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INTRODUCTION

A current trend in the field of special education is to return the special student to the regular classroom. Inconsistent with this emphasis on integration is the absence of teacher-training in methods for effectively managing students who exhibit behaviors which are disruptive to the educational process. In addition, the typical general education teacher is not equipped with the skills or resources needed for the preparation of programmed materials, which are necessary for successful individualized instruction. The result of this situation can be ineffective management of students and student failure due to inappropriate materials.

A teacher-training program focusing on behavioral management techniques and programmed instruction could provide the teacher with those skills necessary to establish an effectively managed individualized program. This would enable her or him to more adequately accommodate a special education student coming into the classroom. Furthermore, the teacher would be in a better position to retain the 'problem' student in the regular class rather than referring that student to a special education classroom.

Researchers concerned with the problem of maintaining effects produced in treatment settings have suggested the training of social agents within natural settings to carry out behavioral interventions (Hartmann, 1970; Patterson and Brodshy, 1966; Patterson, Cobb and
Ray, 1973). Social agents (e.g., peers, parents, teachers) who are 'naturally' in control of reinforcers and punishers can be trained to effect and maintain change due to their natural and continuing proximity to the target subjects. Tharp and Wetzel (1969) formalized a triadic model whereby the experimenter trained a mediator (e.g., teacher, parent, peer) to implement behavioral programs with specific target subjects. With such an intervention model it is not necessary for the experimenter to have contact with the target subject or population since treatment is implemented and monitored by the trained mediator.

The triadic model has been used in the training of teachers to effect behavioral changes efficiently in their classrooms. Teachers have been trained to eliminate isolate play behaviors (Allen, Hart, Buell, Harris, and Wolf, 1964), increase attending and academic behaviors (Brinbrauer and Lawler, 1964; Broden, Bruce, Mitchel, Carter and Hall, 1970), decrease disruptive classroom behaviors (Hall, Panyan, Babon, and Broden, 1968; Becker, Madsen, Arnold, Thomas, 1966), and increase instruction-following behaviors (Schutte and Hopkins, 1970).

Peers and peer groups have been taught to use behavior management techniques to effect the behavior of their classmates or siblings (Packard, 1970; Patterson and Anderson, 1964; Surratt, Ulrich and Hawkins, 1969; Greenwood, Sloan, Howard, and Baskin, 1974). Phillips, Wolf and Fixen (1973) reported training a 'peer manager' to dispense and remove tokens contingent upon appropriate clean-up behaviors of individual subjects in a home for pre-delinquent boys.
Berkowitz and Graziano (1972) in an overview indicate that a variety of parent training approaches have been applied to virtually all child problem behavior, ranging from mild conduct to those labeled grossly psychotic and including mental retardation. Walder and his associates (Walder, Breiter, Cohen, Daston, Forbes and McIntire, 1956; Walder, Cohen and Daston, 1967; Walder, Cohen, Breiter, Warmen, Orne-Johnson and Pavey, 1971) described a fifteen week parent training program aimed at building operant-oriented family therapy. They developed programs to teach parents skills in the analysis of behavior and application of operant principles to parent-child relationship problems.

Within institutions, attendents (Ayllon and Azrin, 1968; Ayllon and Michael, 1959; Panyan, Boozer and Morris, 1970; Schoonmaker and Hitzing, 1971) and cottage parents (Clements and McKee, 1968) have been trained to apply the principles of behavioral technology. Aides were trained to increase appropriate behaviors of institutionalized mental retardates (Parsonson, Baer, and Baer, 1974).

Schoonmacker (1971) suggests that there have been three basic methodologies utilized to effect training programs: 1) within clinic settings, 2) group training situations, and 3) on-site training. Each of these methods has been used to train various populations. The within clinic method has been most extensively employed for training parents, while the group training and on-site methods have been used most frequently with attendents, child care workers, teachers, etc.
Individuals who request assistance generally comprise the population involved in within-clinic training. Professionals model the correct behavioral procedures for effecting change in those problem behaviors described by the trainees. The trainees then practice the application under supervision of the professional. Finally, they conduct the treatment procedure within their own environment. (Bernal, Duryee, Pruett, and Burns, 1968; Patterson, 1965; Straughn, 1964; Whaler, Winkel, Peterson and Morrison, 1965; Wolf, Mees and Risley, 1964). Over a series of visits to the clinic for training, combined with applications in the natural environment, the individuals may experience success in solving their problem through the use of behavior management techniques.

The second training method is that of group training (Galloway and Galloway, 1970; Holzschuh, 1967; Lindsley, 1966). This approach typically requires that individuals attend a series of formal training classes at a central location. There they are taught the fundamental procedures of behavior management: 1) define the problem, 2) measure the behavior, 3) consequate the behavior, and 4) assess the procedure. They are required to perform one or more behavior modification projects. The professional acts as a trainer and advisor. The individuals are expected to develop their own treatment plans from the information that they learn in the classroom.

The third method of training is that of direct, on-site intervention (Hawkins, Peterson, Schweid and Bijou, 1966; Patterson, McNeal, Hawkins, and Phelps, 1968; Patterson, Ray, and Shaw, 1969;
Peine, 1968; Wahler, 1969; Zeilberger, Sampsen, and Sloane, 1968). In general, this method attempts to provide both training and technical assistance within the environment the problem behavior is occurring. A professional assists individuals in developing behavior plans for target subjects. On-site training may also involve the individuals in formal classroom study while the professional is on-site.

Training programs in the principles and techniques of behavior modification are many and varied, as evidenced by the preceding papers. The purpose of the present paper is to discuss and evaluate a group, on-site workshop approach as a method of training teachers to utilize the principles of behavioral technology with their student populations. This paper describes a workshop conducted for school personnel in Muskegon County during the summer of 1974.
THE WORKSHOP

I. Introduction

In April of 1974 a proposal requesting funds to operate a teacher-training workshop, was submitted to the Muskegon County Special Education In-Service Committee. This committee allocates money from its yearly budget for special education in-service programs. The proposed workshop would involve training school personnel in Muskegon County to utilize behavioral technology. Eighteen participants would be paid a stipend of $15/day for fifteen days, the duration of the workshop. In addition, $500 was requested for supplies, which included: books, stop watches, golf counters, and student rewards. A total budget of approximately $5,000 was approved.

A participant could elect to take the workshop for the stipend or receive five hours of credit from Grand Valley State College. Due to Muskegon County Intermediate Board policy, it was not possible to receive a stipend and enroll in the workshop for credit.

Special education administrators in Muskegon County were contacted prior to the workshop for the purpose of securing lab placements for the workshop participants. A variety of classrooms in which the participants would have an opportunity to apply behavioral techniques, were obtained. The classrooms were populated by special education students who had been previously diagnosed as being: physically or otherwise health impaired, mentally impaired, learning
II. Workshop Format

The format for the workshop was drawn from two major areas: practical experience and seminars. The daily schedule provided for a morning lab experience and an afternoon seminar.

A. Practical Experience

Two elementary and two secondary summer school programs were selected as suitable for lab experiences. The secondary programs included: the Muskegon County Youth Home, a juvenile detention facility; and North Shore Center School, a school for adolescents who manifest serious behavior problems. The elementary rooms included children who had been labeled as having one of the previously mentioned disabilities. Every classroom was directly managed by a summer school teacher; therefore, the workshop members were not responsible for the mechanics of running a class.

The participants were scheduled to be involved in the lab experience from 8:00 until 12:00 each morning. A minimum of two hours daily was to be spent working directly with students. The remaining time was to be utilized in the preparation of materials and for completing the extensive reading assignments.

1 These classifications were assigned to the students at an Educational Planning and Placement Committee Meeting as per the guidelines of Mandatory Special Education Rules and Regulations in accordance with P.A. 198 of 1971 of Michigan.
The workshop members participated in the lab experiences in order to gain skills in three specific areas.

1. observation and data collection
2. preparing and initiating intervention plans
3. programming materials

The above skills were realized through the completion of a number of assignments. The participants began by observing in the classroom to pick out behaviors that would be disruptive to the smooth operation of that class. These behaviors were then defined in observable terms, as a prerequisite to the collection of baseline data. Each participant was responsible for establishing reliability with one other workshop member. Under close supervision by the workshop leaders, the participants prepared intervention plans for specific individuals or small groups. Intervention plans were divided into two main categories: behavioral and academic.

Participants practiced being more 'positive' with students, praising desired behaviors, ignoring undesirable behaviors, rewarding behaviors incompatible with those that were undesirable, and specifying reinforcement for individual children. They took data regularly on each other for practice and to give feedback on progress. Task analysis was an integral part of every intervention plan, whether behavioral or academic. Individual assistance was given for work in programming materials.

Supervision and assistance were provided at three of the four locations daily, but only intermittently at the fourth. The workshop
leaders answered questions, observed each person's progress, and modeled correct behavioral management techniques. Attendance at the three supervised settings was excellent, but attendance dropped off significantly at the unsupervised site. Data was not kept as to the exact attendance at the labs. However, the workshop leaders speculated that the lack of direct, daily supervision, assistance, and praise accounted for the attendance decrease.

B. Seminars

The Muskegon Intermediate School District served as the meeting place for the afternoon seminars, the duration of which was three hours daily. The following activities were scheduled during the seminars:

1. Lecture and discussion of readings - Extensive readings were assigned daily to the workshop participants. During the seminars these readings were thoroughly explained and discussed. Initially, a lecture to the whole group was presented explaining the theory. The lectures were presented with an emphasis on the generality of behavior principles to all human behavior. After questions regarding the theory had been answered, the group was divided into smaller units for further discussion.

2. Small group discussion of practical application and projects - In groups of three or four the participants discussed their specific lab experiences. Members sought suggestions and
comments on their intervention plans from others in their group. During this time they had an opportunity to discuss problems and successes of mutual interest. The workshop leaders sat in on these groups sporadically to check progress, and to see if the members understood the theory behind the application. In addition, during these discussions, each member had an opportunity to report on his or her self-modification project. This proved to be interesting and enjoyable, since the projects were quite inventive. Participants worked on everything from beer-drinking reduction to increasing affectionate responses in one's spouse.

3. Role playing - As a rule, before the workshop members began to try a new technique in the classrooms, they participated in role playing activities. For example, while learning how to take data accurately, they observed fellow-members role-playing certain classroom behaviors. They then had an opportunity to practice different recording techniques within their group. The utilization of video-taping was also planned. However, great difficulties were experienced in attempting to get the equipment to operate correctly. Therefore, the video-taping exercises were not completed.

4. Films, slides, speakers - The participants viewed films and slides presenting the theory of behavior modification and showing the use of behavioral techniques in applied settings.
In addition, a variety of speakers offered practical information regarding: Muskegon County Community Mental Health services, Muskegon County Special Education services, and procedures for setting up a contingency managed classroom.

5. Progress checks and participant evaluations - Four progress checks on the readings, lectures, and discussions were administered during the fifteen-day workshop. The progress checks served three functions: a) provided feedback on progress to the workshop participants, b) provided feedback to workshop leaders, c) increased the likelihood that the participants would read the assigned material.

III. Materials/Resources

During the planning stages of the workshop, it was decided that a variety of resources should be utilized in order to provide a stimulating and effective learning situation. These resources and materials can be divided into two general categories:

A. Audio-Visual

1. Films - Only two of the four films ordered arrived in time for the workshop. The first film, 'One Step at a Time', offered good examples of the practical application of behavioral principles. The second film, 'Who Did What to Whom', provided the participants an opportunity to observe and discuss various consequences of everyday interaction between individuals.
2. Slides - With the assistance of Dr. Wade Hitzing, Behavioral Resources, a slide presentation was developed, which included a review of basic behavior modification principles and examples of these principles being incorporated in applied settings.

3. Speakers - As previously stated, speakers were called upon to offer the workshop participants practical information which could be of value.

B. Readings


In addition to these, a number of other books were used as resources by the workshop leaders:


Mager, R. F., Preparing Instructional Objectives, California,

2. Articles - Two articles were read by the workshop participants:


Through the format just described, the participants were able to gain practical experience in the use of behavioral techniques, while acquiring knowledge in the theoretical aspects of that technology. These skills would then be applied in their own school settings upon return to school.
A four-month (Nov.) and a six-month (Jan.) follow-up seminar were held for the purpose of re-assembling the workshop participants after they had had an opportunity to apply the skills learned in the previous summer's workshop. The format for these sessions was very informal, meeting in the living room of one of the workshop leader's homes. Both follow-up sessions were held on a weekday from approximately 4:00 to 6:30 PM. There was no requirement that the participants attend nor did they receive any stipend for doing so. However, the workshop leaders did provide homemade soup, sandwiches and iced tea during these follow-up meetings.

The discussion during both seminars focused around the following themes: successes the participants were having in their classrooms, and practical problems they experienced in using behavior modification techniques in their school settings. The participants and workshop leaders offered suggestions and ideas to the group for alleviating certain problem areas and to improve existing programs.

The participants agreed that the one factor which made using behavior modification in their school settings easier was whether or not another member worked in the same building. Participants appreciated the support of another workshop member in their school settings. On the other hand, those who were alone in their schools, mentioned that they often felt stranded and misunderstood.
At the November meeting the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire indicating how much and in what ways they were employing behavior modification techniques in their schools. This information is depicted in Appendix I. It should be noted that after completing the questionnaire, a number of participants mentioned that they had not recorded all the behavioral techniques they were actually using.

The results indicate that most of the participants were employing behavioral techniques in their classrooms. They offered the following as examples of what they were doing: praising desired behaviors, using contracts, dispensing tokens, recording baselines, and clarifying rules. Many respondents indicated that they operated a more positive classroom environment. Few had read any books or articles relating to behavior management.

The workshop leaders felt that the follow-up seminars were valuable in the total scope of the training program. They provided the leaders with information concerning the amount participants employed behavior modification principles and techniques, as well as pointing out success and problem areas. These follow-up seminars also offered an opportunity for the workshop participants and leaders to meet on a social, informal level to discuss various aspects of behavior management. The response to the follow-up meetings was very positive.
EVALUATION

Evaluations of Participant Performance

Participant performance was measured by means of pre and post-tests, progress checks and follow-up observations. Pre and post-tests were utilized to assess two areas: general knowledge of the principles of behavior, and attitude change toward behavior modification. Two attitude checks were employed, The Semantic Differential and a scale that was developed by the workshop leaders specifically for the workshop. The progress checks offered an objective measure of the participant's comprehension of the material read and presented. In addition, they provided feedback to the workshop leaders, which was an assistance in determining areas of difficulty.

The knowledge test which was written by the workshop leaders, had thirty items (Appendix II). It incorporated the major principles of behavior that were stressed during the workshop. The pretest was administered the first day of the workshop, the post-test on the last day. Table 1 shows a comparison of mean pre and post-test scores for 25 full-time participants. The Walsh Test was applied to the sets of scores. The results obtained indicate that post-test scores are significantly greater than pretest scores at better than .005 level of significance. All participants made positive gains. The range of gains was 2-16 points.

The workshop leaders compiled a fifteen-item attitude survey on which one could receive a high score of 84 (see Appendix III). A
TABLE 1

A COMPARISON OF MEAN PRE AND POST-TEST SCORES AND MEAN SCORE CHANGE ON THE KNOWLEDGE TEST FOR 25 WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>+11.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High score suggests a positive attitude toward behavioral technology. However, there is no standardization for this test. Table 2 shows a comparison of pre and post-test scores as well as mean change for 22 of the workshop participants. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test was applied to the sets of scores. The results obtained indicate that the post-test scores are significantly greater than the pretest scores at the .005 level of significance. The majority of participants increased their post-test scores over their pre-test scores. There were two score decreases.

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF MEAN PRE AND POST-TEST SCORES AND MEAN SCORE CHANGE ON AN ATTITUDE SURVEY FOR 22 OF THE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, pre and post-tests of the Semantic Differential, a subjective attitude survey, were administered to assess attitudinal
change toward behavior modification. This technique was developed by Percy Tannenbaum, George Suci, and Charles Osgood. Extensive descriptions and evaluation of the Semantic Differential can be found in The Measurement of Meaning, Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum and Semantic Differential Technique: A Source Book, Snider, J., and Osgood.

Generally speaking, the Semantic Differential measures the emotional or affective meaning that we attach to words. The authors suggest that most of the emotional meaning attached to words falls into four dimensions: evaluation, potency, activity, and understanding. These dimensions were applied to the four words to which the participants were to respond; self, school, students, and behavior modification.

The chart in Appendix IV offers a visual representation of the results of the test. A t-test was applied to the pre and post-test scores. There was no significant change in the pre and post-test scores in the categories of self, school, and students. However, a significant change occurred in response to behavior modification.

Four progress checks, written by the workshop leaders, were given at intervals during the workshop. Table 3 depicts the mean percent for the progress checks.

TABLE 3
MEAN % SCORES OBTAINED BY WORKSHOP MEMBERS FOR FOUR PROGRESS CHECKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Check</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses on the progress checks suggested that the participants experienced the most difficulty with behavioral terms and definitions. On the other hand, they were capable of offering very good examples of behavioral principles, particularly, if these examples had been discussed in small groups. The participants expressed numerous complaints regarding the difficulty of the progress checks.
FOLLOW-UP OBSERVATIONS

Six-month follow-up observations were conducted on a random sample of 10 workshop participants in their school settings. The purpose of these observations was to evaluate the extent and proficiency with which behavior management techniques were being utilized.

The workshop leaders developed a survey sheet (Appendix V) for recording data during the observation. This survey sheet reflects items suggested by James M. Gardner in his training proficiency scale (Gardner, J.M. Training proficiency Scale, Manual, Columbus State Institute, Columbus, Ohio, 1969). For a period of two years prior to the follow-up observations, the two workshop leaders had participated in behavioral charting together. Their reliability approached 100%. Therefore, the two workshop leaders each observed five participants in the random sample. Each observation consisted of two hours in the school setting and one half hour for discussion with the participant.

The results of the follow-up observations are given in Table 4. The observations indicate that most people in the sample had created a positive environment in their setting. They were using reinforcement techniques correctly and had found effective rewards for their students. They also had developed some good techniques for ignoring disruptive behaviors. In addition, they were sharing their knowledge
of behavioral principles with other staff in their settings. Two had created a token economy in their classrooms, both were elementary teachers.

The elementary teachers in the sample all used primary reinforcers (cereal, sweet tarts, M&M's, koolaid...) with their students. All members of the sample used social reinforcers extensively. The following are examples of other rewards used: sitting at teacher's desk, sitting under teacher's desk, erasing board, handing out papers, going to office, operating audio-visual equipment, watering plants, sitting on teacher's lap, taking attendance, using calculator, bonus points (for grades), pencils, paper, field trips, assisting principal, special awards, smile patches, stars, special projects. Two members of the sample had signs up in the room as a reminder to reinforce the students.

Most members of the sample did not establish baselines and few kept data on students. However, they stressed that they would use these techniques if needed. They emphasized that through the creation of a positive environment, the use of reinforcement techniques, and the ignoring of undesirable behaviors, the whole management of their classroom changed dramatically for the better.

The workshop leaders found the survey form to be inadequate and would revise it before using again. The results did not reflect the extent to which the members of the sample implemented behavioral techniques. Also some ratings were not appropriate for the technique that was being rated.
TABLE 4
POST-EVALUATIVE SURVEY - N = 10 (RANDOM SAMPLE)

PURPOSE: To evaluate the extent and proficiency with which behavior management techniques are being utilized. What procedures do they actually use in the classroom.

INSTRUCTIONS: For each item rate the participant on a 5-point scale. 0 - Does not apply, 1-Never, 2 - Seldom, 3 - Sometimes, 4 - Generally, 5 - Always. Include comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strategy Used</th>
<th>Frequency Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Uses positive reinforcement</td>
<td>1  2  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Finds effective rewards</td>
<td>1  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learning environment conducive for positive reinforcement.</td>
<td>3  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gives reinforcement correctly.</td>
<td>2  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Withholds reinforcement correctly.</td>
<td>1  6  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Shares knowledge of behavioral principles with staff.</td>
<td>3  2  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Appropriately ignores undesirable behavior.</td>
<td>3  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Defines behavior to be changed in behavioral terms</td>
<td>3  1  3  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Keeps graphs or records of behavior.</td>
<td>1  2  4  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Uses behavioral contracting with students.</td>
<td>1  3  3  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>(If applicable) Pairs social and primary rewards</td>
<td>4  1  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Establishes baselines.</td>
<td>6  1  1  2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FREQUENCY USED 5 10 7 21 32 46
Evaluation of Workshop by Participants

A measure of workshop effectiveness involved a written evaluation of the workshop by the participants. This evaluation was a revised form of that employed by Schoonmaker (1971) for use during a workshop for staff working with retarded populations. On the final day of class, the participants were asked to evaluate each facet of the workshop.

This evaluation required three types of responses: a rating of seven questions on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best), which expressed the participant's views regarding the workshop in general (Table 5); the second asked for responses to four open-ended questions (Table 6); and finally, a rating of 11 workshop features, based on a numerical scale of 1 (negative response) to 10 (positive response) (Table 7).

As can be seen in Table 5, the Workshop was well-received by the participants, who found it to be worthwhile, interesting and informative. The participants would definitely recommend the workshop to others even though some did not consider the workshop well organized.

Most workshop features received very favorable ratings (Table 6). Although there were many complaints regarding the extensiveness of the readings and the difficulty of the progress checks, the majority of the participants responded favorably to these on the evaluation.

The open-ended section (Table 7) requested responses to four questions. Most responded that they considered the practical experience the best workshop feature, and least liked certain guest speakers.
The participants suggested that the time of the workshop be increased and that follow-up workshops be offered, as a means of making the workshop more effective. Most participants felt that they would be more positive and consistent with students as a result of the workshop.
### TABLE 5
RESPONSES BY PERCENT TO THE NUMERICALLY-RATED SECTION FOR THE WORKSHOP
GENERAL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,2</th>
<th>3,4</th>
<th>5,6</th>
<th>7,8</th>
<th>9,10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Short</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Clear, Has Application</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Recommend to Others</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worthless
Too Long
Boring
Provided no information
Content Unclear, No Application
Would not Recommend to Others
Unorganized
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,2</th>
<th>3,4</th>
<th>5,6</th>
<th>7,8</th>
<th>9,10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide Presentation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Experience</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Checks</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Data</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Project</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Leaders</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker B</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker D</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

MOST FREQUENT RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS OF THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What did you like best about the workshop?</td>
<td>Practical experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What did you like least about the workshop?</td>
<td>Certain Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How could a workshop of this type be more effective?</td>
<td>Offer a follow-up workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the time (length)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you think your behavior as a teacher will change as a result of this workshop?</td>
<td>More positive and consistent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

This paper has described a workshop approach to training school personnel in behavioral techniques. The participants were involved in a fifteen-day, on-site training program, which afforded them an opportunity to apply new techniques in a classroom setting. This aspect of the workshop proved to be extremely beneficial, since abstract principles could be tested and practiced while being learned.

Providing participants with an opportunity to reconvene after the workshop ended was met with a positive response by those involved. Many participants were lone users of behavior modification in schools that did not value this technique. They appreciated the support from others in the group. Participants were able to use these meetings as a sounding board for their new behavior plans.

Another feature of the program which, if possible, should be included in similar workshops is the use of a quantitative reinforcement for workshop attendance. As mentioned earlier, participants could receive a stipend of fifteen dollars a day or college credit. One could have also elected to attend without a stipend or credit. Table 8 shows the attendance pattern for the participants. This data makes it quite clear that a person continued in the workshop if he or she received some compensation for time expended. Only three of the sixteen who attended the workshop without credit or stipend completed the program.
TABLE 8
ATTENDENCE PATTERN FOR THE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stipend</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance problems occurred at the unsupervised morning lab site. The participants at this site never missed an afternoon seminar, which were always supervised. If all lab locations cannot be adequately supervised, then the number of locations should be reduced.

There were other facets of the workshop which could fall under a heading of problem areas. Although the participants worked with students during the workshop, they were working in another person's classroom. A better arrangement would have allowed for the workshop to be held during the school year so that participants could work with their own classes while taking the course. This also would have eliminated the additional problems associated with fitting the workshop into the already existing structure of a summer school program. In some cases it was difficult to maintain continuity of programming. For instance, a participant working with a small group of students walked in one morning to find that the catalytic group member had been transferred to another class.
During the course of the workshop, many participants indicated that there was not enough time to complete the extensive reading assignments, and that they were experiencing difficulty in understanding some of the technical concepts. Additional time would have indeed eliminated some of the complaints, as many were justified. There would also have been more opportunities to cover difficult material. The materials for the workshop were selected based upon the knowledge that all of the participants were college graduates. However, the levels of competency within the group were wider than anticipated. An example of an unexpected problem area occurred while learning how to compute reliability. Some of the participants were unable to compute a simple percent.

The data presented suggests that the workshop participants were able to learn the theory and methods taught. In addition they implemented new programs in their own school settings based upon the behavior modification principles which they had learned.

Plans for future workshops of this type would include a twenty day program (two times a week for ten weeks) during the school year. The number of schools which could take part in the program would be limited to ensure that two or more participants were involved from an individual school. Finally, reinforcement, be it stipend or credit, would be strictly contingent upon attendance and quality of work.
APPENDIX I

POST WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE (N = 15)

1. USED BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION IN SCHOOL SINCE WORKSHOP.
   Yes: 12   No: 2   No Response: 1

2. NUMBER OF SITUATIONS REPORTEDLY USED (Spaces for 5 ex.)
   2, 2, 4, 4, 5, 4, 3, 2, 4, 2, 1, 3, 2, 4  Average - 3

3. KINDS OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT USED
   a. (6) Lots of praise - praising specific behaviors
      Use of Fruit Loops with kindergarten students who
      were studying
      Rule clarification - writing 4 rules on board each day
      Specifying payoff - when you write the paragraph you
      get 25 points.
   b. (5) Individual contract to improve bus behavior, to bring
      lunch, to decrease loud talk
      Individual and class contract for better use of free time.
   c. (4) Tokens for desirable student behavior - homework, good
      work, good behavior
   d. (4) More behavioral observations,
      Have others recording baseline
      (3) Reinforce positive behavior in students -
      studying, paying attention, hand raising
   e. (4) Reinforcement activities for positive behavior
      glass blowing for good class attention
free time for quiet study behavior
special reading area for finished work

(1) Wall chart to display progress
f. (3) Consistent in ignoring bad behavior
to improve getting lessons in on time
to improve class behavior
time out area in classroom
g. (1) Better listener

4. LIST BOOKS OR ARTICLES READ HAVING TO DO WITH BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT

Psychology Today (2) Parents are Teachers (1)
P.E.T. (3) Journal articles (1)
How to be your own Best Friend (1)

5. HOW HAS YOUR CLASSROOM CHANGED SINCE YOU HAVE STARTED USING BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION?
a. My attitude is more positive
   I identify and respond more quickly to behaviors to be praised.
   Students respond with more appropriate behavior.
b. Kids more positive toward selves and others.
c. Wow! A lot more positive! More fun!
   It's great to work for something.
   Kids are better behaved.
d. Discipline not needed to control, learning to control themselves.
   They have a more positive attitude toward science.
e. The class would be a zoo without it (E.I. teacher).
f. No response.
g. More demanding of me, but children are adjusting better
   I'm using tokens to buy time in the reading corner.

h. The children have quieted down, are happier, better workers.

i. Quieter more positive
   Know more what is expected of them
   I'm less grouchy
   I know how to handle behavior problems now
   I plan in terms of more specific behaviors

j. If I use it consistently, I get results

k. I am more patient

l. I'm not sure it has changed any (haven't used it much).

m. No change - I've not used it

n. It's helped with a few kids.
APPENDIX II

ASSESSMENT OF:
KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF LEARNING
AND BEHAVIORAL TECHNIQUES

1. Praising children for good behavior is a way of using __________ to increase the probability of the good behavior occurring again.

2. In general, what does the Premack Principle state?

3. Define the following terms:
   a. Reinforcement
   b. Punishment
   c. Extinction
   d. Time Out

4. To determine whether or not an activity/event is reinforcing to a student, a teacher should:
   a. Ask the student's mother
   b. Ask the student's best friend
   c. Observe the student's behavior during math and recess and compute differences.
   d. Observe the student to see if he or she engages in the activity frequently.

5. When JoAnna finishes her math assignment the teacher comes over, smiles, and says, "You've done a good job!" This is an example of ________________ (what kind) reinforcement?

6. Jeremy, who frequently engages in loud shouting in class, is observed to receive a great deal of attention from other students during his outbursts. Which of the following would be a good strategy for dealing with the problem?
   a. Have Jeremy stand in a corner when he shouts.
   b. Immediately place him in a room for a short time.
   c. Tell him to please be quiet and sit down.
   d. Take him aside and have a heart to heart talk.
7. Harold is out of his seat very frequently at inappropriate times. The teacher often says, "Sit down, Harold!" This command is an example of ________________________________.

8. As a means of upsetting her teacher, Sandy is in the habit of referring to the teacher in language that would be described by most people as obscene. A good strategy for the teacher to use to reduce the frequency of the behavior is:
   a. Ignore the obscene verbalizations.
   b. "Put her down" with sarcasm.
   c. Consult with her parents in hopes that they can control her behavior.
   d. Tell her that nice girls don't swear.

9. Sue and Gloria can't pass each other without pushing or shoving. What is the best way to handle their aggression?
   a. Ignore mildly aggressive behavior and provide them with opportunities to cooperate then praise them.
   b. Give them boxing gloves and send them to the gym.
   c. Call their parents immediately.
   d. When aggression occurs, immediately punish them by slapping their hands.

10. While correcting papers, Mr. Harris notices that Jack has just finished an assignment. The most appropriate action for Mr. Harris to take is:
    a. Say to Jack, "Well, you're finally done!"
    b. Smile to himself and continue correcting.
    c. Walk over to Jack and praise him for completing his work.
    d. Sit at his desk and tell Jack what to do next.

11. True or False:
    It is more difficult to extinguish behavior that has been reinforced intermittently than that which has been reinforced continuously?
12. List three categories of reinforcers and give an example of each.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

13. The recording of behavior prior to intervention is called:
   a. Prevention Analysis
   b. Graphing Intermittents
   c. Systematic Situational Analysis
   d. Taking a baseline

14. According to the graph, on the 4th day Frank verbally abused others _______________ times.

15. Which graph represents a stable baseline?
16. When reporting a student's inappropriate behaviors, a teacher should:
   a. Report the frequency of defined problem behaviors during a specified time.
   b. Write a narrative describing the child's personality.
   c. Draw a sociogram
   d. Tell the counselor that the child has a poor self concept.

17. In the time-sampling record below what is the reliability (% of agreement)? When 2 observers report that a behavior did not occur within a given interval, count it as an agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Which of the following is not a measurement procedure frequently used in the classroom setting?
   a. Continuous Recording
   b. Event Recording
   c. Interval Recording
   d. Time Sampling

19. The teacher notices that even though he frequently tells John to begin his work, John still sits quite often and procrastinates and daydreams. It is likely that the teacher's attention has become:
   a. A punisher for working
   b. A reinforcer for procrastinating
   c. Unimportant to John
   d. None of the above
20. Which of the following is an example of good instructions a teacher may give a student:
   a. Work on something in Ch. 2
   b. Start on these problems and I'll tell you when to stop.
   c. Work 10 math problems and bring them up when you're done.
   d. Read a story and write a report.

21. Which is the normal sequence of activities in carrying out an intervention plan?
   a. Take baseline, identify reinforcers, establish contingencies.
   b. Identify reinforcers, take baselines, establish contingencies.
   c. Take baseline, analyze contingencies, identify reinforcers.

22. How do you decide whether or not a behavior should be modified?
   a. It seriously interferes with a child's academic and social behaviors.
   b. It bothers other children and interrupts their learning.
   c. You personally dislike the behavior.
   d. A and B
   e. A and C

23. Define behavior:
24. Which of the following is the most common method used to control the behavior of both adults and children?
   a. Positive Reinforcement
   b. Punishment
   c. Negative Reinforcement
   d. Time Out

25. TRUE OR FALSE

   The side effects associated with the use of punishment are mild and generally may be ignored when using punishment procedures.

26. TRUE OR FALSE

   Probably the best way for a teacher to choose a reinforcer for a student is to use his/her experience as a teacher to identify reinforcers that have been successful with other kids.
APPENDIX III

ATTITUDE SURVEY

Please answer honestly how you presently feel about the following statements.

1. I would want a child of my own to have a teacher who is very effective using the principles of behavior modification in the classroom.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 agree

2. Behavior modification is a very effective technique for dealing with problem behaviors in the classroom.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 agree

3. People who have been in behavior modification programs expect to be rewarded for everything they do.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree

4. Behavior modification usually involves the use of psychosurgery.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree

5. Learning behavioral management techniques will make me a better teacher.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree

6. Behavior modifiers usually rely on punishment techniques to control behavior.

   strongly _____________________ strongly disagree
   agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
7. Behavioral management techniques can be used in the home as well as the school to effectively change behavior.

   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

8. Kids should not be rewarded for things which they are expected to do.

   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

9. Teachers who use behavior modification are usually cold and mechanistic.

   strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree

10. Behavior modification is not practical because it takes place in an artificial environment.

    strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree

11. Rewarding children for being good is bribery.

    strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree

12. It is just too hard to reward children in a regular classroom for expected behaviors.

    strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree

13. Under a reward system children come to expect more and more for less and less.

    strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree
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14. Behavior modification implies controlling people against their will.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. The major emphasis of behavior management is the giving of material goods to children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## APPENDIX IV

**Behavior Modification Workshop**

**Semantic Differential - Attitude**

**Mean Factor Scores** N=23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Factor Scores</th>
<th>Self (Pre)</th>
<th>School (Pre)</th>
<th>Students (Pre)</th>
<th>Behavior Mod. (Pre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Factor Scores**

**Self**

- **E** = Evaluation good
- **A** = Activity
- **P** = Potency
- **U** = Understanding

**School**

- **E** = Evaluation good
- **A** = Activity
- **P** = Potency

**Students**

- **E** = Evaluation good
- **A** = Activity
- **P** = Potency

**Behavior Mod.**

- **E** = Evaluation good
- **A** = Activity

E = Evaluation good, relaxed, beautiful, valuable, pleasant, happy

A = Activity active, fast, sharp, exciting, successful, interesting

P = Potency strong, agitated, long, large, deep, masculine

U = Understanding simple, predictable, understandable, familiar
APPENDIX V

POST-EVALUATIVE SURVEY

PURPOSE: To evaluate the extent and proficiency with which behavior management techniques are being utilized.

INSTRUCTIONS: For each item rate the participant on a 5-point scale. 0—does not apply, 1—never, 2—seldom, 3—sometimes, 4—generally, 5—always. Include comments.

1. Defines behavior to be changed in behavioral terms.

2. Establishes baselines.

3. Keeps graphs or records of behavior.

4. Finds effective rewards.

5. Withholds reinforcement correctly.


7. Appropriately ignores undesirable behavior.

8. Shares knowledge of behavioral principles with staff.

9. Uses behavioral contracting with students.

10. Pairs social and primary rewards.

11. Uses positive reinforcement.

12. Learning environment conducive for positive reinforcement.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
APPENDIX VI

POST WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Since school began, have you used behavior management principles in your school setting? yes ___ no ___

2. List examples of those situations in which you have used behavior management strategies since school began.
   a. ______________________________________________________
   b. ______________________________________________________
   c. ______________________________________________________
   d. ______________________________________________________
   e. ______________________________________________________

3. List any books or articles that you have read since the summer workshop, which have to do with behavior management.
   1. __________________________________________  2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________  4. __________________________________________

4. Explain briefly how your classroom has changed as a result of the skills gained in the summer workshop.

5. Are you interested in further workshops on behavior man.? yes ___ no ___

6. Do you think that other staff in your school would participate in a behavior management workshop? yes ___ no ___

7. When do you suggest that such a workshop could take place?

______________________________  ____________________________
NAME  SCHOOL
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WORKSHOP EVALUATION

I. Circle the number that most closely represents your feelings.
   In general I found the workshop to be:

   Worthwhile  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Worthless
   Too short    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Too long
   Interesting  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Boring
   Informative  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Provided no
                 information
   Content clear,  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Content unclear,
                 has application  no application
   Provided no
   information
   Would recommend  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Would not rec-
   to others   ommend to
   anyone
   Organized      1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  Unorganized

II. Open ended

   A. What did you like most about the workshop?
   
   B. What did you like least about the workshop?
   
   C. How could a workshop of this type be more effective?
   
   D. How do you think that your behavior as a teacher will
      change as a result of the workshop?
III. Please rate the following workshop features. Number one would indicate a very positive response and number ten a very negative response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Features</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeYoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner/Marriott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holovka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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