teachers wrote that they travel among buildings and had received two surveys, each at a different building, but had only responded to one. With many elementary art teachers serving more than one building, this was probable with random selection, but was still surprising
considering the relatively small sample size.

Six of the one-hundred responses had to be eliminated. Although five of the respondents had carefully filled out relevant parts, none of these teachers teach students experiencing disabilities. The other survey arrived after the survey deadline and after the data reduction had begun. The resulting response was ninety-five usable surveys with a 57% return. Return rates for mail surveys are traditionally low and target rates rarely specified (Jaeger, 1988; Scheaffer & Mendenhall, 1988), however Dillman shoots for 65% (1979), Babbie says that 50% is "adequate" and 60% is "good" (1972), and Scheaffer, Mendenhall, and Ott (1986) aim for a 60% return. A 57% return is in the ball park of respectability.

Phyla

After the data are collected something must be done with them. In fact, they can be somewhat troublesome if not quickly organized in an orderly manner. Therefore, consistent and accurate recording of data is an essential step of survey research. When survey data are collected they are not in a form which permits immediate analysis and therefore must be put in a form which allows summarization and interpretation. This process is called "data reduction" (Jaeger, 1988). Once reduced, survey data are traditionally
analyzed using a variety of measures including frequency counts, cross-tabulation, a chi-square test and phi statistic. Frequency counts can be converted into percentages of responses within categories and cross-tabulation can show how frequently various combinations of responses occur. Chi-square is used to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables and the phi statistic can measure the strength of the relationship. Both chi-square and the phi statistic show the relationship between two variables but cannot determine whether other factors also influence that relationship (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985, p. 360). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, frequency counts and cross-tabulation were used to determine mean scores and to show possible connections between sets of responses. The data were entered into the computer and analyzed using the data base program Q & A (Symantec, 1989).

Narrative responses included in the comment sections were categorized and analyzed according to the area addressed (Jaeger, 1988) which included demographics, curriculum and instruction, teacher preparation, and placement decisions.

Once the quantifiable data were collected and analyzed and the narrative responses categorized the results then were examined for patterns and relationships.
CHAPTER IV
Trophies

Elusive Quarry

The survey for this study was developed with carefully prepared questions, pretests, and revisions in order to collect specific data. However, in the excitement of the hunt unexpected things can happen; unanticipated game may be bagged. And so it happened in this hunt for data. More data about the general teaching of K-8 art in Ohio were collected than foreseen, however some of these data did not fit the structures constructed for the anticipated quarry.

Teachers were asked to mark, in percentages, the time devoted to aesthetics, criticism, art history and studio/production in their curriculum when teaching classes of regular education students, classes with mainstreamed special education students, and separate classes for special education students. The intent of the question was to discover if teachers taught the same or different curricula to different groups of students and to determine if curriculum weighted in specific areas was connected to students' achievement of course objectives. Gathering data on general curriculum content was a secondary goal. The
questions posed no problems for the pretest groups. The language and intent seemed clear enough. However, as the surveys came back, it became apparent that the survey violated a teaching tenet. Common knowledge of percentage questions and curricular terminology was assumed. The responding art teachers did not understand percentages in the way assumed in the question construction; figures did not total the expected 100%. A typical response was: "aesthetics 90%, criticism 10%, art history 30%, and studio/production 80%.

It was also naive to assume aesthetics and art criticism would have similar meanings to all teachers. Definitions should have been given. The participants responded to these questions out of context, using their personal frames of reference, and therefore it was impossible to know if one’s definition of "aesthetics" was even close to another’s definition. Conclusions about curriculum content throughout the state could not be made.

Fortunately these three curriculum questions appear to be the only ones to have received multiple interpretations in the study. The provision of space for comments permitted respondents to expand or clarify responses; many chose to do so.
A (Con)census

Prior to gathering information about their educational training, methods of instruction, or knowledge of and involvement in placement of students experiencing disabilities, respondents were asked to give a bit of information about themselves and their schools.

Of the study's 95 respondents, 61% (n=58) reported a Bachelor's degree as their highest degree attained, 38% (n=36) have completed Master's degrees, and 1% (n=1) has completed a Doctor of Philosophy degree. Teachers had completed their education as long ago as 37 years to as recently as 6 months for an average of 12.5 years. The average number of years teaching art for the combined groups was 13.2 years; teachers with Bachelor's degrees averaged 10.9 years, teachers with Master's degrees 16.8 years, and the lone PhD 21 years teaching art.

Thirty-five percent (n=33) of the teachers reported having taught subjects in addition to art, including most everything from preschool to geology and German, and 19% (n=18) reported years teaching beyond those reported for art. Seven percent (n=7) of the teachers are certificated in special education as well as art.

When asked about the type of school in which they teach, respondents reported grade levels of the schools but did not divulge the location as readily. Only 75 teaches
responded to this part of the question. Of those 75, 28 (37%) are from suburban districts, 21 (28%) from small towns, 18 (24%) from rural districts, and 8 (11%) from urban districts.

As Table 1 indicates, instructional assignments for the art teachers included a variety of grade combinations. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents teach elementary grades, 19% teach a combination of the grades 6-9, and 23% of the teachers instruct a mixed grade range of students with assignments overlapping elementary, middle school, or high school.

Ninety of the 95 teachers reported the number of students they instruct. The total number of students taught ranged from 32 for a part-time middle school teacher to 1800 for a full-time elementary art teacher. The average number of students was 548 per teacher, however 28% (n=27) instruct more than 700 students.

These 49,302 students include students experiencing disabilities. When asked to break down the number of students experiencing disabilities (referred to in the survey as special education students) 20% (n=19) were not sure how many students there were, and 1% (n=1) did not like to identify students by abilities. The remaining 75 reported instructing an average of 33 students experiencing disabilities (6.6% of total student number), ranging from 1-
Table 1: Grades in Which Respondents Teach Visual Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6, 1-6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 6-8, 6-8, 7-8, 7, 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-7, K-8, 1-7, 1-8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12, 8-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12, 1-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24% (n=1-105) of the student population. Two teachers, however, added that the numbers did not accurately reflect the diversity of the student population. At-risk students and "students who do not qualify for special education, by state standards, but who also need extra help" also present challenges to the art teacher.

Information on at-risk students or students experiencing learning difficulties, who are not in special education courses, was not requested. Teachers were asked to report the types of special education classes, defined by law, housed in the building in which they teach. According to their responses a majority of the schools have specific learning disabled (SLD) classes and developmentally handicapped (DH) classes; one-third have multihandicapped classes (MH), and almost one-fourth have severe behavior handicapped classes (SBH). Hearing handicapped classes (HH), orthopedically handicapped classes (OH), and visually handicapped classes (VH) are less widely represented. A small number of teachers were unable to identify the specific classes in their school by category (see Table 2).

Of the 90 buildings in which the above categories of special education classes were reported 80% (n=72) serve two or more different groups of special education students. Approximately one-third of the buildings, and art teachers, serves two groups, one-fifth serves three groups, just under
Table 2: Special Education Units Located in Schools Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Units</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>% of Buildings with Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disabled (SLD)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Handicapped (DH)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multihandicapped (MH)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Behavior Handicapped (SBH)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Handicapped (HH)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically Handicapped (OH)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Handicapped (VH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Classes Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: More than one response may have selected by respondents.
Table 3: Number of Different Types of Special Education Units Located in Buildings Served by Art Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different Types of Units</th>
<th>(N = 90) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one-fifth serves four groups, six serve five groups, and one serves all seven groups (see Table 3).

So much is said in Ohio about "art on a cart" that it was a surprise to discover that the art teachers in this survey teach primarily in a designated art room. The majority of the teachers in the study teach full or part time in an art room and almost two-thirds teach full time in an art room. As for "art on a cart", approximately one-third teach full or part time in classrooms. In addition some teachers are forced to become squatters and teach part time in cafeterias, gymnasiums, libraries, and on stages (is that what they mean by performance art?) (see Table 4).

Puzzle Pieces

According to these demographic data, the mythical teacher who responded to this study has a B.A., is certificated in art, has 13.2 years of teaching experience, teaches outside a city, has an art room, and teaches 548 children, 33 of whom experience either developmental or learning disabilities. However, more useful data to the solution of the research question are those showing the numbers of students taught, and the numbers of students experiencing disabilities.

State and national educators report that students with disabilities make up 10 - 12% of the student population (F.
Table 4: Room (location) Where Art is Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Room</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Room (full time)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room (part time)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms (part time)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms (full time)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. 9.5% teach in sites ranging from cafeterias to libraries.*
New, personal communication, 1991). The percentage of students experiencing disabilities (6.6%) reflected in this study seems low in comparison, however this study excluded special needs schools which are included in state figures. 6.6%, on the other hand, may seem like a large number to an art teacher who is responsible for 548 students. In addition, the 6.6% reflects a diverse group of students. 86% of the teachers in the study instruct two or more different disability groups. These teachers are not only challenged to learn the names of 500+ students, teach them, and evaluate their progress, they are also expected to meet the individual needs of the students experiencing disabilities. Quite a challenge.

Choosing an Alphabet

After the brief background check in the demographics section, teachers were asked questions about their instructional program. They were not specifically asked if their curriculum was based on DBAE (discipline based art education), BCAC (basic comprehensive art curriculum) or STP (seat of the pants). However questions were asked about curriculum content, class schedule and size, and instructional resources and support.

When asked the number of classes taught per week 93 teachers responded reporting a range from 2-45 classes, an
average of 27 classes per week (n=93). The number of students taught in these classes varied from a low of 13 students per class to a high of 35, an average of 25 students per class (n=93).

Teachers were also asked to report both officially scheduled and actual planning time per week. The Ohio Department of Education Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools require that full time teachers shall have a minimum of 200 minutes scheduled per week for planning, evaluation, and conferences (Ohio Department of Education, 1983). According to school evaluators (I. Wilson & L. Damas, personal communication, July 1990) most school records indicate compliance with state standards, but frequently teachers report less actual planning time. Sixty-nine percent (n=59) of the teachers in this survey reported that their official and actual planning time was the same. However 21% (n=18) reported having less actual time than officially scheduled and 9% (n=8) reported having more planning time than was officially scheduled. Actual planning time was all over the place, ranging from zero minutes to 600 minutes per week. The average actual planning time for art teachers was 186 minutes per week (n=85), with only 47% (n=40) receiving the minimum 200 minutes. Teachers were not asked if the time was either adequate or scheduled in useful blocks, which is an
important consideration according to the qualified response of one teacher, "200 minutes of planning time is really 5 minutes here and there and time between classes. The largest block of time I have is 15 minutes."

If those 15 minutes are well spent the art teacher will plan instruction to implement an art curriculum. Questions about that curriculum were addressed in terms of percentage of time spent on each area, with areas described as aesthetics, criticism, art history, studio/production, and other. One teacher, who did not respond to this group of questions, wrote that the curriculum "varies per student, each student has different capabilities." And only one teacher responded to "other," writing that "proper use of materials and tools is also taught." Of the 93 teachers who responded to these questions only 44% (n=41) of the percentages marked added up to 100%. The two respondents who reported teaching 100% aesthetics, also taught 90% studio/production, 30% criticism, and 10% art history. One teacher described this art program: "I include aesthetic consultations and criticism throughout dialogues with the students during art production." Another integrates "aesthetics, art history, and art criticism into production." Of the 10 respondents reporting 100% studio/production only one did not report instruction in the other curricular areas. These data could not be compared
for average curricular time spent on a specific content because of the absence of a common vocabulary and concept of percentage.

Respondents were asked to report curricular percentages for three separate groups of students: regular education art classes, art classes with mainstreamed students, and art classes for special education students. The data from these three groups were compared for each teacher to see if there were differences among the groups. All the teachers reported teaching both regular classes and classes with mainstreamed students; 41\% (n=38) teach separate special education classes. Over one-half of the teachers reported that they teach the same curriculum to both regular and mainstreamed classes. One-fifth teach the same curriculum to regular and mainstreamed classes, but teach differently to special education classes. Approximately one-tenth teach a different curriculum content to mainstreamed classes than regular classes and about the same number teach the same curriculum to all three groups of students (see Table 5).

Thirty of the 32 (94\%) teachers reporting that they teach a different curriculum to classes with special education students said that they increase the studio/production portion. Seven (22\%) of the 32 report teaching only studio/production to classes for students experiencing disabilities. One such teacher has developed a
Table 5: Curriculum Content Taught to Different Student Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Content</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and M the same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and M the same, S different</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and M different</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, M, and S the same</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M and S the same, R different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, M, and S different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Abbreviations: "regular" art classes (R), classes with mainstreamed students experiencing disabilities (M), and classes for students experiencing disabilities only (S).
separate curriculum for the classes with students experiencing developmental disabilities. Another teacher expressed a need for such a curriculum, and wrote: "When I asked to help develop a K-6 DH curriculum I was told it wasn’t necessary. Very disappointing since I teach all 8 units!"

Teachers were then asked about instructional materials used to implement the curriculum. Art production materials, art books, and reproductions are the most widely used instructional materials among the respondents. Virtually all the teachers reported use of art production materials, and a majority reported use of art books and regular use of reproductions. Although the use of textbooks is promoted by the Ohio Department of Education, only a little more than one-fourth of the teachers report using them. Computer programs were the least popular instructional choice (see Table 6).

When asked what kinds of instruction support are available to help them meet the instructional needs of special education students almost one-fifth reported that none is available. Written responses ranged from "instructional support—ha ha" to "no one ever steps foot into the art room." Teachers who reported receiving assistance credited the special education department or a friendship with a special education teacher. Survey data
Table 6: Instructional Materials Regularly Used by Art Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art production supplies</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art books</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductions</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines and hand-outs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film strips</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tapes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum slides</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio tapes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-made slides</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally-made slides</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. More than one response may have been selected. Other materials written in included teacher-made examples, 4% (n=4), games, 2% (n=2), and current events, guest artists, and picture files.
supported these responses. The most widely available assistance came from special education teachers, followed closely by school psychologists, classroom aides, and guidance counselors. Classroom aides, however, were limited to classes with multihandicapped and orthopedically handicapped students. Although Special Education Regional Resource Centers (SERRCs) exist for the purpose of parent and teacher support very few art teachers use them, with one teacher complaining that the "SERRCs have very little information regarding art." In addition, only four of the teachers had adapted equipment and only one teacher reported having adapted materials. None of the teachers reporting had an integration specialist or a special education art course of study available (see Table 7).

Teachers commented that availability of personnel did not guarantee assistance. One teacher wrote that the "art supervisor is willing, but does not know special education." Another summed up the comments of many others: "Support services may be 'available' but cooperation is minimal (i.e. counselor, psychologist, administrator, etc.). It is my responsibility to handle the students from special education classes when I have them for art. There is scarce to no administrative and/or auxiliary support."

The most commonly used instructional strategy in classes which include special education students was
Table 7: *Instructional Support Available to Art Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom aide</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERRC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Study with Adaptations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Assistance Team</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written guidelines from IEP team</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* More than one response may have been selected.
individual instruction. Several teachers wrote that they use time before class to provide individual instruction for both remediation and to get students started. Other teachers complained that although individual instruction was needed, that their schedules did not permit it. The buddy system was another popular choice however one teacher felt it was too distracting and another thought it put too much burden on the children. Several of the teachers reported using no instructional strategies at all and computers took a back burner again (see Table 8).

As Table 9 shows, less than one-half of the teachers reporting use multiple instructional strategies. One teacher who believes that teaching strategies can make a difference wrote: "I do not even know my special students are in the room because I stress team working."

Up the Creek without a Paddle

According to the data on curriculum and instruction, Ohio art teachers have been set adrift in the educational mainstream.

Only 47% of the teachers meet the minimum planning time requirement set by the state (Ohio Department of Education, 1983). Art teachers have less than seven minutes planning time per class they teach, according to average reported data. Even with the tacit understanding that lesson
Table 8: **Instructional Strategies Used by Art Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized instruction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy system</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group instruction</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strategies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. More than one response may have been selected. Other included classroom aides, handwritten instructions, and visual aides.*

Table 9: **Number of Instructional Strategies Used by Art Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Strategies</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
planning occurs away from school, seven minutes is not much
time to prepare for a class, particularly if that class
includes studio activities and requires adaptations for
individual needs.

The problem is compounded by the fact that
instructional support is weak or unavailable. Eighteen
percent of the teachers receive no instructional support,
whatsoever, and only 5% had either adapted equipment or
materials. The SERRCs, whose primary responsibilities are
education, technical assistance, and support for educators
and families working with children experiencing
disabilities, play a very minor role in the support of art
teachers.

The art teachers also limit themselves. Art production
materials, art books, and reproductions dominate their
choices of instructional materials. Although many claim
individualized instruction as a strategy they use in the
classroom, only 7% report the use of computers. Over half
the teachers limit themselves to two or less instructional
strategies.

Teachers do not let their course of study limit them,
however. Although only 8 teachers reported having a course
of study with adaptations, 33% report teaching differently
to classes with students experiencing disabilities. Ninety-
four percent of the teachers who change their content report
increasing the studio component. According to Fine Arts and Physical Education (Ohio Department of Education, 1983) students experiencing disabilities are to be taught from the regular course of study objectives unless the course of study includes adaptations or a separate course of study has been written. It is quite possible to teach objectives in more than one way, however it would be interesting to see if these teachers are truly meeting their art history objectives through these studio activities. Another concern worthy of consideration is the 11% of the classes, which include mainstreamed students, who are receiving different content than classes with "regular" students only. This means any student, by virtue of being scheduled into one of these classes, receives different content than students in other classes.

It seems we are a far cry from competency based education (CBE) in art.

Monkey See, Monkey Do?

How do teachers learn strategies for working with students experiencing disabilities? Questions were asked about teacher preparation for teaching students experiencing disabilities. Almost one-half of the teachers surveyed have had no college or university courses to prepare them for teaching students experiencing disabilities (see Table 10).
Table 10: College Courses Taken in Preparation for Teaching Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art therapy (elective)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field placement with special populations (required)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field placement with special populations (elective)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching with special education students (required)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching with special education students (elective)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education (elective)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education methods incorporating special populations (required)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education on special populations (elective)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education (required)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field placement which included time with special populations (required)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art therapy (required)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field placement which included time with special populations (elective)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education on special populations (required)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education methods incorporating special populations (elective)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven percent (n=7) of the teachers having course work took classes for special education certification, and another 4% (n=4) took elective classes while working on Master's degrees. Adjusting for these data the actual number of the responding teachers who had no course work during their undergraduate art education program to prepare them for teaching students experiencing disabilities is 59% (n=56). Teachers described themselves as "woefully ill equipped to deal with these special students" and asked, "Do art education courses on special populations or art education methods courses incorporating methods for special populations really exist? I would love to take a course!"

One teacher took the issue of lack of preparation a step further and wrote, "I have no preparation to teach disabled students and I resent being told I must when others with more training could better meet the needs of this population."

To compound the issue of preparation, over two-thirds of the teachers have had no inservice education to assist them with the instruction of students experiencing disabilities (see Table 11). Of those who did, three complained that the "inservices are usually so general they are of little help."

Teachers were also asked about topics which may have been covered in either inservice or preservice education
Table 11: *Inservice Education Received in Preparation for Teaching Students Experiencing Disabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inservice</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-wide</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* More than one response may have been selected.
courses. Forty-five percent reported receiving no information on any of the listed topics. Of the topics addressed, information about different disabilities and on learning styles were the most widely reported. Only nine respondents reported receiving information on instructional adaptations; two of the nine also reported special education certification (see Table 12).

In addition, respondents were asked if they had personal experiences which helped prepare them for instructing children experiencing disabilities. Many cited a friendship with a special education teacher; others had observed a special education class or had volunteer experiences. Almost one-fifth claimed a disabled friend or family member and a few cited their own art teaching experience or "live and learn", as one teacher put it. However almost one-fourth claimed no preparatory experiences at all (see Table 13). Even personal experience can only go so far, according to one teacher who wrote, "I have a disabled daughter and am on the board of the local training center, but this still doesn't prepare me to teach three MH children along with a classroom of twenty-six first graders or seven DH students along with a regular second grade classroom." Another teacher added that adequately teaching students experiencing disabilities goes way beyond training: "There is no real preparation in college courses and even in
Table 12: **Topics Addressed in Preservice and Inservice Education Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/Does not apply</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on disabilities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least restrictive environment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 94-142</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of art in education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional adaptations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of art in special education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of placement criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of art in IEP and placement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teaching objectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. More than one response may have been selected.*
Table 13: Personal Experiences Which Help Prepare Teachers for the Instruction of Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>(N = 95) Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher as friend</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experiences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of special education classroom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or family member experiencing a disability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics volunteer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching special education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching art</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Special Arts volunteer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. More than one response may have been selected.
workshops which can prepare a teacher for working with students with disabilities in a classroom when they are mainstreamed to meet objectives that are not based on a thorough knowledge of the student’s condition. I talk with friends who have whole classes of severe and mild disabilities and from my volunteer involvement, I find that many IEPs (such as: The student will raise right arm and make mark with taped on pencil for two second, or whatever) have to be abandoned when ... it is found out that there is no brain, but only a brain stem or to find out later that a tumor has destroyed the very area the IEP is trying to develop."

The Ostrich Legacy

Where are the heads of curriculum planners in schools of education and in district central offices? There are 632 school districts in Ohio of which only 30 do not have funded special education units (Ohio Department of Education, 1990). Data from the study show that 83% of the districts with special education units have K-8 art teachers. However, 59% of the teachers surveyed have had no undergraduate course work to prepare them for teaching students experiencing disabilities and 69% have had no relevant inservice education. Only 9% had a required methods course which incorporated information about
disabilities and 2% had a required art education course which focused on students experiencing disabilities. Of the teachers who have taken course work only 7% have received information on instructional adaptations. To aggravate the situation, 23% of the teachers report that they have no personal experience to draw on. While the educators of educators bury their heads, they send their offspring out into a world for which they are unprepared.

Mystery on the Educational Express

If the experiences of kindergarten chaos and (dis)functional IEP goals described earlier are not hallucinogenic in nature, there must be explanations for such practices. To investigate these practices questions about how art class placement decisions, for students experiencing disabilities, are made and the art teacher’s role in decision making were asked. The questions struck a chord and the respondents enlivened the data with written notes.

Ohio law requires that placement decisions be made during a conference to develop the individualized education program for each student experiencing disabilities. Required members of this team include a district representative (principal, superintendent, supervisor, etc.), the child’s teacher, one or both of the parents, the
child when appropriate, and other individuals at the discretion of the parents or agency (Ohio Department of Education, 1989). Art teachers fall into the discretionary category.

One-fourth of the art teachers surveyed did not have a clue about who makes placement decisions in their schools. Another fourth knew placement is a team decision and listed several team members. The remainder of the teachers (n=45, 47%) named one or two decision makers. However, when the data were compiled the art teachers were on target with key team members. The special education teacher, the principal, the guidance counselor, the parents, and the school psychologist were the most frequently identified. Only seven of the art teachers in the study participated in IEP team decisions (see Table 14).

The teachers were then asked in what ways they were involved in placement decisions for art classes. Over two-thirds reported no involvement. One teacher said that in sixteen years of teaching she has been asked only once for input on a student. Another teacher, who has taught in three districts, has never had any involvement in the decision making process. Others had similar stories. A teacher wrote, "I have no part in mainstreaming. If I ask I am told it is the state law to mainstream; all kids must be mainstreamed." Many said that they are not only left out of
Table 14: Persons Involved in IEP/Placement Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular education teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. More than one response may have selected.
the process, but also are not given information on their
students. "Special education students of all handicaps and
disabilities are placed in art with no information given
about them to me from anyone," wrote one teacher. Three
others said that they were left on their own to figure out
that there were special education students in the classes.
An Ohio teacher described a similar circumstance. She was
in a new school and had prepared an exciting and challenging
lesson for the third grade class. Ten minutes into the
lesson she realized that there was a problem—many of the
students were not getting it. When she went to the
principal to inquire about the students he laughed and said
he wondered how long it would take her to figure out that
she had special education students mainstreamed into that
class. He thought it was a great joke! (L. Lowe, personal
communication, June 1991).

Some teachers, however, report some level of
participation in the placement process. Close to one-fifth
reported that they meet with the special education teacher,
many by invitation, and two actually attend IEP meetings
(see Table 15). One teacher reports that the IEP team comes
to the art room. Another teacher, who is not waiting for an
invitation to become involved, has been trying to develop
art IEPs for the past year. Of the six who fill out an art
check list one is not convinced that it is even used.
Table 15: *Art Teacher Involvement in Placement Decisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with the special education teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication with IEP team</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation check-list for art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written progress reports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation check-list for basic skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal conversation with special education teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* More than one response may have been selected.
Decisions about placement in either special education classes or regular education classes for students experiencing disabilities is to be based on multifactored evaluation data and current progress and made by IEP team members (Ohio Department of Education, 1989). Art teachers were asked for specific criteria used by the IEP team when making decisions about placement in art classes for students experiencing disabilities. One-half did not know what criteria was used. Artistic achievement and artistic ability were low on the list of criteria for placement and several of the teachers recounted that the main criteria was the special education teacher's schedule. A teacher wrote, "It is a mistaken assumption in our district that all students must always be mainstreamed for all art, music, and physical education classes. This does not always enhance a student's education and place them in their own least restrictive environment. The placement is done for the classroom teacher's least restrictive environment." Another commented, "Those who are mainstreamed absolutely cannot function in a high level regular art class. Some are mainstreamed because of scheduling and some because the psychologist say they are good at art. I think the psychologist needs to take more art courses" (see Table 16).

Many teachers reported a blanket mainstreaming policy for students experiencing certain disabilities. Over one-
Table 16: Criteria Used for Art Class Placement of Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria unknown</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SLD students are mainstreamed in art</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All DH students are mainstreamed in art</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's schedule</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher schedule</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MH students are mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic ability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SBH students are mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HH students are mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SBH students take special art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 4.2% (n=4) marked other combinations; more than one response may have been selected.
third of the teachers reported that all students experiencing specific learning disabilities (SLD) are mainstreamed in their schools and over one-fourth reported that all students experiencing developmental handicaps (DH) are mainstreamed. Translated into percentages per population this means that of the 74 teachers instructing students experiencing specific learning disabilities, these students are automatically mainstreamed in 46% (n=34) of the cases. For students experiencing developmental handicaps, they are automatically mainstreamed in 38% (n=26) of the buildings. One teacher described the process, "It is automatically assumed that all special education students will have art with their age-appropriate peers—regardless of the functioning level of the student. I don't know who has determined this policy, but it certainly wasn't me."

Another teacher reported, "At one school all are mainstreamed. DH kindergarten [students] are in with the regular kindergarten which gives me 30 in a class and no extra help." Blanket policies for separate classes were not as prevalent. Students experiencing severe behavior handicaps (SBH) were most frequently served under this option (see Table 17).

The concept of least restrictive environment (LRE) is based on the availability of a continuum of educational options for children experiencing disabilities. Art
Table 17: Blanket Placement Policies for Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All SLD students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>(n=74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All DH students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>(n=68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All VH students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HH students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MH students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SBH students mainstreamed for art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SBH students take special art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All VH students take special art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MH students take special art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>(n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HH students take special art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers were asked which options are available for students in art. They reported that mainstreaming is the most widely used option and is available in a majority of the schools; over one-half report mainstreaming as their only available option for students. Separate classes for students with disabilities are available in slightly more than one-fourth of the buildings, and classroom aides assist with mainstreamed children in less than one-fifth of the art classes. Fewer than one-tenth of the schools offered more than two options for students taking art (see Table 18).

To further explore the LRE concept in art education, teachers were asked which of the options were available for specific groups of students experiencing disabilities. For students experiencing specific learning disabilities 100% of the schools offered the mainstreaming option; only 5% (n=4) offered alternative options. Students experiencing developmental handicaps (n=68) had a mainstreaming option available in 93% of the sites with alternate options available in 18%. On the other hand, students experiencing multiple handicaps, had mainstreaming options available in 63% of the schools, separate classes in 47%, and other options in 7% (see Table 19).

Children experiencing disabilities are to have the same educational opportunities available to them as their non-disabled peers. However, art teachers were asked if any
Table 18: Art Class Placement (LRE) Options for Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time regular class (mainstreaming)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time special class (separate)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time regular class with aide</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination regular class and special class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time regular class with volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of School Sites with Handicapped Units</td>
<td>Placement Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH (N=68)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH (N=14)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH (N=30)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (N=11)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH (N=22)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD (N=74)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH (N=8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. "Other" includes regular education/special class mix and classes with assistants; school sites may offer more than one option.
children in their building do not receive instruction in art. Six percent (n=6) of the teachers reported special education classes in their buildings that did not receive art. These classes include two severe behavior handicapped (SBH), two orthopedically handicapped (OH), one multihandicapped (MH), and one visually handicapped (VH). Two teachers reported that art class is used as a reward for students experiencing severe behavior handicaps. The remaining 94% (n=89) reported that all children in their buildings receive art instruction.

Patterns of placement were also explored. Teachers reported that within one building different patterns of placement might occur. The most prevalent practices reported were individual mainstreaming, mainstreaming in small groups, and mainstreaming of entire classes. Special education classes are grouped together for separate art instruction in 7% of the buildings (see Table 20). A teacher described what "small group" means within the context of her building: "students are placed by grade level, so if there are 6 SLD students of the same age, they are mainstreamed as a group into a class." Other teachers concurred by clarifying "small group" to mean any number less than the entire special education class.

Numerous teachers in the study expressed displeasure and concern about placement practices in their schools. One
Table 20: Patterns of Placement in Art Classes for Students Experiencing Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Practice</th>
<th>(N = 95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual mainstreaming</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming by small group</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming of total class</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate class</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more special education classes combined</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split pair special education and regular education classes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse mainstreaming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teacher wrote, "Some of my classes have as many as 12 mainstreamed students which brings the class size to 40 or more and makes it next to impossible to teach when so many need special help." Another said, "All special education students would be better off if only 2 or 3 were mainstreamed per class. To put entire classes together with an entire class of other children makes it impossible, or at least more difficult, for all." Other teachers described their districts as callous and their school's placement practices as unprofessional. One wrote, "[School district] does not really care what we do with our special classes for art class. I asked once about mainstreaming and group work. I was told by our Assistant Superintendent: 'We do enough for them already.' That pretty much sums up their attitude." Another teacher added, "I like the DH students but it is a nightmare in [school district] because they do absolutely anything with them with no regard as to what is best for the students. It's very frustrating to say the least." Yet another teacher carries concern a step further, "I am not against mainstreaming, for the children we have are very dear and we accept them. I don't know what we would do without them. I am against guessing on the part of teachers when lots of medical and psychological help for each individual student could be available. It is unprofessional to do otherwise."
Ignorance is Not Bliss

In general art teachers know who the decision makers are in their schools when it comes to making placement decisions for children experiencing disabilities. However, 68% have no involvement in that decision making process and 51% don’t even know what criteria are used for making decisions. One teacher cited artistic achievement as a criterion and artistic ability served as a criterion in only three schools. Having a disability label seems to be the most recognized criterion for placement according to the teachers in the study. Thirty-six percent of students experiencing disabilities are automatically placed in either mainstreamed or separate art classes, based solely on their disability designation. Worse yet, some children do not receive art for the same reason; six percent of the teachers reported classes of students who do receive art instruction.

Of course most districts do not offer many options. For 52% of the teachers, mainstreamed classes are their only option for children experiencing disabilities. Only nine teachers reported more than two available options, which was substantiated when the options were broken down by disabilities.

Data about placement patterns uncovered some more fascinating practices. The Rules for The Education of
Handicapped Children (Ohio Department of Education, 1988) specify teacher/student ratios for units of children experiencing disabilities, however in 36% (n=34) of the schools, art teachers report teaching more than one class of children.

It is no wonder that teachers felt compelled to enhance their reports on placement issues with color commentary.

A Panel of Impartial Judges

Taking a detour from more structural issues, teachers were asked to consider the special education children they teach in mainstreamed classes and select characteristics they thought were representative of the different groups. As expected, many teachers found this question difficult and commented that the characteristics marked were generalizations and they all did not absolutely apply to all children identified within a group. One teacher summed up this view: "You can't generalize students—one DH student may be hanging from the lights while another is totally absorbed in the lesson." Another teacher gave this qualified response: "Characteristics vary by child. Generalizations have exceptions but classes' majority follow noted characteristics." With this in mind, several bits of information came out. According to the art teachers, children with disabilities are not overwhelmingly accepted
by their peer group in mainstreamed classes. Three-fourths of children experiencing specific learning disabilities are accepted, one-half of children experiencing developmental disabilities are accepted, and just over one-third of children experiencing severe behavior disabilities and children experiencing multiple disabilities are accepted by their peers. Students receiving the most acceptance are students experiencing hearing impairments and students experiencing orthopedic disabilities. In addition teachers report that students experiencing disabilities are frequently either ignored or teased (see Table 21). One teacher described the problem: "These kids often only attend 'specials' with a 'regular' class; they are not part of that group and do not feel accepted." Another suggested that neutral territory helps: "I've had greater success when mainstreamed students come to the art room. Moving them into a regular classroom with folding chairs and tables causes them to be treated differently by others and affects their performance."

Based on the reported acceptance, it is not surprising that a majority of children experiencing orthopedic disabilities are easily integrated into regular art classes and only slightly more than one-fourth of children experiencing multiple disabilities are easily integrated (see Table 22).
| Disability | Accept | | Ignore | | Tease | |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| DH (N = 63) | (32) 50.8 | (22) 34.9 | (21) 33.3 | |
| HH (N = 12) | (10) 83.3 | (0) 0 | (0) 0 | |
| MH (N = 22) | (8) 36.3 | (8) 36.3 | (8) 36.3 | |
| OH (N = 6) | (5) 83.3 | (0) 0 | (1) 16.7 | |
| SBH (N = 16) | (6) 37.5 | (4) 25.0 | (5) 31.2 | |
| SLD (N = 74) | (57) 77.0 | (41) 55.4 | (20) 27.0 | |
| VH (N = 5) | (3) 60.0 | (0) 0 | (1) 20.0 | |

*Note. N represents the number of respondents reporting characteristics specific to a disability group.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically Handicapped (n=6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Handicapped (n=12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability (n=74)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Handicapped (n=63)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multihandicapped (n=22)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Behavior Handicapped (n=16)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Handicapped (n=5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students experiencing multiple disabilities were also named as the most likely to be unable to meet course objectives, even with modifications. Two-fifths of children experiencing multiple disabilities and more than one-third of children experiencing developmental disabilities are unable to meet objectives, even with modification, according to the teachers (see Table 23). A frustrated teacher explained: "Many of the DH and LD are unable to read. Art history and art criticism are affected. Even though we read aloud, they can't even answer written questions or evaluations."

When asked which students would be better served in a separate class teachers reported numbers which were not always consistent with the percentages of students unable to meet objectives. Although students experiencing developmental disabilities were unable to meet course objectives in 35% (n=22) of the cases reported, 49% (n=31) of the teachers felt they would be better served in special art classes. Students experiencing multiple disabilities, on the other hand, were unable to meet course objectives in 41% of the cases but were recommended for special art class in only 32% (n=7) of the cases. The percentage of students needing extra assistance did not directly relate to recommendations for special art classes nor did the occurrence of disruptive behavior, although seven teachers
Table 23: Ability of Students Experiencing Disabilities to Meet Course Objectives in Art Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Meets Course Objectives</th>
<th>Achievement Meets Course Objectives with Modifications</th>
<th>Unable to Meet Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH (N = 63)</td>
<td>(16) 25.4</td>
<td>(35) 55.5</td>
<td>(22) 34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH (N = 12)</td>
<td>(11) 91.7</td>
<td>(4) 33.3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH (N = 22)</td>
<td>(1) 4.5</td>
<td>(9) 40.9</td>
<td>(9) 40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (N = 6)</td>
<td>(2) 33.3</td>
<td>(5) 83.3</td>
<td>(2) 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH (N = 16)</td>
<td>(7) 43.7</td>
<td>(7) 43.7</td>
<td>(1) 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD (N = 74)</td>
<td>(42) 56.7</td>
<td>(24) 32.4</td>
<td>(12) 16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH (N = 5)</td>
<td>(3) 60.0</td>
<td>(2) 40.0</td>
<td>(1) 20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N represents the number of respondents reporting characteristics specific to a disability group.
Table 24: Art Teacher Recommendations for Special Class Placement in Relation to Need for Assistance and Disruptive Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Needs Assistance #</th>
<th>Needs Assistance %</th>
<th>Disruptive #</th>
<th>Disruptive %</th>
<th>Better Served in Special Class #</th>
<th>Better Served in Special Class %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH (N = 63)</td>
<td>(37) 59.7</td>
<td>(26) 41.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31) 49.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH (N = 12)</td>
<td>(3) 25.0</td>
<td>(3) 25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) 8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH (N = 22)</td>
<td>(15) 68.2</td>
<td>(8) 36.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) 31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH (N = 6)</td>
<td>(2) 33.3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH (N = 16)</td>
<td>(8) 50.0</td>
<td>(12) 75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) 31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD (N = 74)</td>
<td>(21) 28.4</td>
<td>(28) 37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13) 17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH (N = 5)</td>
<td>(3) 60.0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) 20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N represents the number of respondents reporting characteristics specific to a disability group.
commented that these were valid reasons for special classes (see Table 24). One teacher disagreed: "I've had students in both options [mainstreamed and special class] and would rather have them mixed in." Other factors such as teaching experience and teaching preparation were also examined for a relationship with special class preference; however no patterns were found.

In addition to disruptive behavior teachers reported on other behavioral characteristics (see Table 25). Students experiencing orthopedic or visual disabilities were voted the most cooperative and not surprisingly, students experiencing severe behavior disabilities blew away the competition in the categories of "behavior problems" and "disruptive." It was again no surprise that students experiencing multiple disabilities needed the most assistance and were least able to work independently or that students experiencing hearing disabilities were most likely to work independently. And it would seem that the very language barrier which might contribute to their independence would in fact require students experiencing hearing disabilities to need considerable assistance, however, according to their teachers, these students required the least amount of extra assistance.
### Table 25: Behavioral Characteristics of Students Experiencing Disabilities in Art Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Cooperative #</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Behavior Problem #</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Works Independently #</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH (N = 63)</td>
<td>(27) 42.8</td>
<td>(33) 52.4</td>
<td>(12) 19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH (N = 12)</td>
<td>(8) 66.7</td>
<td>(2) 16.7</td>
<td>(5) 41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH (N = 22)</td>
<td>(10) 45.4</td>
<td>(13) 59.0</td>
<td>(3) 13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (N = 6 )</td>
<td>(5) 83.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH (N = 16)</td>
<td>(4) 25.0</td>
<td>(13) 81.2</td>
<td>(4) 25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD (N = 74)</td>
<td>(48) 64.9</td>
<td>(30) 40.5</td>
<td>(27) 36.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH (N = 5 )</td>
<td>(4) 80.0</td>
<td>(2) 40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N represents the number of respondents reporting characteristics specific to a disability group; see Table 24 for other behavioral characteristics.
Character Witnesses

It was refreshing to find that many teachers were unwilling or unable to stereotype the children. It was discouraging, though, to find among the group that participated in the generalizations that there were forty-seven reports of students unable to meet course objectives. According to these teachers 24% of the students experiencing disabilities cannot successfully meet course objectives. Such evidence does not provide strong support for the reported blanket placement policies.

As students experiencing disabilities struggle in art class, they also struggle for acceptance by their peers. Special educators encourage mainstreaming for the normalization/socialization aspects as well as the educational. However, according to teacher reports, placing students in mainstreamed art classes is not getting the job done. Acceptance is tentative at best.

Crossed Wiring

In a study like this in which respondents answer thirty-two questions with multiple response choices, it is next to impossible to isolate two factors and confidently report that they have direct, or indirect, influence on one another. However, to give Q & A (Symantec, 1989) a run for the money, several factors were isolated and compared.
The response "unable to meet objectives" was examined in relationship to several other factors. In 98% (n=46 of 47) of the cases where art teachers reported that students experiencing disabilities were unable to meet course objectives, there were no adapted equipment or adapted materials available as instructional resources. Fifty-one percent (n=25) reported no instructional support whatsoever. Although 49% (n=23) had at least one university course addressing students experiencing disabilities, only 30% (n=14) had inservice. Seventy-two (n=34) of the respondents teach the same content to all students. Of the 46 teachers reporting that students were unable to meet objectives, 56% (n=26) employed two or less strategies while 43% (n=20) used three or more. There was no evidence that range of materials used for instruction had any impact on student achievement. Textbooks were specifically looked at as teachers have expressed (1988-1990, personal communication) that textbooks complicate instruction of students experiencing disabilities. However, 61% (n=16) of the teachers in this study using textbooks for instruction indicated that the students experiencing disabilities were able to meet objectives.

Involvement in placement decisions was examined for connections to teacher education. Sixty-five percent (n=19) of the teachers involved have had university course work,
38% (n=11) have had inservice training, and 17% (n=5) have had neither preservice or inservice course work. Of the teachers involved in placement decisions 86% (n=25) also receive instructional support. However, it was surprising to note that 52% (n=15) of the 29 teachers involved in placement decisions also reported students who did not meet objectives. Teacher involvement in placement decisions did not necessarily insure student success in meeting objectives.

Untangling the Web

The one connection that can be reported with conviction is that 100% (n=1) of the researchers for this study were able to identify a few tenuous strands among the comparisons above: teachers who reported unsuccessful students did not have access to adapted materials and equipment; teachers who use textbooks also report that their students are able to meet course objectives; teachers who have had university course work to prepare them to teach students experiencing disabilities tended to be involved, at some level, in placement decisions; and teachers who are involved in placement decisions get instructional support.
To Tell the Truth

Respondents took full advantage of the extra comment space at the end of the survey, as well as the margins and blank back sheet.

Some responses were upbeat and optimistic. "Students need to be mainstreamed. Some have special talents," penned one teacher. Another wrote that "LD and DH students are not identified as such in art; they are creative, interested, accepted as everyone else; I don't make it a point to know who they are. They get along, don't belong and have their behavior moments like the rest; I thoroughly enjoy them all."

Other teachers would like to see more placement options. Suggestions made included "Thirty to thirty-five minutes extra time for supplemental help," smaller classes, and part time participation in regular education art classes "for easier lessons." Three teachers reported they had offered supplemental classes in the past, found them to be effective, but the classes were discontinued by their district. One district called such practices a "violation of the law." A teacher commenting on the district policy of blanket mainstreaming sorrowfully added, "both groups of students lose; it is frustrating."

Teachers worry about children's safety as well as their own ability to meet student needs. A concerned teacher
wrote: "I see my students once every three weeks; this makes it difficult to teach a varied curriculum and to give my special students additional attention."

Not all teachers feel a responsibility to meet the needs of the students experiencing disabilities; others were more negative. A teacher wrote, "They tell me they are in class for socialization so I don't help them much." Another complained, "I don't have the time to give special attention," while another insisted such efforts are futile: "class work is so much beyond their ability that they can't even do the work with special help; I have a schizophrenic student who sleeps in class." Yet another concurred: "LD and DH students are too easily distracted in the busy room. They have trouble walking and talking at the same time."

In addition two teachers expressed open resentment of the students experiencing disabilities whom they teach. One said, "Some of the students are so low they cannot hold a crayon, yet they get more art time than regular or talented and gifted kids." The other was a self-declared spokesperson for art teachers: "I, as well as most teachers, believe the DH's should not be taught art as an intellectual pursuit where the regular intelligent student should. DH's should be taught Art Therapy (more related to medicine than Art) and teach them how to survive in the culture. Somewhere, someone confused medicine (Art Therapy) with art
(a rearranging of a very complex visual world)."

The End of the Beginning

In the concluding comments one teacher described the survey as "thorough but unrealistic" and said, "I wish I had time to address art in such a complete manner." Others did not find the process as frustrating and offered luck and encouragement and described the issues surrounding students experiencing disabilities as an area in art education "that needs lots of help and vast improvement soon!" Several teachers were grateful, offering thanks "for addressing this issue" and some effusive: "Thank heaven I've found someone who is doing something, you are needed. Thank You!"

What do we do?
Full Circle

The intent of this study was to describe the status in Ohio of art instruction for K-8 children experiencing disabilities. The impetus for this study came from encounters with arts and special education teachers and students in Ohio’s schools, as well as through teaching, counseling, and my former job as Arts for Handicapped consultant for the Ohio Department of Education. Although children experiencing disabilities have been educated in the public schools for years, many prior to PL 94-142, concern continued to be expressed about both the impact these children had on the art classroom and the impact the art teachers had on these children. The art education literature provided little help. The bulk of the literature focused on therapeutic issues or stereotypic approaches to instruction. Investigations into placement factors and current practice were virtually nonexistent. Music educators, however, had been more systematic in investigating issues surrounding the education of children experiencing disabilities, and had come to some consensus on
major factors affecting the instruction of these children. Instructional support, teacher preparation, and involvement in placement decisions had been identified as significant factors in music education. Based on this research in music, as well as the investigations of physical educators into least restrictive environment factors, and my own experiences and observations, research questions were developed and a survey was constructed to assess and describe current conditions in Ohio affecting the art education of children experiencing disabilities. The survey was mailed to a random group of K-8 art teachers to investigate the following questions:

1. How are placement decisions in art education made for children experiencing disabilities?
2. What preparation do art teachers have to teach children experiencing disabilities?
3. Does school district art curriculum affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities?
4. What factors besides placement, teacher preparation, and curriculum affect the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities?
5. What are the critical issues that need to be addressed and further researched in art education for children experiencing disabilities and the art teachers who are teaching them?
The teachers' responses to the survey questions, including their invited comments and parenthetical remarks, provided answers to these research questions as well as providing insights into the methodology.

A Snapshot

I selected the mail survey method well aware of its short-comings, or so I thought (see pages 52-53). I knew that I would be getting a snapshot, rather than a full color documentary, of existing conditions. However, I did not anticipate how frustrating that would be. As I read over responses, I wanted to ask teachers for their definition of aesthetics or if they really meant they did not use any instructional strategies in their teaching? Questions such as why they do not use computers or why they are not familiar with placement criteria kept popping up. I wondered why teachers who choose to increase the studio portion of their curriculum when teaching classes with students experiencing disabilities do so. Do these teachers think of studio as more concrete and less conceptual than other approaches? If so, what is it they do in studio instruction? These and a myriad of other questions raced through my mind as I reduced and analyzed the data.

Although it would have been educational, informative, and enjoyable to satiate my curiosity and travel around the
state getting "up close and personal" with several teachers and their programs, I also know from my experiences with state organizations that numbers often speak louder than case studies to power brokers. Since one objective of this study was to produce data which could be used to affect bureaucratic change, it seemed best to let the numbers talk. This is not to say that I did not find useful information. Although the sample was small, the data obtained supplemented and substantiated information I had gathered during my tenure with the state department and were critical in developing a picture of art education practices in Ohio for children experiencing disabilities, and in answering the following research questions.

**Automatic Pilot**

**Question 1: How are placement decisions in art education made for children experiencing disabilities?**

Educational placement is a key component of PL 94-142 and the subsequent state regulations. Therefore an examination of art education practices for children experiencing disabilities required an investigation of how least restrictive environment (placement) decisions are made for art class placement. What I discovered was in the majority of cases decisions are made without input from the art teacher, are based on criteria that have no overt
connection to art or, in many cases, to the child, by individuals who may or may not know anything about either art or art instruction.

There is no place in the regulations guiding the education of children experiencing disabilities where it is stated that art class is exempt from the process of deliberate, individually made placement decisions. However, Ohio practice belies that fact. Numerous schools have blanket policies which schedule students into art class placement options based solely on their identified disability. A few districts take things even further and deny children art because of their identified disability. In many other schools logical criteria for placement, such as achievement in art or artistic ability are ignored in favor of tangential criteria such as grade level, chronological age, student schedule, or even teacher schedule. The art teacher, who is responsible for the instruction, rarely participates on the placement team or has any input into decisions. Instead, decisions are primarily made by non-instructional personnel like psychologists, guidance counselors, parents, and principals. When I asked a school psychologist, from a rural county school system which engages in many of the above practices, about the educational rationale for their decisions regarding art class placement he replied that they had
always mainstreamed all special education students into art and he guessed he just had not thought about it before. It seems that now is the time for placement teams to abandon automatic pilot and start thinking about what makes the best educational sense for each child placed in art.

**Thoroughbreds**

**Question 2: What preparation do art teachers have to teach children experiencing disabilities?**

Children experiencing disabilities are attending public schools in ever increasing numbers. State rules and standards require that these children have the same opportunities available to them as other children, including art. Since children experiencing disabilities will be placed in art class (one way or another), it is important to know what preparation art teachers have to teach them.

Evidently students with disabilities are rendered invisible, by some mysterious cloaking device perhaps, to college and university art education faculty. Courses providing preparation for the instruction of children experiencing disabilities are few and far between. Very few schools offer relevant methods courses or incorporate special education issues into existing course work. Art therapy courses are occasionally proffered, however the art therapy emphasis on art as a tool to facilitate
psychological processes seems to have only minor relevance to educational objectives. The majority of teachers with preservice "preparation" get that preparation at the hands of their supervising and cooperating teachers in their field experience. Therefore, teachers who most likely have had little preparation themselves, are expected to provide these university students with an instructional bag of tricks. And although school districts cannot deny or ignore the existence of children experiencing disabilities, they have not picked up the slack in teacher education. Even fewer art teachers have had inservice preparation than those who had undergraduate course work. Relying on chance and opportunity, some teachers have found their preparation in the school of hard-knocks and others have sought out elective special education courses at the master's level. For most teachers, however, teacher training programs and school districts have let them down.

Another aspect of this preparation issue is that of quality. Numerous teachers have complained that although inservice has been offered, it is often too brief and superficial to adequately address the issues. In addition, teachers who have had an opportunity to take preservice or inservice courses report that pertinent topics such as classroom management, instructional adaptations, art and the special education student, and placement are often
neglected. Educators of educators must open their eyes and offer courses and educational experiences that not only address and acknowledge the diversity of students in the schools, but do so in a complete and thorough manner.

Altered States

Question 3: Does school district art curriculum affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

Yes. Curriculum invariably affects instruction. However obvious the question and answer might seem, curriculum choices may have more impact on some students than others. It was the intent of this question to look at curriculum content in terms of "equal educational opportunities."

Investigating this issue became more complicated than I thought due to the nature of the responses. Questions based on curriculum components of art, championed by the Ohio Art Education Association and the Ohio Department of Education, were apparently interpreted in very individual ways. Aesthetics to one teacher meant creative expression through the art process, to another it was a heightened experience through interaction with art and art materials, and to another philosophical inquiry about art. One could not be compared with another. However, within each teacher's responses curricular patterns could be seen. According to
their reports, many teachers teach differing amounts of "content" based upon whether or not students experiencing disabilities are in the class. In addition, most all of these teachers restructured their curriculum with a heavier dose of studio/production. Students are being taught different stuff, solely on the basis of being designated "handicapped" or being assigned to a class with students experiencing disabilities. This practice has multiple implications.

First, standards require that instruction be based on an adopted course of study, however most of the teachers made adjustments without course of study support or IEP support. Very few districts had courses of study with adaptations for disabilities or addressed art in the IEP, and only one teacher reported having a special course of study. Second, teachers are assuming that children with disabilities will be more successful with studio/production than with art history, art criticism, or aesthetics. Such an assumption severely limits the art education opportunities for many students. A student with a visual or spatial learning disability or a student with limited motor function, for example, would be "handicapped" by an emphasis on studio. Third, there is the consideration of the "more capable" students. Students who are not experiencing disabilities, but are in these same classes, also receive
art instruction in an altered state. Fourth, and last, there is the consideration of equal educational opportunity. A different curriculum translates into a different educational opportunity, (see pages 8-10, 32-36) and limits both short and long term opportunities for students. Therefore it is imperative that curriculum and instruction be adapted on an individual basis, reflecting the individual needs and abilities of the student.

Understudy or Lead?

Question 4: What factors besides placement, teacher preparation, and curriculum affect the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities?

From experience, research, and word of mouth I knew that things beyond how kids are placed, how teachers are prepared, and what content they teach affect instruction. Ferreting out those factors was therefore essential; several were identified:

1. **Age range, ability, and numbers of students taught**

   When a teacher wrote that she teaches 1800 students I was flabbergasted. Such a task would require a mastery of illusion rather than instruction. Student assessment and sequential curriculum development would be fantasy and, for the seventy-five students experiencing a wide range of disabilities, adapted instruction a dream. Unfortunately,
although this case is extreme, many art teachers suffer under similarly outrageous expectations. Responsibility for more than seven hundred students is not uncommon. The demands are increased by the range of disabilities represented in those numbers. A substantial majority of buildings have two or more different kinds of special education classes. In addition, few teachers have the luxury of teaching a narrow age range of students. The K-6 range is most prevalent, however one-fourth of the art teachers must bridge grade gaps from primary to middle school and some even from kindergarten to grade twelve. The challenge of constantly shifting curricular and instructional gears must be all consuming. Until realistic expectations are made of art teachers, in terms of numbers and age range of students taught, it is inevitable that some children will be lost in the race.

2. Planning time

To aggravate the problems of multiple ages, multiple abilities, and multiple plans, less than half the art teachers get the state required minimum planning time. Many of the ones who do complain say the minutes are so chopped up that they are rendered virtually useless. In any case, forty minutes a day is only a drop in the bucket to a teacher planning for 700 students of all ages and abilities. In order to meet the preparation needs for large numbers of
students and a varied curriculum, it is essential that art teachers have blocks of time to plan, and that the time scheduled be at least the state minimum required time.

3. **Instructional environment**

   At the elementary level, many are itinerant art teachers who serve more than one building. Because they lack permanency in a building, these teachers frequently have to teach in the students' own classrooms or in preempted spaces such as cafeterias and gymnasiums. When children experiencing disabilities are scheduled into one of these classes for art, integration becomes more difficult. Teachers report that students experiencing disabilities often have to sit at tables in the back of the room, on the floor, or at desks which are brought in for this purpose. In such settings it is difficult to socially integrate the students and physical integration is nearly impossible. The students experiencing disabilities are interlopers on the other students' turf. The additional bodies complicate the logistics of instruction and limit student and teacher options. It is important that instruction take place in an environment which accommodates the physical needs of the students as well as the implementation of quality lessons.

4. **Placement patterns**

   It seems that sending an eight year old student into the third grade classroom for art should not be a big deal.
However in the majority of cases, it is not one child but groups and entire classes of children. Over one-fourth of the schools "mainstream" entire classes of students experiencing disabilities and two-fifths "mainstream" by small groups. Even in neutral territory like an art room, such practices limit instruction. Requiring an art teacher to plan and implement instruction for a classroom of children which includes an entire special education unit and an entire elementary class as subsets is unreasonable. Despite such problems, the practice continues along with a pattern of placement which combines classrooms of students experiencing disabilities for art instruction. Not only do these practices violate my sensibilities as an educator, they also violate the state rules and regulations. How an IEP team, or principal, can rationalize grouping 18 students experiencing multihandicaps together for art, when the regulations require a multihandicapped classroom be limited to eight students, a teacher, and an aide is beyond my comprehension. But this has happened in Ohio. These illegal and educationally unsound placement practices must be halted.

5. **Instructional support**

Once teachers find themselves besieged by students and trapped in the placement and mainstreaming maze, they often discover that their life-line has also been cut.
Instructional support is often superficial, inadequate, or in many cases nonexistent. Only a handful of districts provide adapted materials, equipment and courses of study although these items are readily available in special education classrooms. Art teachers primarily depend on school psychologists, guidance counselors, and classroom aides for assistance with instructional problems. However these individuals may have little or no classroom teaching experience or knowledge of art. Special education teachers are available for help only a little over one-fourth of the time. The other troublesome bit of information is that art teachers make little use of the Special Education Regional Resource Centers. Art teachers report that SERRC materials on art are limited, which is true because in reality there are few decent materials available. However, these centers are staffed by individuals who are expert in the identification and instruction of children experiencing disabilities, house special education libraries, regularly offer courses, and exist for the purpose of providing technical assistance to parents and teachers of children experiencing disabilities. Art teachers must be more assertive about their needs and in seeking solutions.

6. Instructional materials and strategies

Art teachers seem to limit themselves in other ways, too. The range of instructional materials used is quite
narrow, and the use of varied instructional strategies restricted. In classrooms in which they report a broad spectrum of abilities, teachers base instruction primarily on art production materials, art books, and reproductions. More than half confine themselves, and their students, to two or fewer teaching strategies, and some teachers say they do not use any at all! Computer instruction, which has helped pave significant inroads in special education as well as in art education, is barely used. Teachers continue to use techniques and materials employed twenty years ago in my bumbling efforts to teach art. Whether such practices are the result of poor motivation or inadequate preparation programs, they affect the instruction of students experiencing disabilities. A student whose arsenal of learning styles is already reduced may be additionally "disabled" by a teacher who employs only one mode of instruction and uses one kind of instructional material. Teachers must expand their knowledge of instructional strategies and materials in order to broaden the educational opportunities of their students.

7. Peer Acceptance

Although children experiencing orthopedic disabilities, hearing disabilities, and learning disabilities are fairly well accepted by their peers, children experiencing developmental disabilities are only
accepted about half the time, and those experiencing multiple or behavioral disabilities only one-third of the time. Acceptance could affect ease of integration in the classroom and the success of teaching strategies, such as small group instruction and cooperative learning groups. In fact teachers report that children experiencing orthopedic disabilities are not only well accepted, but are also cooperative and easy to integrate while those experiencing multiple and behavioral disabilities are far less cooperative and are more difficult to integrate. IEP teams and art teachers must examine placement patterns, teaching environment, and curriculum and instruction to determine how these factors might influence peer acceptance (see pages 14-15).

It is clear from the data that many factors interact to affect the instruction of children experiencing disabilities. Class size and age range, number of students experiencing disabilities, planning time, physical space, placement patterns, peer acceptance, and instructional support, strategies, and materials all play a major role along with placement decisions, teacher preparation, and curriculum in the art instruction of children.
Question 5: What are the critical issues that need to be addressed and further researched in art education for children experiencing disabilities and the art teachers who are teaching them?

Data collected in response to the first four questions raised numerous issues and concerns about the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities. Based on this information, my personal experience, and research in the arts and in education, I am making ten recommendations which encompass the areas previously identified by music educators: teacher education, involvement in placement decisions, and instructional support.

Teacher Education. Teachers must be better prepared to instruct students with a wide range of abilities. This study has shown that art teachers lack knowledge about the identification and placement policies in their schools affecting children experiencing disabilities. They are limited in their use of instructional strategies, materials, and resources. They adjust curriculum or make judgements for children based on handicapped identification rather than on individual ability or achievement, and they do so without guidelines. Teachers also lack both preservice and inservice opportunities to develop the necessary skills, strategies, and knowledge for the instruction of children.
experiencing disabilities. Therefore I recommend that:

1. course work addressing the diversity of the student population, including students experiencing disabilities, be required for teacher certification and recertification in the visual arts;
2. the State Arts Advisory Committee, the Ohio Art Education Association, and the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education support a course requirement and make recommendations to the State Board of Education to that effect;
3. inservice or continuing education courses addressing the diversity of the student population, including students experiencing disabilities, be made available through the sixteen regional Special Education Regional Resource Centers in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education and local colleges and universities, with priority given to cooperating and supervising teachers;
4. art education programs in teacher training institutions develop course work addressing the diversity of the student population, including students experiencing disabilities;
5. supportive materials for preservice and inservice courses be developed including text books and instructional videos; 6. criteria for identification of quality instruction of children experiencing disabilities be established and exemplary teachers identified; and
7. Research on how to facilitate transfer of content knowledge to practical or pedagogical knowledge be continued and effective models of instruction developed.

Teacher education is the most critical area affecting the art instruction of children experiencing disabilities. It is essential that certification requirements be changed to include course work addressing student diversity. The support of arts education committees and professional organizations can help facilitate this change due to their advisory status with the Department of Education and their political connections within the state legislature (see pages 42-45). This change alone, however, is not enough. Preservice and inservice courses must be developed around successful models of instruction, such as the University of Chicago/Columbia Model (see pages 41-42), and be based on specified criteria, such as that developed by the Warnock Committee (see pages 40-41), and current research in teaching and learning to teach (see pages 40-43). It is imperative that cooperating and supervising teachers be among the first to receive continuing education and inservice because of their instrumental role in shaping future teachers (see page 41). Recognition of this role in various reform movements is the first step (see pages 37-38).

In order to provide this essential course work,
partnership efforts are needed. Art Education departments frequently do not have faculty with the experience and knowledge needed to develop such courses. In addition, adding new courses to a program requires a great deal of time and effort. However, special education departments and education departments offer basic courses on handicapping conditions and mainstreaming, which could be opened to art education majors. The faculty from these departments could then assist art education faculty in planning ways to integrate a continued discussion of students experiencing disabilities into the existing program. SERRC workshops, such as "experiencing handicapping conditions", and guest speakers could be used to provide awareness activities.

For inservice and continuing education courses, a solid structure already exists. The Special Education Regional Resource Centers operate under the umbrella of the Division of Special Education and could be directed to provide, in coordination with the Arts for Handicapped Consultant, the needed course work. Many SERRCs currently coordinate with area universities and colleges to provide college credit as well as continuing education units. With the sixteen sites spread around the state, courses could be accessible to more teachers by offering SERRC coordinated courses at the SERRC, at colleges and universities, and within school districts.

A difficulty in providing the courses is the paucity of
quality resource and instructional materials in art education related to students experiencing disabilities. Texts must be written to provide information to teachers within an art education context. Criteria for identification of exemplary practices must be developed and teachers identified to be used in the production of instructional video tapes. In the meantime, a collection of useful material could be gathered by carefully picking and choosing among the existing articles and gleaning pertinent passages from the books. In addition books such as Horn's *History of Special Education in Ohio, 1803-1985* (1986), Orlansky and Heward's *Voices* (1981), Gardner's *Frames of Mind* (1983), and Polloway, Patton, Payne, and Payne's *Strategies for Teaching Learners with Special Needs* (1989), could be used to supplement instruction.

Teacher education programs cannot become stagnant and must respond to research and reality. If art teachers develop knowledge of special education history, rules, and policies, awareness of least restrictive environment and placement options, awareness of disabilities and the students experiencing them, methods of assessment, a portfolio of instructional strategies and materials, techniques for adaptation, and are on-line to available resources, they will be able to regain control of their programs and the educational opportunities they provide.
their students.

Instructional Support and Involvement in Placement Decisions. Although teacher education and knowledgeable teachers are the backbone of quality instruction, school and administrative policy can support or crack that back. Art teachers must be included in placement decisions for art involving children with disabilities and must also have adequate instructional support. In order to change current practice, I also recommend that:

8. informational updates be sent to art teachers and principals by the Ohio Department of Education Division of Special Education clarifying least restrictive environment rules as they pertain to arts classes and listing the location and phone numbers of the sixteen resource centers;

9. the Ohio Art Education Association brochure on basic and quality programs address planning time, instructional environment, and student load, as well as involvement in placement decisions; and

10. assessments, separate from those currently used to determine disabilities, must be developed for visual art and research on learning styles, modes of intelligence, and learning through the arts be continued and analyzed for potential impact on art placement, instruction and curriculum.

With luck, the State Board and legislature will have
the wisdom to require course work addressing students experiencing disabilities for all educators. However, until that time there are mechanisms in place to educate and update administrators and other educators. The Department of Education puts out reams of publications, updates, and newsletters. Many, I know, land in the round file. But there are two methods of communication that draw the attention of administrators. One is the annual packet of information distributed at the beginning of the school year, which includes the current year's buzz words and forms; the other is anything mailed from special education, because of their purse-string power. Information and guidelines for least restrictive environment and art classes and the availability of instructional assistance from the SERRC could easily be included in one of these communication vehicles. A joint mailing from the art consultant and the arts for handicapped consultant to art teachers would assure that the information reaches all the necessary parties. An additional source of information can come from the Ohio Art Education Association publication on basic and quality programs. The intent of this document is to provide art teachers and administrators with standards by which they can assess and develop their art program. The inclusion of information on student load, instructional environment, planning time, and involvement with placement decisions
could work to reinforce state department and inservice efforts.

Meaningful involvement in placement decisions will require more than an invitation to contribute information or to attend meetings. Art teachers must be able to identify requisite skills for each level of their program in order to provide the placement team with guidelines. Art teachers who have developed such skill lists have discovered that special education teachers and placement teams find them both informative and helpful. However, these team members must still depend on their team evaluation of the student to determine placement needs. Assessments must be developed to identify ability in the arts separate from those used to currently identify educational disability. Arts educators cannot assume that a disability in learning math translates into a disability in learning art. Research from Project Zero at Harvard (see pages 32, 36) must be continued and analyzed, along with other research on learning styles and assessment in the arts, for impact on the assessment and instruction of students experiencing disabilities.

Even the most experienced and knowledgeable art teachers cannot provide quality instruction to children experiencing disabilities without having a say about what, how, when, and where that instruction takes place, without instructional support, and without research upon which to
base instruction.

A Final Note

According to the Ohio art teachers in this study, there are many factors affecting the instruction of K-8 students experiencing disabilities. Art teachers have little input into placement decisions, minimal knowledge about the instruction of students experiencing disabilities, and few opportunities to gain such information. They teach large and varied numbers of children with limited instructional support, planning time, and instructional space. This very lack of knowledge, instructional support, and involvement often leads to different educational opportunities for students with disabilities. PL 94-142 was an attempt at equalizing opportunities for all students and was seen as a means for students experiencing disabilities to achieve normalized lives. However, as long as students receive limited educational opportunities, based solely on their identification as "handicapped", Wolfensberger’s ideal is far from being achieved.

Art educators alone cannot change the sociopolitical or educational structures of our nation. But we can change or improve our practices so that our role in those structures does not contribute to the continuation of poor practice. The current alliance of state educational organizations,
support from the Ohio Department of Education and Ohio Arts Council, and efforts to upgrade teacher preparation programs create a climate for change. Suggested models of instruction and syllabi for teacher preparation exist in educational literature. Research is underway on modes of intelligence, assessment, and learning through the arts. However it will take a partnership effort by school districts, teacher training institutions, and the Department of Education, on-going advocacy by the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education, the Ohio Art Education Association, the State Arts Advisory Committee, and the Ohio Citizens Committee for the Arts, continued research and study of teaching and learning by educational and arts educational researchers, and a choral cry from the teachers to make the necessary changes. With a concerted effort, art instruction for children experiencing disabilities can move from the realm of "social construction work" to the purview of meaningful and effective educational practice.
APPENDIX A

1706 Andover Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212
April 15, 1991

Dear Colleague:

During my tenure as Arts for Handicapped Consultant with the Ohio Department of Education I became increasingly aware of special education initiatives and their effect on art teachers and art instruction.

As special education responds to renewed initiatives for increased inclusion of children with disabilities in regular education, it becomes paramount that we examine our art programs and our ability to serve these children.

Since Public Law 94-142 was enacted fifteen years ago, children with disabilities have been in our classrooms. However, there is little existing data describing what 94-142 has meant in terms of art programs, art teachers, and children with disabilities.

This study is a beginning. My intent is to collect data on current practice in instruction and placement of children with disabilities in K-8 art classes in Ohio. The data will then be used to make recommendations to the Ohio Department of Education, school districts, arts organizations, and colleges and universities. In addition, the data will be analyzed to define issues for future research.
Through your participation in this study, we have an opportunity to affect our destiny and make a difference. The completed survey may be returned in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Susan W. Witten
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN ART EDUCATION
FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

This survey is part of a dissertation study which seeks to identify current practices in the placement and instruction of children with disabilities in visual art classes in Ohio. Participants have been randomly selected from K-8 art teachers who teach in school districts with at least one special education unit; respondents will remain anonymous. Please answer all questions as completely and concisely as possible; space is also available for additional comments. Thank you for your assistance.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please fill in the blanks, check, or circle the appropriate response(s).

1. Highest degree obtained (check one):
   ___ Bachelor's degree
   ___ Master's degree
   ___ Doctorate

2. Year highest degree received: 19

3. Number of years you have taught art: ___

4. Total number of years you have taught: ___

5. Other subjects taught (please specify): __________________

6. Grade level(s) currently teaching (circle all that apply): pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12

7. Total number of students you currently teach: ______

8. Types of special education classes in building (check all that apply):
   ___ Developmentally Handicapped (DH)
   ___ Hearing Handicapped (HH)
   ___ Multihandicapped (MH)
   ___ Orthopedically and/or Other Health Handicapped (OH)
   (list continued on next page)
Severe Behavior Handicapped (SBH)
Specific Learning Disabled (SLD)(LD)
Visually Handicapped (VH)
No special education classes
Yes, there are classes but I’m not sure which ones

9. Total number of special education students you currently teach: __________

10. Location in which you teach (check all that apply):
    __cafetera
    __classrooms
    __designated art room
    __gymnasium
    __other (please specify): _________________________________

11. Type of school in which you teach (check all that apply):
    __K-3 __K-4 __K-5 __K-6 __K-8 __5-6
    __6-8 __7-8 __7-9 __urban __suburban __small town
    __rural __other (please specify): _________________________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

DIRECTIONS: The questions below are about your art education program. Please fill in the blanks and check all the answers that apply.

12. Number of classes taught per five day week: __________

13. Average number of students per class: ____________

14. Planning time per week: _____ officially scheduled _____ actual

15. Please check the curricular areas you address in regular art classes and the estimated percentage of time devoted to each:
    __aesthetics _0% _10% _20% _30% _40% _50% _60% _70%
    _80% _90% _100%
    (list continued on next page)
16. Please check the curricular areas you address in art classes with mainstreamed special education students and the estimated percentage of time devoted to each:

_aesthetics_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_art history_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_criticism_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_studio/ production_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_other (please specify): ________________________________________

_0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

17. Please check the curricular areas you address in special/separate art classes special education students and the estimated percentage of time devoted to each:

_aesthetics_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_art history_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_criticism_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_studio/ production_ __0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

_other (please specify): ________________________________________

_0%__ 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

(list continued on next page)
18. Please check the materials that you regularly use for instruction:

- Art production supplies (paint, clay, fibers, etc.)
- Audio tapes
- Books about art or artists
- Computer programs
- Film strips
- Journal articles
- Museum slides
- Movies
- Outlines and other hand-outs
- Overhead transparencies
- Reproductions (postcards, posters, and prints)
- Professionally packaged slides
- Teacher-made slides
- Textbooks
- Video tapes
- Other (please specify): __________________________

19. Please check the kinds of instructional support that are available to help you meet the instructional needs of special education students:

- Adapted equipment
- Adapted materials (i.e. large type books, audio tapes)
- Art or curriculum supervisor with knowledge of special needs
- Classroom aide
- Course of study with section on adaptations
- Guidance counselor
- Integration specialist
- Intervention assistance or building level teams
- School administrator with knowledge of special needs
- School psychologist
- SERRE (special education regional resource center)
- Special education art course of study
- Special education teacher consultation
- Supplemental service teacher
- Volunteers
- Written guidelines from the IEP team or special education teacher
- Other (please specify): __________________________
- None of the above
TEACHER PREPARATION

DIRECTIONS: The questions below are about your preparation to teach children with disabilities. Please fill in the blanks and check all the answers that apply.

20. Please check all instructional strategies you employ in classes which include special education students:
   __buddy system
   __computerized instruction
   __cooperative learning groups
   __individualized instruction
   __peer tutoring
   __small group instruction
   __other (please specify): _______________________________________
   __none of the above

21. Please check the types of university courses you have taken in preparation to teach children with disabilities and indicate whether the course was required or elective:
   __art education course on special populations
      __elective  __required
   __art education methods course incorporating methods
      for special populations
      __elective  __required
   __art therapy course(s)
      __elective  __required
   __field placement with special populations
      __elective  __required
   __field placement which included time spent with
      special populations
      __elective  __required
   __special education course
      __elective  __required

   (list continued on next page)
__student teaching at school with special education
students
  __elective __required
__other (please specify): __________________________
  __elective __required
__no courses addressing students with disabilities

22. Please list the number of inservice sessions and
workshops you have attended in the past three years to
assist you in the instruction of children with
disabilities:
___ home school
___ district-wide
___ county-wide
___ regional
___ state-wide
___ other (please specify): __________________________
___ none

23. Please check any of the topics below which were included
in either preservice or inservice classes or workshops
you have attended pertaining to children with
disabilities:
__ assessment
__ classroom management
__ development of placement criteria
__ development of teaching objectives
__ IEP (individualized education program)
__ inclusion
__ information about different disabilities
__ instructional adaptations
__ least restrictive environment
__ learning styles
__ mainstreaming
__ Public Law 94-142
__ role of art in education
__ role of art in special education
__ role of art teacher in IEP and placement
__ other (please specify): __________________________
__ does not apply

24. Please check additional experiences you have had to
prepare you for the instruction of children with
disabilities:
__ disabled friend or family member

(list continues on next page)
friendship with a special education teacher
observing special education classroom
Special Olympics volunteer
Very Special Arts volunteer
other volunteer work (please specify): ________________
other (please specify): ______________________________
none

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

PLACEMENT DECISIONS

DIRECTIONS: The questions below address placement decisions for special education students. Please fill in the blanks and check all that apply.

25. The IEP and subsequent decisions about regular and special education placement are made by a team of teachers, administrators, parents, and others as necessary. Please check the persons who make decisions affecting placement in art classes in your school:
  __art supervisor
  __art teacher
  __assistant principal
  __assistant superintendent
  __child
  __guidance counselor
  __parent
  __principal
  __psychologist
  __regular education teacher
  __social worker
  __special education supervisor
  __special education teacher
  __superintendent
  __therapist
  __other, (please specify): ______________________________
  __I don’t know

26. Please check any of the following ways in which you are involved in art class placement decisions:
  __attend IEP meetings
  __fill out evaluation check-list for art

  (list continued on next page)
fill out evaluation check-list for basic skills
meet with the special education teacher
verbal communication with IEP team members about the goals and objectives of the art program
written communication with IEP team members about the goals and objectives of the art program
written progress reports
other (please specify): ________________________________
no involvement

27. Please check any criteria used by the IEP team to make placement decisions regarding special education students in art classes and specify information where requested:
academic ability
age
all (specify disability) ________________ students
automatically mainstreamed into art
all (specify disability) ________________ students
automatically placed in special art class
artistic ability
artistic achievement
behavior
grade level
motor skills
physical needs
social needs
student schedule
special education teacher schedule
other (please specify): ________________________________
I don’t know

28. Please check the art class placement options available for students with disabilities in your building:
full time regular art class (mainstreaming)
full time special art class (separate class)
full time regular art class with additional special class for individualized or remedial instruction
full time regular art class with instructional aide
full time regular art class with volunteer assistant
other (please specify): ________________________________

29. The lists below contain the kinds of special education classes you may have in your building. Please check which of these special education students are taught in the art class options (mixed option includes students who take both regular and special art classes and classes with assistants):
(list is on the following page)
Special Educ. Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH (Developmentally Disabled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH (Hearing Handicapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD (SLD) (Specific Learning Disabled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH (Multihandicapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (Orthopedically Handicapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (Other Health Impaired)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH (Severe Behavior Handicapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH (Visually Handicapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Please list any special education classes or students that do not get art instruction in your building:

31. The list below describes placement patterns in relationship to art class size. Please check all that apply:

- regular education students are placed in classes with special education students (reverse mainstreaming)
- special/separate art classes contain only one class of special education students at a time
- special/separate art classes contain two or more classes of special education students at one time
- special education students are mainstreamed as an entire class with an entire regular education class
- special education students are mainstreamed individually into regular art classes
- special education students are mainstreamed in small groups (2-3) into regular art classes
- special education classes are paired with regular education classes with part of each group attending art class together

32. The list below contains characteristics which may apply to special education students who are mainstreamed into regular art classes. Please check any characteristics which may generally apply to each of the listed disability groups as identified above:

(list is on the following page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>HH</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>SBH</th>
<th>VH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accepted by peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to meet course objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to meet objectives with modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easily integrated into art class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignored by peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs much assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teased by peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to meet objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be better served in special art class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Thank you for your help with this study.
Please mail the completed survey in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

You may contact me at the address or phone number listed on the cover letter if you have questions, would like a copy of the survey results, or would be willing to participate in future studies.

Thank you.

Susan Witten
APPENDIX C

PHONE SCRIPT:

HELLO. THIS IS SUSAN WITTEN FROM THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY. I HAVE SOME INFORMATION TO SEND OUT AND NEED TO KNOW IF YOU HAVE BOTH AN ART TEACHER AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSES IN YOUR BUILDING. ........................THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago you received a survey on current practice in art education for children with disabilities. If you did not complete and return the survey, I urge you to do so now. I have enclosed an additional form for your convenience.

During my tenure as Arts for Handicapped Consultant with the Ohio Department of Education I became increasingly aware of special education initiatives and their effect on art teachers and art instruction.

As special education responds to renewed initiatives for increased inclusion of children with disabilities in regular education, it becomes paramount that we examine our art programs and our ability to serve these children.

Since Public Law 94-142 was enacted fifteen years ago, children with disabilities have been in our classrooms. However, there is little existing data describing what 94-142 has meant in terms of art programs, art teachers, and children with disabilities.

This study is a beginning. My intent is to collect data on current practice in instruction and placement of children with disabilities in K-8 art classes in Ohio. The data will then be used to make recommendations to the Ohio Department of Education, school districts, arts organizations, and colleges and universities. In addition, the data will be analyzed to define issues for future research.
With your participation in this study, we have an opportunity to affect our future and make a difference. The completed survey may be returned in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Thank you for your prompt response.

Sincerely,

Susan W. Witten
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
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