

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 678

40

HE 002 436

AUTHOR Carriker, William R.; Howard, Douglas P.
TITLE Summary of Six National Special Study Institutes on Upgrading Doctoral Level Training Programs in Mental Retardation. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. School of Education.
BUREAU NO BR-5-6-1251
PUB DATE 70
GRANT OEG-0-70-3170
NOTE 143p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development, *Doctoral Programs, *Graduate Study, Higher Education, *Mental Retardation, Professional Training, *Retardation

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the major issues and recommendations which emerged from the 6 3-day institutes. The institutes aimed to: examine the current status of doctoral level programs in mental retardation; examine the philosophical basis, objectives and practices desirable for designing future doctoral programs; determine the personnel desired in the field; recommend what kinds of training and experience are necessary to produce such persons; and involve participants in planning strategies that would lead to changes within their own institutions' training programs. Each of the institutes focused on 1 or more aspects of doctoral level training in mental retardation, emphasizing teacher education, research, or administration. The report discusses the required competencies of students completing academic programs in the field and the substance of the programs themselves. (JS)

ED0 53678

Report 56-1251
BEH
PA 40

HE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned
this document for processing
to: HL

In our judgement, this document
is also of interest to the clearing-
houses noted to the right. Index-
ing should reflect their special
points of view.

FINAL REPORT

Summary of Six National Special
Study Institutes on Upgrading
Doctoral Level Training Programs
In Mental Retardation
1970

CONTRACT NO. DEG -0-70-3172

by
William R. Carriker and Douglas P. Howard
National Coordinators
Department of Special Education
School of Education
University of Virginia

Supported by
United States Office of Education, Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped under PL 85-926 as amended

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002436

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Introduction and Overview.....	1
A. Purpose.....	3
B. Focus.....	4
C. Procedures.....	5
1. Georgia State University Institute.....	5
2. University of Illinois Institute.....	6
3. University of Northern Colorado Institute	7
4. University of Oregon Institute.....	8
5. University of Texas Institute.....	9
6. University of Virginia Institute.....	10
D. Post-Institute Evaluations.....	12
E. Organization of the Report.....	13
II. Common Elements of Mental Retardation Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.....	15
A. Common Competencies Expected of all Doctoral Students at the Completion of the Program.....	15
B. Doctoral Students.....	19
C. Faculty.....	21
D. Curriculum.....	24
E. Evaluation.....	35
F. Specific Implications.....	35
III. Teacher Education Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.....	39
A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students at the Completion of the Program.....	39

Table of Contents (Con't)	Page
B. Additional Competencies Expected of the Teacher Educator.....	42
C. Evaluation of Students, Faculty and Programs.	47
D. Curriculum.....	49
E. Implications.....	51
IV. Research Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.....	59
A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students at the Completion of the Program....	59
B. General Recommendations.....	60
V. Administration Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.....	64
A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students at the Completion of the Program....	64
B. Program Structure and Recommendations.....	65
C. General Comments.....	67
VI Summary of Common Major Recommendations.....	69
Appendix A - Georgia State University.....	71
Appendix B - University of Illinois.....	84
Appendix C - University of Northern Colorado.....	93

Table of Contents (Con't)	Page
Appendix D - University of Oregon.....	102
Appendix E - University of Texas.....	112
Appendix F - University of Virginia.....	127
Appendix G - Names and Addresses of Institute Directors and Coordinators.....	136

FINAL REPORT

Summary of Six National Special Study Institutes on Upgrading Doctoral Level Programs in Mental Retardation

by

Carriker, William R. and Howard, Douglas P.

Department of Special Education, School of Education

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The United States Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Training Division in Mental Retardation, recognizing a critical need for upgrading the preparation of leadership personnel in special education, particularly in the area of mental retardation, sent out requests to those institutions with funded doctoral programs, to apply for Special Study Institutes to explore the past, present, and future status of doctoral training programs in mental retardation.

It is known that a number of factors will influence the direction and magnitude of changes in doctoral programs in mental retardation. Among them are the considered consensus of professionals, federal encouragement and assistance, and the willingness and capacity of universities to translate what is known into innovative responsible programs. The institutes' purposes were to provide an avenue for the

interchange of ideas and an opportunity for members of the field to collectively consider major problems relative to upgrading and updating doctoral programs in mental retardation. As part of a national effort, the contributions of the institutes in the form of recommendations and suggested standards could ultimately:

1. Provide guidelines for use by the United States Office of Education in evaluating doctoral level programs in mental retardation.
2. Provide planning guidance for developing programs.
3. Assist in the implementation of effective programs.
4. Stimulate further development or improvement in existing programs.

This report is an attempt to succinctly summarize the major issues and recommendations which emerged from the six three day institutes which were held during July and August of 1970. The host institutions and the directors were:

Georgia State University - Nicholas R. Castricone
University of Illinois - Laura J. Jordan
University of Northern Colorado - Tony D. Vaughn,
(William Gearhart assumed final responsibility for
the report subsequent to Dr. Vaughn's death)
University of Oregon - Herbert J. Prehm
University of Texas - John D. King
University of Virginia - Douglas P. Howard

The institutes were located regionally so that all fifty states and Puerto Rico would have the opportunity to be represented. Representation was comprised of both producers and consumers of doctoral level leadership personnel.

A. Purpose

The overall purpose was to critically examine existing programs and practices at the doctoral level in the area of mental retardation. This goal was accomplished in some cases by analyzing institute position papers prior to the proposed institute or by hearing position papers at the institute. In some cases the participants were charged with specific tasks. In all cases a system was provided whereby the participants could evaluate the relevance of the information acquired and could suggest modifications or recommendations for training programs.

The innovative programming planned for most of the institutes was aimed at bringing forth original and creative efforts by all participants prior to and during the proceedings. These institute programs and organizational structures exemplified the flexible and progressive attitude with respect to providing an environment where old ideas were constantly being challenged and new ideas were being cultivated.

The specific objectives of the institutes were to:

1. Examine the current status of doctoral level programs in mental retardation.

2. Examine the philosophical basis, objectives, and practices for designing doctoral level programs for the future.
 3. Explore the types of persons desired in the field (teacher trainers, researchers, administrators).
 4. Recommend what kinds of training and experience are necessary to produce such persons, e.g.; courses, practica, internships, and/or field work.
 5. Involve participants in the planning of strategies which will ultimately lead to the implementation of changes within their training programs.
- This objective appeared in only one institute because they (the University of Oregon) planned to follow-up in the spring of 1971 to see if any changes occur.

B. Focus

Each of the six institutes focused on one or more of the areas of doctoral level training in mental retardation with emphasis in teacher education, research or administration. It should be noted that none of the recommendations suggested a doctorate in mental retardation only. The recommendations were for a doctorate in special education with emphasis in mental retardation and specialized competence in at least one of the above three areas.

Four of the institutes dealt with the problems of doctoral level training programs in mental retardation focusing on preparing teacher educators, researchers and administrators while two, University of Illinois and Northern Colorado University, focused primarily on preparing teacher educators.

C. Procedures

Each of the six institutes proceeded in their own unique way which was probably a reflection of the individual director's innovativeness, facilities available, types of participants and availability of time. In relation to time, for example, the University of Illinois Institute had only one month to prepare as compared with two months for the University of Oregon Institute.

A brief summary of the organizational and operational procedures incorporated by each of the institutes follows:

1. Georgia State University - This institute's procedures followed the general format of dividing the participants into four different groups. Each group remained intact throughout the three days with the same discussion leader. Each of the four teams met for discussion and interaction after each of the three speakers presented their position papers. At the conclusion of the "team" sessions all four "teams" met together to hear and react to the

recorder's summaries of each of the four groups. All four groups dealt with the three issues, i.e., teacher education, research and administration.

The specific program schedule, list of participants, major speakers and the titles of their position papers can be found in Appendix A.

2. University of Illinois - The Hott Memorial Center was the site for this institute and was quite influential as to the procedures used, in that the participants "lived in" during the three day period. Although the format provided for speakers and position papers followed by general discussion and reaction, interaction continued during non-official time, i.e., evenings, meal times, etc. Each general discussion was followed by small group sessions. The leaders as well as the members of the small groups changed from one day to the next. Each small group was charged with the same specific areas to discuss and report back to the total group. The emphasis was on doctoral level training programs for teacher educators. The planned areas of discussion were the need for such programs; their present strengths and shortcomings, adequacies and inadequacies; means of improving the programs; and necessary alterations of practice needed to meet foreseeable future demands on teacher educators in a changing field of education.

Materials were gathered or prepared for distribution to the participants. These fell into several categories. Some were meant to inform, some to serve as reminders of points probably familiar to most of the participants, others for reference.

The specific planned program schedule, list of participants, major speakers and the titles of their presentations or position papers can be found in Appendix B.

3. University of Northern Colorado - Specific emphasis in three critical areas of doctoral level training programs emphasizing teacher education was provided by the speakers and utilized as the vehicle for the conference. Small group discussion sessions chaired by group leaders who had been oriented as to the major goals of the institute, plus total group discussion sessions were held throughout the three-day period. Group discussion leaders and recorders met each evening of the institute and at the completion of the institute to synthesize institute thoughts and outcomes.

It should be noted that the three discussion group leaders were the same throughout the conference. The participants were involved one day in each of the three different groups.

The specific planned program schedule, list of participants, major speakers and the titles of their position papers is presented in Appendix C.

4. University of Oregon - The institute did not follow a traditional format in the sense of having formal papers presented at the conference. Rather, prior to the conference, leaders in special education teacher training, research, and administration submitted papers which were duplicated and distributed to all participants. The "presenters" gave a "charge" each day and were in attendance at the institute to interact informally as consultant reactors with small groups of institute participants. The style of this institute also was influenced by the facility in which all participants lived in.

Institute participants were charged with the responsibility of critically reading and evaluating the three major papers. They came to the institute prepared to discuss their reactions to the papers with the authors and other participants.

Participants met in small groups in an informal setting, each with a discussion leader and a recorder. The three "presenters" rotated from group to group and were on call when specific portions of their papers were under discussion. In addition, "experts" from anthropology,

philosophy and medicine participated in discussions with the various groups with the purpose being to gain an "outsiders" view of the happenings of the conference. (See Appendix D)

The planned program schedule, list of participants and position papers with their authors are available in Appendix D.

5. University of Texas - The organizational structure of this institute provided for three major position papers, one each within the framework of doctoral level training in teacher preparation, administration and research. Each of these position papers were followed by "expert commentators" who reacted to the position papers and also made presentations. Both of these activities were carried out in the morning sessions with all participants.

The afternoon activities consisted of three small group discussion sessions focusing on the morning topic. These small groups reported back in a general session.

There was a summary session at the close of each of the three days which consisted of a summary and discussion involving all of the participants under the leadership of Dr. John Kidd. (See Appendix E) It should be noted that the "make up" of the small groups was different each day and the discussion leaders changed each day.

The individuals who presented major position papers were video taped of presentation and are being used for instructional purposes within the Department of Special Education at the University of Texas. Their papers were subsequently sent to the participants.

A copy of the planned program, institute participants, list of group session leaders and recorders (post-masters students) as well as the titles and authors of the position and commentor papers are located in Appendix E.

6. University of Virginia - As was the case in three other institutes, the focus was on doctoral level training in teacher education, research and administration (one area each day) in an effort to generate specific recommendations and/or guidelines for positive professional action at local, state, and national levels. An effort was made to translate what is known into potential relevant programs that escape the bounds of tradition.

No formal position papers were presented, however pre-institute materials were sent to each participant so that he would be prepared to be "charged", at the opening session, with the task of:

- a Examining the current status of doctoral level programs in mental retardation.
- b Examining the philosophy and objectives for the future.

- c Exploring the manpower, needs and competencies needed for personnel in teacher training, administration, and research.
- d Recommending training and experiences necessary for producing such persons; e.g., courses, practicum, program content and structure, etc.

The participants were divided into three groups and were either led by the head group leader (who changed groups each day) or by an assistant group leader who as a participant from the group who had been pre-selected to lead a group for one full day. Four group working sessions were held each day, lasting approximately one and a half hours per session.

At the completion of each day's work session a summary general session was held with the aid of videotapes that had been produced by rotating taping equipment from group to group throughout the day. Professional recorders (stenographers) were utilized to record each group session. A summary of all of their efforts was assembled at the end of the final small-group sessions and the summaries were distributed to all participants for discussion in the concluding general session.

The general schedule, master program schedule, list of personnel and participants can be seen in Appendix F.

D. Post-Institute Evaluations

Each of the six institutes conducted a post-institute evaluation for the purpose of exploring the possibilities and directions of future institutes. The individual participant evaluations and recommendations focused on the specific institute attended by the participant. These individual evaluations were then summarized by the two National Co-ordinators and made available to each of the Institute Directors. It should be noted that the University of Virginia Institute evaluation summary was done by Dr. Ed Meyen due to the fact that the coordinators were from the host University.

There was a consensus that institutes of this type are very valuable in many respects and extremely important in improving communication within the field. It was suggested that future institutes be held to further consider the current topic as well as other crucial issues, and that participants be selected to represent other disciplines, minority groups, power structures and positions of leadership such as Deans of Schools of Education.

The post-institute evaluation summaries are located as the last item in Appendices A through F.

E. Organization of the Report

The remaining body of the report is presented within a framework of five areas; i.e.,

1. Common Elements of Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.
2. Teacher Education Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.
3. Research Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.
4. Administration Emphasis in Doctoral Training Programs in Mental Retardation.
5. Summary of Common Major Recommendations

An effort was made to glean from each of the six institutes and their final reports various major recommendations and concerns that were representative. An effort was also made to report major differences and unique recommendations.

Obviously, it was impossible to include all of the outstanding contributions made by each participant or the complete final reports from each of the institutes. Including a copy of each of the some 20 position papers alone, all of which were excellent, would have made this document more valuable but probably too heavy to lift!

In summary this document is written in an attempt to reflect and report on topics, concerns and recommendations which seemed to be common among all six regional institutes but which may have been reported or stated in at least six different ways.

It should be noted that the following sections may well be biased by the training, background experiences, and current positions of the selected participants. Their interests and motivations would certainly influence the resulting recommendations which should not necessarily be considered as representative of the special educators who are concerned especially with the area of mental retardation. This qualification is an absolute function in relation to all special educators. Likewise, the structure, format, and the individual biases of the directors of each of the six regional institutes as well as the two co-ordinators should be considered as additional factors which may have influenced the resulting product.

II. COMMON ELEMENTS OF MENTAL RETARDATION DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

A. Common Competencies Expected of Doctoral Student at the Completion of the Program

1. Research

- a. Ability to recognize and/or ask relevant questions to be answered through research
- b. Ability to conduct research in the classroom
- c. Ability to translate research findings into meaningful classroom application
- d. Ability to write grant proposals that warrant funding
- e. Ability to communicate research findings to related professional disciplines, e.g.; via a journal article
- f. Ability to supervise research of others

2. Affective Domain

- a. Ability to relate effectively to personnel in other disciplines
- b. Ability to apply principles of human relations in the community

- c. Ability to perceive dynamics of human relations in the environment
- d. Ability to demonstrate a tolerance for ambiguity
- e. Ability to understand oneself
- f. Ability to be sensitive to the needs of others
- g. Ability to radiate humanness to colleagues and children
- h. Ability to personally adjust behavior to ultimately benefit children
- i. Ability to work with teachers in classes
- j. Ability to function as a team member

3. Cognitive Domain

a. Skills

- (1) Ability to identify and assess educational difficulties
- (2) Ability to construct prevention, developmental, and/or remedial strategies
- (3) Ability to administer, score, and interpret standardized tests
- (4) Ability to segment and sequence a specific learning task
- (5) Ability to utilize modern media and technology for instructional purposes
- (6) Ability to establish behavioral objectives

- (7) Ability to develop innovative programs
- (8) Ability to interpret special education to others
- (9) Ability in oral and written communication

b. Understandings

- (1) Ability to understand implications of various theories of perception, learning, cognition, personality, etc.
- (2) Ability to understand principles of human growth and development
- (3) Ability to understand philosophical, sociological, and anthropological implications of ideas presented by disciplines in and out of education
- (4) Ability to understand the process of change
- (5) Ability to understand the professional place and responsibility of special education in the community and in society
- (6) Ability to understand the impact of various cultural milieus on special education
- (7) Ability to understand basic school law-- legal aspects of special education

c. Knowledge

- (1) An awareness of many types of research strategies

- (2) An awareness of efforts being pursued in tangential disciplines
- (3) An awareness of various types of educational programs being conducted throughout the world
- (4) An awareness of sources of information outside the field of education
- (5) An awareness of universal ecological problems dealing with population, economics, environments, etc.
- (6) An awareness of a variety of service delivery systems
- (7) An awareness of alternative methods of instruction
- (8) An awareness of the variety of life styles of youngsters
- (9) Awareness of relationships between etiological information and educational programs
- (10) An awareness of basic subject matter within the scope and sequence of regular education

- (11) Awareness of related areas and ancillary services
- (12) Awareness of basic principles of financing programs in special education in public schools, institutions, and in higher education

B. Doctoral Students

1. Recruitment process

Universities should seek out prospects who relate well to people, who have demonstrated their commitment through performance, and who have the ability to perform at higher levels of competence. Women and representatives of minority groups should actively be recruited into doctoral programs. Special educators should recruit more candidates from anthropology, sociology, and other related fields.

2. Selection Procedure

- a. Biographical data collection and a personal interview (one or two days) for additional clarification
- b. Preliminary comprehensive written and oral examinations
- c. One semester probationary seminar in which oral and written skills are demonstrated

- d. Review of letters of reference, previous academic performance, and standardized test scores, including GRE, MAT and some sort of personality measurement
- e. Demonstration of ability to perform certain kinds of skills
- f. Flexible admissions policy for so called disadvantaged or minority group students
- g. Demonstration of commitment to the field prior to admission
- h. Flexibility in how requirements are met, e.g., if teaching experience is necessary, some individuals may meet it as a prerequisite while others may be allowed to meet it within the program
- i. Conditional admissions policy focusing on the productivity of the candidate

If given competencies are to be expected of the student at the completion of his program, it follows that the selection of doctoral students should be based on factors which will show an aptitude to acquire those competencies. Selection should be considered in terms of several clusters of competencies which are to be expected even of the well-prepared teacher, and hence could be developed to some degree even

before the beginning of doctoral training.

3. Procedures for Evaluating Progress Through a Program

- a. A behavior check-list based on observation and related to base-line data
- b. Demonstration of proficiency in specific skills
- c. Demonstration through performance in real and simulated situations, in writing, and in oral communication of all competencies listed previously
- d. Evaluation of courses completed or grade-point averages
- e. A competency check by observation of teaching or other field work
- f. Student self-evaluation
- g. Peer evaluation
- h. Evaluation by another university

C. Faculty

1. Staffing--Staff should reflect needs of the region served. The faculty should be either available at the university or in a nearby facility which should reflect diverse backgrounds such as teacher training, administration, and research. Visiting professorships should be provided for those individuals who could contribute in terms of skills

are not available at the university. Staffing should reflect balance between practice and theory.

2. Faculty should possess doctorates except in exceptional cases of proven accomplishments.
3. There is a need for mental retardation specialists who are competent researchers.
4. There is a need for teacher-trainers who are competent instructors and who provide a model for instruction in higher education.
5. Faculty training doctoral students should be competent in functioning with children and should exhibit this to the students.
6. Urban problems are of increasing importance, faculty members need to display the ability to deal with these problems. Recruitment of faculty from minority groups should be emphasized.
7. Universities should work out an exchange program for doctoral students, primarily to allow them to gain supervised college experience. The same plan has implications for staffing, as part of the student's program would be provided outside of the home department, reducing its load, at the same time that service was being provided for another school. This would constitute a shifting of the student-staff

ratio between colleges, rather than a real gain or reduction in the total amount of teaching to be done.

8. The main need in faculty staffing is to delimit areas of responsibility. This might be done by having survey courses taught by graduate students under direct supervision, at the under-graduate level. Faculty load should be based on something other than student faculty ratios. Such a figure might be arrived at by a given department if it were to determine the sum total of experiences it intended to offer its students, multiply by the number of students, and divide the result into faculty full-time equivalents.
9. Continual upgrading of staffs directly involved in preparing doctoral students. In this regard, post-doctoral training, in the form of institutes, workshops, internships, and so forth, were strongly recommended to be supported by Universities, Schools of Education, and by The United States Office of Education agencies.

D. Curriculum

1. Philosophy

- a. Doctoral programs should be more individualized, more flexible, and based on competencies and the development of the affective domain, rather than on a collection of course hours.
- b. While there may be a movement toward a less categorical approach in terms of disability, it may be very appropriate and significant to consider moving toward more specialized doctoral programs such as a doctoral program in special education, e.g., with a major emphasis in curriculum for the mentally retarded. The end product could be one or any combination of the following:
 - (1) A practitioner in special education,
 - (2) A basic researcher,
 - (3) A leader or a contributor in setting new guidelines,
 - (4) A trainer of personnel to fill the needs of the consumer, such as public schools, and/or,

- (5) A translator of data and research findings to classroom teachers for practical application.
- c. Whether the degree should be highly specialized or general would depend upon:
 - (1) The academic setting,
 - (2) The organizational setting, and
 - (3) Manpower needs and supply and demand.
 - d. Certain defined behavioral outcomes should be centered around each student's needs. There should be a series of evaluations to determine if the outcomes have been achieved, rather than the completion of designated courses to signify success.
 - e. One aspect of the doctoral training program should be the teaching of skills which enable candidates to become change agents.
 - f. Doctoral candidates should develop a knowledge of and an appreciation of the need for social philosophies dealing with such issues as the effect of technology, work, and leisure within a social environment. Consideration of such questions as "what kind of change" and "how much change" should be accomplished.

- g. Candidates should develop a knowledge, awareness and an appreciation of cultural variance, social class, etc.
- (1) Training programs should provide field related experiences that will contribute to the development of social values and cultural awareness.
 - (2) Part of the university training program should take place in the community. The doctoral student would work directly within the sub-culture. Total involvement would be emphasized. The faculty would function in the field rather than on campus.
 - (3) Prepare doctoral candidates in political strategies and awareness for using this vehicle to further the cause of special education.
- h. Each department should be programmed periodically revise the special education doctoral training program rather than attempt to add on or cover over the present program.

2. Structure

- a. Program should be individualized and directly reflect student's interests, needs, and background.
- b. Program should be flexible with possibility of different culminating activities, other than the traditional dissertation requirement, for teacher trainers, researchers, and administrators.
- c. In addition to course work taken within the department and school, opportunities should be provided to take course work cross-campus and outside the university. More emphasis should be placed on realistic practica and internships, as well as more opportunities to participate in:
 - (1) Seminars which cover:
 - (a) published research,
 - (b) discussion of own research design,
 - (c) classic studies in field, and
 - (d) controversial issues of the field
 - (2) Informal gatherings
 - (3) Independent Study--own research or dissertation

- (4) Colloquia
- (5) Student participation in policy, recruitment, etc.

d. University programs should develop working relationships with public schools wherein professors could be provided opportunities to work with children in the public schools and thereby provide training by precept and model for the assigned doctoral candidate.

- (1) Develop a model whereby master teachers, researchers, and administrators in public schools could exchange positions with university instructors on an annual basis.
- (2) Instructors should have demonstrated their competencies in the areas in which they are teaching and should continue to do so.

3. Sequence

Relatively few statements were made regarding this concept as it appeared to conflict with the feeling that special education should be responsive to the needs and abilities of the individual, and a stated sequence was more often seen as repressive than facilitating. The realization that recommendations could be made nationally inhibited

expression, as few schools want to be locked into a sequence.

- a. Sequence should be individually determined based upon the total program of the university and the size of the staff, not determined on a national basis.
- b. Practicum should, in general, follow formal course work.
- c. Observations and micro-teaching should be presented concurrently with didactic presentations and should be spread throughout the doctoral program.
- d. The development of communication skills necessary to the comfort and adjustment of the student should take precedence over communication practice directed toward changing the behavior of others.
- e. The progression should be from observer to active participant with leadership responsibility on a continuum from classroom projects to community and university endeavors.
- f. The model, which follows represents a schematic representation of levels of competencies included in a total doctoral program. The

subtopics under each level would vary according to individual backgrounds, needs, interests, and goals of each doctoral student. The program, starts with a broad base and gradually focuses in, according to area of emphasis and ultimate professional role of the person being trained.

KNOWLEDGE

(Awareness of related information from various disciplines)

UNDERSTANDING

(In-depth preparation in essential principles and theories)

SKILL

(Ability to perform specific tasks required of:

- 1) Teacher trainer,
- 2) Researcher, or
- 3) Administrator

PRODUCT

Short internship experiences should be provided in the initial stages of a training program. This would assist the trainers in evaluating the student's skills and needs. It would also provide in part for student self-evaluation and direction.

4. Practicums and Internships--A doctoral program should be flexible. For example, for someone who has been working five years in an institution, it would be foolish to require that he enroll in an extra practicum in an institution. Planning should be in terms of where experience may take the place of a course or where course taken earlier may suffice.

There should be more opportunities for planned field experiences in the public schools, in residential schools, in state departments of education, and on teaching assignments in other universities.

Universities should exchange doctoral students for one quarter for students to take on the responsibility of teaching a class or classes under supervision outside the protective (and sometimes repressive) walls of their own institution.

When students complete a teaching internship in their own university, they are more apt to be viewed as "just another doctoral student" by undergraduates enrolled in their classes. In another university, however, their status might be viewed differently. There would be less likelihood that their professors and supervisors would neglect the need for major emphasis on meaningful teaching

experience. Field experiences with the director or assistant director of state schools for the retarded, with state directors of special education, with appropriate health agencies, etc., could provide similar experiences.

Concurrent seminar sessions should be planned to run in conjunction with the field experience sequence. If the ability to work as part of a team is valued, practica should be reality-based assignments which will develop team interaction through the natural development of crises, for example:

- a. Responsible committee assignments with voting rights
- b. Planning of colloquia
- c. Program evaluation
- d. Cooperative writing of proposals
- e. Cooperative research
- f. Planning and implementation of workshops and institutes
- g. Placement in interdisciplinary clinics and evaluation units with case staffing responsibilities
- h. Practica related to the development of communication skills

- (1) Taking responsibility for courses as teaching fellows; this should include stating the objectives, lecturing, structuring discussion, and writing examinations.
- i. Flexibility; new patterns of service
 - (1) Work should be offered describing non-traditional programs such as those using para-professionals in terms of their significance, their structure and form, and their evaluation.
 - (2) A series of practica introducing students to these programs in action would seem imperative for real understanding.

Universities have largely ignored the option of granting credit, or waiving requirements; by proficiencies. If use of proficiencies were the policy rather than the exception, redundant experiences might be avoided.

E. Evaluation--There is a need for longitudinal or follow-up studies that evaluate products of doctoral programs. During doctoral study, however, there is more of a need for evaluation of actual performance of competencies in practicum or internship situations.

1. Define criteria for competencies and develop effective procedures for evaluating to what degree those criteria have been met.
2. Examine problems with respect to the most appropriate utilization of practical and/or theoretical approaches.
3. Develop models to evaluate the effectiveness of any of the suggested approaches.
4. The first year out, after receiving the doctorate, ex-students should be asked to return to the university to participate in an evaluation of the adequacy of their programs and the appropriateness and values of their advisement and training experiences.

F. Specific Implications in Regard to

1. Learning Disabilities Movement--The interest in learning disabilities can provide a vehicle for a loosening of categorical labels. Through the increased emphasis on a higher degree of assessment

competency, in terms of the nature of the learning problems and the learner, a more effective application can be made in regard to different learning strategies for youngsters exhibiting learning problems.

2. Noncategorical Movement--More emphasis should be put on and more opportunities should be provided for cross-categorical training at all levels of special education. Programs should emphasize training in several directly related areas of study rather than in just one, like Mental Retardation, for example.

Although the professor in mental retardation has an obvious "categorical" label, he should be aware of the present concern about and considerations favoring a non-categorical model for special education.

Even those who may eventually reject the idea of a departure from categorical models must be able to consider all options in an objective manner in order to arrive at meaningful conclusions. Leadership in this search must be provided by the colleges and universities and must be a planned part of the doctoral program.

3. Educational Concern for the Disadvantaged--Doctoral programs in mental retardation should certainly concern themselves with the issue through:
 - a. Integrating academic course work and practical experiences.
 - b. Becoming involved with departments who jurisdictionally assume this responsibility, e.g., child development departments.
 - c. Identifying promising individuals from target areas and involving them in the hope that they might better provide for the needs of these children.
 - d. Exchanging faculty in various colleges and universities.
 - e. Having doctoral programs become more concerned about education for children beginning at birth.
 - f. More involvement with disadvantaged families.
 - g. Considering the disadvantaged family as a unit rather than looking at isolated disadvantaged (mentally retarded) students in the classroom.

Future special educators, must be prepared to work with the problems of minority and underprivileged groups. Training institutions must give more attention to planning experiences

which will acquaint the doctoral student with the unique problems of various cultural origins and differing life styles. Talking about such problems is insufficient. Experience and involvement, even if limited due to time and/or geographic considerations, are more desirable than arm-chair discussions.

4. Consumer Needs

- a. Personnel with inner-city training and experience.
- b. Personnel with residential institution training and experience.
- c. Research personnel who can work directly with public schools.
- d. Teacher trainers who can prepare undergraduate and master's level people to fill needs a-c, above.

III. TEACHER EDUCATION EMPHASIS IN DOCTORAL TRAINING
PROGRAMS IN MENTAL RETARDATION

A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students
at the Completion of the Program

1. Teacher educators must be able to teach. A theoretical knowledge of teaching alone is inadequate preparation for teacher education.

a. Certain competencies are necessary and desirable in teachers and therefore should be exhibited and demonstrated by teacher educators.

These competencies include:

- (1) Knowledge of the global goals of education and alternate routes by which these goals may be reached
- (2) Ability to state a rationale for providing services for exceptional children in addition to those available in the standard program
- (3) Ability to communicate to others the philosophy held concerning the education of the mentally retarded
- (4) Ability to use a systematic approach to

devise, apply, and evaluate curriculum
--the system chosen is less important
than making certain that it provides
a basis for consistency in the educational
choices which must be made, such as:

- (a) Identification of a learnable task
 - (b) Definition of the task in behavioral terms
 - (c) Development of a behavioral criterion of success
 - (d) Development of suitable resources and materials
 - (e) Development of an integrated teaching-learning plan
- (5) Ability to observe and record behaviors of individual pupils and of the teacher as well. This requires the ability to define a behavior, to observe it over time, then to use it to determine the next instructional task.

The ability of a teacher to observe and analyze both the learning behavior of the child and his own instructional behavior make these further demands:

- (a) Knowledge of the stages of child development and a means of setting reasonable expectancies for a retarded child within these stages
 - (b) Competency in self-evaluation and knowledge of the resources that will allow him to be comfortable in performing it
 - (c) Awareness of sound instructional goals for each child, and ability to determine whether the child is accomplishing what the teacher planned for him
- (6) Ability to analyze educational materials or information to determine whether it fits the curriculum sequence of the class
 - (7) Ability to manipulate the social and academic behavior of children
 - (8) Ability to make effective use of the services of both professional and non-professional personnel. This includes:
 - (a) The knowledge which makes it possible to take full advantage of the supportive services of other professions

- (b) The flexibility to adapt to new patterns of educational service to the handicapped such as the use of teacher aides in the classroom
- (9) Ability to communicate with parents relative to the specific educational goals for the child
- (10) Ability to provide consultant services to other teachers concerning retardation-related problems.
- (11) An awareness and knowledge of supportive community, state, and federal agencies and their services which are available to the mentally retarded and to their families.

Teacher competencies desired by the schools are changing as the patterns of educational services for the retarded are changing and diversifying. Teacher educators, too, must be aware of the probable directions of change or their doctoral training can be outmoded by the time the degree is conferred.

B. Additional Competencies Expected of the Teacher Educator

The teacher educator must possess additional competencies over and above those it is hoped the teachers of the retarded will eventually display. These additional requirements for the teacher educator include:

1. Adoption of a conceptual framework for the education of teachers which the teacher educator is able to define.
2. Ability to communicate effectively with those whom his work will bring him into immediate contact, i.e.; members of other professions, lay persons, students, and mentally retarded pupils in the classroom.
3. Possession of an in-depth knowledge of mental retardation, including knowledge of etiologies and of the application of educational techniques, including:
 - a. Knowledge of the content of relevant literature
 - b. How to decide what is relevant in the literature, and how to become acquainted with it
 - c. How to teach others to acquaint themselves with the relevant literature
 - d. Knowledge of how to decide when information is out-of-date
 - e. Knowledge of who to call on outside of special education for essential knowledge which they may possess
4. Understanding of the scientific method and how it is applied to the basic sciences such as psychology, human development, and biology.

5. Understanding of the current systems of delivering health, education, and welfare services, and the rationale supporting the various systems. It should include:
 - a. The procedures involved in maintaining standards of service and professional competence through accreditation, certification, and legislation
 - b. Political and economic strategies which have become an important part of the educator's knowledge
6. Ability to indicate clearly to students what they should know and what knowledge is expected of them as an acceptable minimum. Therefore, teacher educators must possess a mastery of a broad base of methodology and teaching skills, including analytic and evaluative techniques, and the ability to demonstrate them.
7. Ability to generate more alternative courses of action than could the average special education teacher.
8. Ability to use methodology in conformity to a conceptual model.
9. Ability to use audio-visual media and equipment.
10. Ability to analyze, synthesize and blend instructional materials with specific teaching methodologies.

11. Ability to prepare students to establish and implement behavioral objectives.
12. Ability to advise students relative to professional and personal goals. Some of these include:
 - a. Ability to assess prospective students as teacher candidates or as candidates for advanced study, to re-assess them periodically for continuance.
 - b. Ability to plan a course of study which will fit the needs and skills of the particular student.
 - c. Ability to advise students on educational problems they may be experiencing.
 - d. Ability to recognize the problem that is in need of referral; for example, knowledge of the limitations of one's own effective counseling skills and of how to help the students make the necessary contacts for further help.
 - e. Knowledge of the ways in which universities and other agencies break through red tape in order to help students achieve their legitimate goals.
 - f. Familiarity with accreditation procedures and transcript evaluation.

- g. Awareness of the need for and skills in securing information on the current status of various courses; for example, knowing when a student's program should be changed because a course has changed and will no longer meet the need for which it was originally designed.
13. Knowledge of professional organizations and their respective roles in the education of exceptional children, and in the professional lives of teachers.
 14. Ability to place and supervise students in various kinds of practica which include but are not limited to student teaching.
 15. Ability to work with students on current social problems which are not confined to retardation.
 16. Ability to recognize and fulfill the many other non-teaching aspects of the role of the faculty member, such as:
 - a. Providing various kinds of consultative and information giving service.
 - b. Engaging in research, especially related to the evaluation of classroom transactions and interactions.
 17. Skill in college teaching includes:

- a. Ability to teach in the informal as well as the formal setting.
- b. Ability to get excited about knowledge and to get others excited about it.
- c. Ability to avoid force-feeding of knowledge to students.
- d. Ability to make the objectives evident to the students.
- e. Ability to meet the objectives, of producing change in the learners.
- f. Ability to motivate and guide student discussion.
- g. Ability to effectively use teaching aids, such as over-lays and opaque projectors.
- h. Ability to construct and score tests which are appropriate to the instruction offered.
- i. Possession of a value system which places high priority on teaching and preparation for teaching.
- j. Ability to relate and give guidance on thesis research

C. Evaluation of Students, Faculty and Programs

1. Demonstration of competencies listed in III A and III B.

2. Evaluation of college teaching ability.
 - a. Both the student and the professor should be video-taped for the evaluation of their teaching skills and methods.
 - b. Evaluation of teaching performance of students during their practicum or internship on other university campuses should be made by the local university faculty.
3. Evaluation of communication skills.
 - a. Written and oral communication skills should be sufficient to allow the student to make passing grades.
 - b. Communication skills should be sufficiently well-developed to carry out the professional duties which include:
 - (1) Professional writing for various audiences.
 - (2) Conferences with parents and with students, in supervisory sessions.
4. Evaluation of the success of the teacher educator is best determined by the degree to which the students show the desired behaviors in the teaching-learning process.

5. Evaluation of knowledge may be achieved through course examinations, projects, and papers.
6. Evaluation of supervisory skills may be achieved through observation of the effectiveness with which the doctoral student is able to work with student teachers.
7. Committees should be formed, within the field of special education, resembling the NCATE model with doctoral programs being required to supply data, to substantiate the validity of their existence, to outside auditors.

D. Curriculum

1. The teacher educator should be the one asking questions of the researcher, rather than the researcher disseminating information as to what they think the teacher educator ought to know.
2. Too much emphasis is currently placed on theory and not enough opportunities are provided for practice in the field. Field resources are too often neglected or not taken advantage of to their fullest. Opportunities should be provided for post masters trainees to participate in many of the following activities.

- a. Conduct a student teaching seminar
- b. Help arrange student teaching placements
- c. Assist with supervision of students
- d. Help plan curriculum revision
- e. Teach discrete blocks of the methods courses
- f. Evaluate the university's training program
- g. Serve with professional organizations
- h. Organize and plan workshops
- i. Prepare and grade examinations
- j. Write reports for various audiences
- k. Participate in inter-professional communication
- l. Communicate among colleagues
- m. Assist in writing recommendations
- n. Write book reviews
- o. Assist in writing grant proposals
- p. Write and prepare lesson plans
- q. Write staff directives
- r. Write professional letters
- s. Respond to questionnaires
- t. Prepare brochures
- u. Address both professional and non-professional groups
- v. Teach courses under supervision
- w. Work with various local, federal and state agencies
- x. Write abstracts
- y. Participate in faculty meetings

z. Plan professional-social activities

3. Internships

a. Universities could plan a joint exchange doctoral level internship program for a period of one or more terms, semesters, etc. This activity would provide interns:

- (1) An experience of learning the views of more than one department
- (2) An opportunity to interact in a professional way with a variety of faculty and therefore may feel freer to contribute to discussions and meetings than in his own university department.

b. An internship could occur in colleges or universities with large teacher education programs but who do not offer doctoral level work

c. An acceptable internship would include supervision via regular visits from the faculty of the university who have placed the intern.

E. Specific Implications in Regard to

1. Non-category concepts.

a. Universities should consider submitting applications for BEH program support rather than for specific areas such as mental retardation. This

could allow for greater freedom in student selection and program development than is now occurring.

- b. The recommendation that a doctoral program should be offered in special education rather than in mental retardation implies that the categories are not too useful or realistic at the level of advanced study and there are significant areas of overlap among many of the exceptionalities.
- c. The public schools are receiving support to try different strategies with children, and some districts have done without state support rather than confine their programs to officially listed categorical areas. Doctoral level programs should take note of this!
- d. A question was raised as to whether teacher preparation programs should be preparing specialists for a specific category or educators first and specialists second. Within-category training tends to reduce flexibility and openness to new and innovative programs.

It was felt that programs should prepare individuals who would be educational specialists, but not through the usual pattern of elementary education.

2. The Changing Position on Special Class Concepts
 - a. The question was raised but left unanswered:
Is it legally possible for professional organizations and/or bargaining agencies to impose contract conditions upon the school board, such as those which note types of students which a teacher could legally, ethically, or professionally refuse to teach? This question reflects concern for the tendency of general education to dissociate itself from the child with problems, to regard him as falling within the domain of special education, and thereby close the door to plans for educational change or modifying educational delivery systems
 - b. There is no hard evidence concerning improvement of the retarded child's behavior resulting from resource room placement as contrasted with special class placement. This approach has not yet had a fair trial. It is important for professionals not to look so eagerly for a way out of the "problem classroom" that the resource room placement concept is accepted without question as the way of solving problems
 - c. What are the implications for teacher education if new concepts of educational programs are to

be implemented? Would the change be largely administrative, or should teachers be trained differently?

- d. Certification is very broad. Can teachers be professionally prepared for all levels? In addition, is it realistic for them to be prepared to function as consulting teachers, pre-school teachers, pre-vocational teachers, and diagnostic teachers? (A divergent opinion)
It may be years before many of the expected different roles for teachers in special education emerge. Perhaps the field should concentrate on doing a better job of training the teacher for the self-contained classroom, so that a positive result could be shown from the placement of children in that type of setting
- e. A question was raised as to whether the decision about competencies and patterns of handling children should originate with the universities. Perhaps federal agencies should consider granting funds directly to school districts to enable them to purchase the teacher education services they want from the universities.

3. Educational Concern for the Disadvantaged

This was more assumed than stated. There appeared

to be no rejection of the assumption that many children are placed in classes for the educable retarded when their problems are not a result of slow learning. This prompts much of the dissatisfaction with existing definitions of retardation and labeling that often result from special class placement. It is this dissatisfaction which leads to a constant search for other alternative educational delivery systems which can keep the child closer to his "normal" age peer group and at the same time provide an intensive attack on specific educational problems.

4. Consumer Needs

a. Institutions of Higher Education

(1) Those preparing doctoral students

(a) Understaffing is endemic; it militates against:

- 1) the development of innovative programs
- 2) the concern with more than "the essentials"
- 3) the student's receiving the time and attention from which he could profit
- 4) the development of adequate practicum experiences because of the problems or supervision

- (b) Adequately prepared faculty remain in short supply, particularly those with strength in teacher education
 - (c) The universities need more freedom and less restriction from the federal granting agencies if those agencies are really interested in change and innovation
 - (d) For any great increase in the excellence of teaching at the university level, or any shift in priorities to student assistance, the reward system will have to change
- (2) Those Preparing Undergraduates and Master Degree Teachers
- (a) The need is for more faculty with real skills in teacher education
 - (b) These colleges and universities would like to have more of a role in the development of doctoral training programs in other colleges and universities; they would like to communicate the kinds of faculty they hope will emanate from them.

5. Education Agencies

a. Local

- (1) Colleges and universities are now preparing far more teachers to teach at the primary than at the secondary level. Specialized teaching skills and knowledge are especially needed for the high school and for preschool programs. Could differential programs be initiated?
- (2) Change is rapidly occurring within the schools via a variety of special education services which are being developed, such as consulting teachers, resource teachers, part-time cooperative special class teachers, and full-time classes for the severely involved. As these services develop, teachers will be thrust into a variety of different program organizational modes. This has implications for the training of personnel who will teach future and in-service teachers how to adjust to these roles
- (3) A distinction should be made between the responsibilities of teacher preparation regarding in-service and pre-service education, so that overlap is restricted and important areas are not left out

- (4) Universities tend to want to commit themselves to the training of full-time students, and this usually is not understood by the public schools, who are more concerned with the certification of teachers already teaching in other areas
- (5) It has been assumed that teachers know what is best for their students and how to provide it. In many instances however they really do not seem to want the responsibility or know how to determine what is educationally sound for the individual child. This is a problem that teacher education programs must attempt to solve.

IV. RESEARCH EMPHASIS IN DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMS IN MENTAL
RETARDATION

A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students

at the Completion of the Program: Students should be
able to:

1. Demonstrate skill in working directly with deviant
children and/or adults.
2. Read and critically interpret research articles.
3. Demonstrate a broad knowledge of the research ac-
complishments and failures in special education.
4. Identify and analyze relevant and researchable
questions in special education.
5. Independently design research in order to respond
to field or theoretical problems
 - a. Review and summarize relevant research and/or
theoretical literature
 - b. Develop a plan for collecting and processing
data
 - c. Implement the plan
 - d. Interpret, integrate and communicate the findings
6. Demonstrate understanding (appropriate application)
of data processing methods.

7. Provide useful research consultation.
8. Demonstrate a knowledge of research funding problems and procedures.
9. Supervise the research of another person and/or manage a research team.
10. Demonstrate the ability to provide both formal and informal instruction relevant to special education research.

B. General Recommendations

1. Researchers are needed to conduct educational and sociological studies in institutions for the severely and profoundly retarded. When a student shows an interest in research he should be encouraged and given access to all available resources.
2. Research which has direct implications for giving new directions in classroom management, instruction, curriculum modification should be encouraged.
3. A method should be designed to evaluate doctoral dissertations coming from institutions that have doctoral level programs. It was suggested that two dissertations be selected at random from each institution over the past two or three years. They should be read and evaluated without identification of author or institution. This effort, then,

could possibly lead to more precise competencies needed for preparing researchers to produce and disseminate the kinds of research needed in the field.

4. Special Education Departments can and must provide the environment within which the incipient special education scholar-researcher can learn to apply what he has learned from his "parent" discipline. It is virtually impossible for a Department of Special Education to participate in the research training process unless faculty within that department are conducting research.
5. While it is possible to teach about research, it is not possible to become a researcher by being taught about research. One cannot learn to do research, and thereby become a scholar-researcher, except by doing research. Although research is thought of as a logical, orderly process there is still a good deal of art (or serendipity) in good research. It is imperative that future special education researchers be provided with models to emulate, environments within which they can develop, and opportunities for research internships.
6. Questions were raised concerning the responsibility

of special education to prove that it does, indeed, help the children it purports to help before programs are expanded or more support requested. The question is particularly pointed in the area of educable mental retardation, where apparent abuses have been uncovered in the placement of children of culturally different background.

7. Participants appeared to recognize abuses and shortcomings and felt that research should be undertaken to test the efficacy of special instruction, but at the same time, felt that programs for the educable, at their best, are good and worthy of continuation and development.
8. Few suggestions were made concerning how objective evidence of the worth of special programs might be gathered. The most positive suggestion and often-repeated statement was that "behaviorial goals must be elucidated if educators are to be able to decide whether they have succeeded with each child." This, coupled with a willingness to consider re-grouping by learning problems or styles, rather than etiology, could possibly lead to the kind of evidence about which statements could be more safely made.

9. The call for accountability in education is a summons to review and reform the educational system. It is a public policy declaration. In practical terms, the concept rests on three fundamental parts.

These are:

- a. demonstrated student accomplishment
- b. an outside audit of that accomplishment
- c. a public report of that accomplishment.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE EMPHASIS IN DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMS
IN MENTAL RETARDATION

A. Specific Competencies Expected of Doctoral Students at
the Completion of the Program: Students should be able
to demonstrate:

1. Ability to delegate responsibility for decision making.
2. Ability to handle fiscal management.
3. Sensitivity in regard to the personalities of others.
4. A knowledge of individual and group psychology and motivation.
5. A knowledge of government structure and function.
6. Ability in organizational planning.
7. Ability in decision making.
8. Skill in evaluation of personnel and programs.
9. Skill in organization and utilization of all resources and skills available.
10. Ability to communicate effectively.
11. Ability to interpret basic law relative to the legal aspects of special education.
12. A knowledge of the various aspects of special education administration and familiarity with the major

components of general administration.

13. Skill in formulating objectives for a special education program and in identifying the strategies and requirements needed to implement these objectives.
14. A knowledge of information dissemination and retrieval systems that reflect varied special educational requirements.
15. A knowledge of research techniques and research interpretation in order to insure application within the school setting.
16. A knowledge of the sociological-psychological problems and implications of urban and minority group education.
17. Skills in dealing with the power structure of the community.

B. Program Structure and Recommendations

1. Trainers of special education administrators should plan for the recruitment of highly competent individuals representative of minority groups.
2. Doctoral level training programs in special education administration should emphasize public relations techniques, finances, legal aspects, change strategies, etc.
3. Administrators should be trained in management and

systems techniques using a problem-solving approach.

4. Trainers of doctoral level administrative candidates should allow for their candidates' participation in major decision making as a part of the training program.
5. Grant and proposal development techniques should be an inherent part of the candidate's program.
6. Students should be encouraged to consider administrative assignments in residential facilities serving the exceptional child.
7. Administration training programs should realize the most value will be gained by doing. Therefore, simulation experiences and controlled internships should receive foremost attention. The following aspects are suggested to improve the internship program:
 - a. Paid internships in the public schools should be provided
 - b. These internship experiences should be placed in exemplary administrative systems
 - c. Training opportunities within a school system need to be explicated so that they may be utilized at the time of their occurrence, i.e., budget planning, episodes of crises, and conflict.

8. The administrator should be trained in implementing evaluation of ongoing programs.
9. In addition to the so-called "maintenance skills," the doctoral student in special education administration should be prepared to enhance the field by becoming an effective change agent through his intellectual inquiry.
10. Evaluation of proficiency should be based on performance criteria as demonstrated by practicum and internship types of assignments.

C. General Comments

1. The special education administrator should be a person in the system who is qualified, by training and by virtue of his unique position, to determine the ingredients and "mix" of persons, skills, materials, and programs needed to meet the needs of individual students. The role of the special education administrator will be that of a strategist and facilitator who will take the discrete human and material components of a school and its community and both rationally and artfully combine them to build a functioning unit. This cohesive and competent unit becomes the source and resource to provide the special education services and programs to meet the

individual needs of handicapped students.

VI. SUMMARY OF COMMON MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The most common recommendation of all six institutes was the demand for the creation of more and better designed field experiences.

1. Earlier contact in realistic settings (inner-city for example) with increased university involvement was cited time and time again.
2. Additional opportunities for practical experiences in the community for students and faculty at all levels.
3. Promotion of exchange of students and faculty in any possible combination that would help develop competencies of participating personnel in upgrading the profession in general.

B. In line with the above emphasis on practicum and internship programs, a desire was expressed for flexibility that would allow for the development of individualized competency-based programs with a broader foundation in order to extend horizons and allow study in related disciplines whenever deemed appropriate.

C. Another major concern dealt with the regard for the

humanistic approach in all phases of training programs involved with the education of exceptional children. The desire for an increased emphasis on humanism was prevalent along with an interest in the development of programs that blend the humanistic approach with accountability based on behavioral objectives.

D. As a result of the above, certain questions will undoubtedly need to be raised and answered in the future, namely:

1. How will current universities' staffing patterns be affected?
2. What are the implications for relationships between programs within the School of Education as well as with other disciplines within the university?

E. It was recommended that the results of institutes in other areas such as Visually Impaired, Emotionally Disturbed, and Learning Disabilities be studied to determine what other recommendations might be forwarded to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Appendix A.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
Georgia State University
July 27-29, 1970

(Planned)
SCHEDULE

SPECIAL STUDY INSTITUTE

Monday, July 27, 1970

9:00 Opening Session - Room 205 Student Activities
Building, Georgia State University
Courtland Street

Welcome: Dr. Nicholas Castricone, Institute
Director

Dr. Roy Hall, Dean, School of Education
Georgia State University

Dr. Charles Forgnone, Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped, United States Office
of Education

Dr. Bobby Palk, Bureau of Education for
the Handicapped, United States Office
of Education

9:30 SPEAKER: Dr. Leon Lessinger, Calloway Professor of
Education and School Administration, School
of Education, Georgia State University

"Implications for Training Doctoral Level
Students in Special Education in the
Accountability Movement"

10:30 BREAK Coffee and Coke

10:45 Cracker Barrel Session (See list of "teams")

Team I

Dr. Mildred Barksdale, Discussion Leader,
Room 205
Rhona Hopper, Recorder

Team II

Dr. Leonard Curtis, Discussion Leader
Room 208
Antoinette Mayfield, Recorder

Team III

Dr. Harold Turner, Discussion Leader,
Room 212
Patricia Kuntz, Recorder

Team IV

Dr. Wayne Sengstock, Discussion Leader
Room 214
Victor Hobbs, Recorder

- 1:00 LUNCH: Room 216, Student Activities Building
- 2:00 Cracker Barrel Session (Continue in same groups
for all sessions)
- 3:30 BREAK
- 3:45 Cracker Barrel Session and Summary of Group
Discussions by Team Recorders
- 5:00 ADJOURN

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Institute meeting will be held at the Georgia Retardation
Center on North Peachtree Road, Chamblee, Georgia

- 8:15 Meet in Convention Lobby (Cain Street Level) of the
Mariott Motor Hotel for bus ride to Georgia Retar-
dation Center
- 9:00 Welcome: Dr. James Clements, Director, Georgia
Retardation Center
- 9:15 SPEAKER: Dr. Frances Conner, Professor and Chair-
man, Department of Special Education,
Columbia University, New York, New York
- 10:15 BREAK: "Dutch Treat"
- 10:30 Discussion of questions and interaction of Dr.
Conner's presentation
- 12:30 LUNCH: Therapy Building
- 1:30 Tour of Georgia Retardation Center
- 3:00 Return to Theatre Building for group discussion
- 4:30 ADJOURN Return to Marriott

Wednesday, July 29, 1970

9:00 General Session, Room 205 Student Activities Building, Georgia State University, Courtland Street

SPEAKER: Dr. Maynard Reynolds, Professor and Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

"Differentiating Programs for Differentiating Roles"

10:15 Cracker Barrel Session (Report to same team and room as previously assigned)

11:00 BREAK Coffee and doughnuts

11:30 Group Discussion and Summary of Group Discussions by Team Recorders

2:00 ADJOURN

All participants will be sent a copy of the Institute proceedings. Each participant will also be sent a copy of the final report which will summarize all six Regional Institutes.

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL INSTITUTE ON DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN SPECIAL
EDUCATION

List of Participants
(Invited)

Betty Baker
Bureau of Education for the Handi-
capped
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Mildred Barksdale
Professor of Special Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. Daryll Bauer
Special Education Program
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Dr. Katherine Blake
Professor of Special Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Dr. Allen Blumberg
Human Resources & Humanistic
Studies Division
Department of Special Education
Kanawha Valley Graduate Center
P.O. Box 547W
Nitro, West Virginia 25143

Mr. Foster Boyd
Department of Education
Exceptional Children Division
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Miss Adah Branagan
Midlands Center
8301 Farrow Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Mrs. Betty Bright
School Principal
Frankfort State Hospital and
School
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mrs. Mary Cadora
Director of Special Education
North Avenue School
689 North Avenue
Hapeville, Georgia 30354

Dr. Nicholas R. Castricone,
Institute Director
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. Frances Conner
Professor and Chairman
Department of Special Education
Columbia University
New York

Dr. Dale Coons
Department of Special Education
Division of Human Development
George Peabody College for
Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Leonard T. Curtis
Associate Professor of Education
Georgia State University
33 Gilmer St., S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Miss Aurelia Davis
Douglas County Schools
Douglasville, Georgia

Mrs. Beverly Dexter
Institute Assistant
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. Wilson Dietrich, Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. William Dorne, Chairman
Department of Exceptional Child
Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Dr. Dorothy Douglas
Associate Professor
University of South Alabama
Mobile, Alabama

Dr. Billie Downing, Director
Division of Special Education
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071

Dr. Robert Dwyer
Director of Special Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Charles Forgnone
Director, Mental Retardation Unit
Bureau of Education for the Handi-
capped
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Roy Fossett
Georgia Retardation Center
4770 N. Peachtree Road
Chamblee, Georgia

Dr. Roger Frey, Chairman
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
College of Education
University of Tennessee
West Cumberland Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. Nealon Gaskey
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

Dr. Edwin Hall, Department of
Counsel Educational Psy-
chology and Special Educa-
tion
Box 291
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Bob Hill
Division of Exceptional
Children
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Victor Hobbs
PMA Student
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Mrs. Rhona Hopper
Graduate Assistant
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Doug Howard, Coordinator
Mental Retardation Programs
Special Education Department
Room 13, Peabody Hall
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. Jacob Hunt, Chairman
Division for Exceptional
Children
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Mrs. Patricia Kuntz
PMA Student
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. G.E. Lancianese
Colin Anderson Center
St. Mary's, West Virginia
26170

Dr. Alba Lebron
Associate Professor of Education
University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931

Dr. Leon Lessinger
Calloway Professor of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Betty Levy
Associate Professor of Education
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

Mrs. E.C. Marcum
Sunland Hospital of Orlando
Orlando, Florida 32802

Mrs. Antoinette Mayfield
PMA Student
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Miss Joan Morris
Institute Assistant
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. E.W. Oliver
Clayton County Schools
Jonesboro, Georgia

Dr. Bobby Paik
Bureau of Education for the Handi-
capped
Director of Physical Ed. & Recre-
ation for the Mentally Retarded
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Walter Peach
Program for Exceptional Children
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro, Georgia 30458

Dr. Gil Ragland, Chairman
Special Education
University, North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mr. John Rawlings
Central State Hospital
Milledgeville, Georgia

Dr. Cary Reichard, Coordinator
Mental Retardation
Department of Special Educa-
tion
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Dr. William Reid, Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Dr. Maynard Reynolds
Professor and Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dr. Tommy Russell
Special Education Department
College of Education
University of Alabama
P.O. Box 2592
University, Alabama 35486

Mr. John Schifani
PMA Student
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

Dr. Wayne L. Sengstock
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Ira Simmons
Assistant Director Special
Education
Memphis Public Schools
Memphis, Tennessee

Miss Elizabeth Todd
Consultant in Mental Retarda-
tion
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Harold Turner
Administrative Assistant
Program for Exceptional Children
Robert Shaw Educational Center
385 Glendale Road
Scottsdale, Georgia

Mr. Alex Wawrzyniak, Director
Institute for Vocational Educa-
tion Teachers
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

Sarah Wheeler
Principal, Fairfield School
10th Ave. & Bruce Street
Huntington, West Virginia

Julia Wickersham
Duval County
Jacksonville, Florida

Miss Glenda Young
Department of Special Education
Central State Hospital
Milledgeville, Georgia

(Planned)
TEAM PARTICIPANTS

CRACKER BARREL SESSIONS

Team I - Room 205

Dr. Mildred Barksdale, Leader
Mrs. Rhona Hopper, Recorder
Mrs. Anna Pearl Atkinson
Mr. Foster Boyd
Dr. Dale Coons
Miss Aurelia Davis
Dr. Billie Downing
Dr. Bob Hill
Mr. John Rawlings
Dr. William Reid
Mr. Alex Wawrzyniac

Team II - Room 212

Dr. Harold Turner, Leader
Mrs. Patricia Kuntz, Recorder
Dr. Daryll Bauer
Miss Adah Brangan
Dr. William Dorne
Dr. Walter Peach
Dr. Tommy Russell
Mrs. Betty Levy
Mrs. Faye Anderson
Dr. Jake Hunt
Dr. Nelson Gaskey

Team III - Room 208

Dr. Leonard Curtis, Leader
Mrs. Antoinette Mayfield, Recorder
Dr. Roger Frey
Mrs. E.D. Marcum
Mr. E.W. Oliver
Dr. Gilbert Ragland
Dr. Cary Reichard
Dr. Laurel Schendel
Mr. John Scifani
Miss Liz Todd
Miss Glenda Young

Team IV - Room 214

Dr. Wayne Sengstock, Leader
Mr. Victor Hobbs, Recorder
Dr. Allen Blumberg
Dr. Wilson Dietrich
Dr. Dorothy Douglas
Dr. Robert Dwyer
Dr. Roy Fossett
Mr. G.E. Lancianese
Dr. Alba Lebron
Mr. Ira Simmons
Mrs. Mary Cadora

Major Speakers

The following papers were presented at the Georgia State Special Study Institute. They can be obtained by writing to Dr. Nicholas Castricone.

Conner, F., Professor and Chairman, Department of Special Education, Columbia University, New York, New York--
"Professional Articulation Between the University and the Community"

Lessinger, L., Calloway Professor of Education and School Administration, School of Education, Georgia State University--"Implications for Training Doctoral Level Students in Special Education in the Accountability Movement"

Reynolds, M., Professor and Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota--"Differentiating Programs for Differentiating Roles"

Georgia State University

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION INSTITUTE

PARTICIPANT POST-INSTITUTE RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

I. Pre-Institute Materials and Arrangements

The majority opinion seemed to be that the institute was weak in this respect. Several participants claimed that the materials were inadequate and slow in being sent, while some never received the materials at all. Others received materials but felt that they were too general, that more specific details were needed. It was suggested that the participants should "have had position papers in advance to read and study" or should have been assigned to a particular "issue group" to prepare for in advance. It was also felt that, in the words of one participant: "The purpose of the institute needs to be clearly stated several weeks before the institute is to meet. The participants should have the responsibility of 'doing their homework' and actually bringing some degree of pre-arranged material to the institute."

On the other hand, two delegates felt that the "16 points" were a good point of departure and that they knew specifically when they arrived "what the goals and objectives of the institute were." Finally, suggestions were made to the effect that it would have been helpful to have had pre-institute orientation or training for both discussion leaders and recorders in order "to channel discussion more effectively and make more useful reports."

II. Structural Organization of the Institute

Here there was a "mixed bag" of opinions with the majority being favorable. Most people felt that the institute was well-planned and well structured with enough flexibility "to allow freedom of thought and expression." Other members felt that much more structure was needed, particularly on the first day, to give more direction to the discussions and to point to the desired outcomes. General approval was expressed about the small-group sessions though a few people felt that there was not enough "inter-group participation," which might have improved discussion. One person wanted to maintain the small-group composition but to try to devise more "mixing techniques" so that she could get to know the members of the other groups.

A few people felt that there were too many small-group meetings or that they were too long. Indeed, several people felt that the entire institute was too long, that one or two days would have been better. One participant stated that "95% of the work done here in Atlanta was accomplished on Monday" (the first day) though another felt that the three days helped to "bring us to some sort of commonality." While the speakers were felt to be "stimulating," one person suggested that they be treated as regular participants rather than as "Guests." Other members felt that paid recorders were needed at all sessions.

III. Participant Representation

Opinion was overwhelmingly favorable that participant representation was varied and equitable with emphasis from three different areas. Members felt that an "excellent cross-section of interests was represented in the participants." Of course, there were many suggestions, such as: (1) Include deans of education schools and other university administrators. (2) Increase the number of consumers and broaden the areas of their representation.

IV. Facilities and Equipment

Reactions to this category ranged from "good" to "excellent". A couple of persons indicated that they would like to have seen the use of some educational media or at least a demonstration of same. Two people suggested that either the conference should have been held in the same facility housing participants or transportation have been provided.

V. Focus

The vast majority felt that the focus was "timely" "much needed", a "vital issue", and a "healthy" approach to evaluation of present methods used in doctoral training programs. One person felt that the focus on mental retardation was too narrow and that all exceptionalities should have been explored. A few people expressed the opinion that the focus was not clear enough and hoped that post-institute materials might clarify the objectives better.

VI. Post-Institute Materials

The majority expressed a desire for post-institute materials, particularly copies of the prepared presentations

by the guest speakers. One participant expressed the desire for immediate reinforcement and another suggested wide distribution to all producers and consumers.

VII. Main Presenters and Presentations

The reaction to the main presenters was overwhelmingly favorable. Some suggestions for improvement were: (1) Have speakers attend as participants from beginning to end. (2) Have speakers represent consumers and not just college professors. (3) Cut down on the length of presentations. Most people felt that the speakers were excellent, stimulating, and that they focused on the topic at hand perfectly.

VIII. Others

There were very few comments here, so a few of the more provocative ones will be revealed verbatim.

1. "In the organization of institutes a firm commitment should be required of all participants."
2. "What type of follow-up will ensue? How will recommendations affect present and future programs?"
3. "Plan additional conferences--Let us know if we can be of any help. Good luck."

Appendix B.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
University of Illinois
July 15-18, 1970

SPECIAL STUDY INSTITUTE: DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS IN MENTAL RETARDATION

July 15-18

Sponsored by:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, and
Department of Special Education, University of Illinois

Wednesday, July 15

6:15 p.m.

Dinner

7:30 - 9:30 p.m.

Opening Session

Orientation - Dr. Laura Jordan

"The BEH Perspective on Leadership Training" - Dr. Edwin Martin, Associate
Commissioner for the Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped

"Changing Patterns in the Public Schools" -
Mr. Lawrence Vuillemot, Director, Special
Education District of Lake County

Group discussion of presentations

Thursday, July 16

7:45 a.m.

Breakfast

8:30 a.m.

Presentation of organizational plan
of the conference

"Some Thoughts on Doctoral Programs in
Special Education" - Dr. James Gallagher,
Director, Frank Porter Graham Child
Development Center, The University of
North Carolina

10:30 - 11:30 a.m.

Work Session. Best use of time will
be determined by the small working groups
and their chairmen.

12:00 -	Lunch
1:00 - 4:30 p.m.	Work Session
5:45 p.m. -	Dinner
7:30 - 9:00 p.m.	Dr. John Salvia, University of Illinois, will present for discussion the results of surveys concerning desired faculty preparation, the types of positions widely available, and student expectations.

NOTE: Coffee will be available in the cafeteria each morning at about 10:15 and each afternoon at about 3:00.

Friday, July 17

7:45 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30 - 11:30 a.m.	Work Session
12:00 -	Lunch
1:00 - 4:30 p.m.	Work Session
5:45 p.m.	Dinner
7:00 p.m.	Meeting of small group chairmen and recorders

Saturday, July 18

7:45 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30 a.m.	Rough drafts of completed work available. Work in small groups on clarifications and supplementations.
10:45 - 11:30 a.m.	Group session; brief reports from each work group. Summation.
11:45 a.m.	Lunch

Dismissal

University of Illinois
Special Study Institute
List of Participants

Billingsley, James F.
Studies in Behavioral Disabilities
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Brinegar, Leslie
Indiana Department of Public
Instr.
103 State Office Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dinger, Jack C., Chairman
Department of Special Education
Slippery Rock State College
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania 16057

Flint, Wallace (Student)
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois
Room 210 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Gallagher, James J. (Dr.)
Frank Porter Graham Child
Development Center
625 W. Cameron Avenue
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Henderson, Robert A., Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois
Room 210 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Hummel, Elizabeth
Devereaux Schools
Devon, Pennsylvania 19333

Jordan, Laura, BEH Institute
Director
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois
Room 210 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Keller, Edwin
Elementary and Special Education
342 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Lema, David E.
Exceptional Children Faculty
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Morgan, Ben
Director of Special Education
Education Center
120 E. Walnut
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Olson, James L., Chairman
Department of Exceptional
Education
3253 N. Downer
University of Wisconsin-
Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Phelps, Harold R., Chairman
Department of Special Education
105 Fairchild Hall
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Spencer, Elizabeth, Chairman
Department of Special Education
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Stahlecker, Lotar V.
Department of Special Education
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44240

Stearns, Keith E.
Special Education Department
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Stephens, Will Beth
Department of Special Education
College of Education
Temple University
435 Ritter Hall
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Todd, Thomas W.
Special Education Department
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Voelker, Paul H., Chairman
School of Education
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Observers:

Carriker, William
Special Education Department
Peabody Hall - Room 17
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Personnel attending from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped -
Office of Education - Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Martin, Edward, Associate Commissioner

Baker, Betty

Forgnone, Charles

Heller, Harold W.

Palk, Bobby

Vuillemot, Lawrence D.
Director, Special Education
District of Lake County
4440 West Old Grand Avenue
Gurnee, Illinois 60031

Wawrzaszek, Frank J., Chairman
Department of Special Education
and Occupational Therapy
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Major Speakers

The following speakers and the titles of their topics or position papers are listed below. None of these documents is available.

Gallagher, J., Director, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina -- "Some Thoughts on Doctoral Programs in Special Education"

Martin, E., Associate Commissioner for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.O.E. Washington, D. C. -- "The BEH Perspective on Leadership Training"

Salvia, E., Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Illinois -- he presented for discussion a preliminary report on the results of surveys concerning desired faculty preparation, types of positions available and student expectations.

Vuillemot, L., Director, Special Education, District of Lake County, Gurnee, Illinois -- "Changing Patterns in the Public Schools"

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS MR INSTITUTE---JULY 15-17, 1970

PARTICIPANT POST-INSTITUTE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATION AND COMMENT

Pre-Institute Material

Some individuals felt it would have been helpful to have had a list of the participants and their positions available before the conference. It was also suggested in a couple of instances that a working paper from the director or one devised by some group that was responsible for the institute be used as a structure for a take-off point. This paper might have assisted in moving the institute along somewhat more quickly and possibly to further depth. Lastly, there was considerable positive comment about the value of the material which was included in the packet. It was felt that it was very thought-provoking and helpful.

Structural Organization

There seemed to be a general consensus that the use of small groups was quite effective and should be encouraged in other institutes; however, there was some disagreement among the participants in regard to the make-up of the small groups. There seemed to be two positions. One was that the groups should retain their original membership throughout the conference. The other major position seemed to be, "change the make-up of the small discussion groups" so that feedback, formation of thoughts, and general insights gained from the various discussion groups could be transmitted to one another.

It seemed there was general agreement that the make-up of the conference in terms of participants including university, college, state department, and public school representation was valuable. A couple of participants did suggest, however, that a graduate dean and/or a dean of education might have been a valuable addition.

Two comments reflected the concept of retaining a relatively small group for the total conference so that total group interaction could occur. In other words, twenty-four to thirty participants appeared to be quite appropriate.

The Friday afternoon general session, at least as expressed by some of the participants, was somewhat questionable in terms of its value. They seemed to feel that much of it was repetitious and could well have been replaced by small-group meetings with a "forced mix" of small groups.

There seemed to be two extremes in terms of attitude toward the structural organization. The one extreme was a general feeling of wanting to have a much more structured approach than was employed in this institute. The other extreme was one of recognizing that the problems involved in mounting an activity of this type in such a short period of time would tend to lead to an unstructured approach. The lack of structure seemed to be helpful in terms of not inhibiting individuals in relation to ideas they might wish to express. This latter point might best be described by quoting one participant: "The active role by the director in terms of keeping the program moving was exemplary and I would hope that all directors of the remaining institutes will become as actively involved in directing but not dictating their institutes. We had leadership here without dictation. I especially liked that."

There also seemed to be almost two extreme positions in regard to the use of major speakers. The one extreme was elimination of speakers unless they are proposing some "standards." The middle position suggested that formal lecturers are helpful but sometimes constrict exploration of new approaches. The other extreme is that the formal presentations were excellent and should be encouraged in all institutes.

Facilities and Equipment

It appears from many of the comments that the need for having a chalkboard available in each of the rooms where the small groups are meeting is imperative.

Alternative methods of recording and for interaction might be used, such as video-taping so there could be a preservation of the exact flavor of ideas, comments, suggestions, etc.

The use of xeroxing and typing services to inform participants of the work of some of the small groups was also recommended; for example, giving the participants a copy of the thirteen competencies as well as a list of each group's original contributions would have been helpful. Everyone was quite positive in regard to the housing facilities. The fact that the conference was held in a setting which provided an opportunity for isolation and "groupness" was highly praised.

Focus of Institute

It appears that there was some concern about the institute's focusing in on a model. It ranged from suggestions that a decision by the group be made at a point early in the conference and a

decision be reached as to, "Do we patch up the present training model, do we design a new model, or do we do both?" Many suggested that the goals for the institute ought to be limited either prior to the institute or at the first conference meeting. It was also suggested that maybe each institute might wish to focus on different topics. The feelings seemed to be, "The matter of greatest importance in relation to the institute's focus is a clear definition of the expected output of the institute, no matter how this is arrived at."

There was some comment in relation to using a PERT or some other type of systems approach in an effort to get at the product that is desired. It was expressed by one individual in the following way: "A non-special educator who is an expert in systems development or other processes for development might have provided either an initial structure or a latter integrated framework which could have saved time and allowed for more appropriate closure."

Post-Institute Materials

There was general agreement that materials developed from this workshop should be provided for subsequent institutes. It was proposed that the list of suggested competencies should be made available to the other institutes; that, if, in fact, it can advance the deliberation by one day, then that is real progress for the whole project.

Other

The director of the institute was commended for her difficult tasks in leading this group without dictating. The participants who submitted comments felt that it was a most worthwhile activity even though everything which was said might not be recorded. The feeling could probably be best expressed by quoting the comment from one of the participants. "...aspects of such conference is that general and specific exchanges have allowed for personal questioning and relation of problems, ideas and programs--which will not end as the conference is completed--and perhaps will open up communications between participants from this point on."

One participant expressed a feeling of disappointment in that a definite statement on feasibility of a doctorate in MR was not made. It seems there was quite a bit of concensus on this item; namely, doctorates in MR are not the pattern.

Appendix C.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
University of Northern Colorado
July 30 - Aug. 1, 1970

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO
Greeley, Colorado

INSTITUTE - "FOCUS ON DOCTORAL PREPARATION IN MENTAL RETARDATION"
July 30, 1970 through August 1, 1970
Panorama Lounge, University Center

Thursday, July 30

9:00 a.m. Registration and Coffee

10:00 a.m. Welcome--
Dr. Darrell Holmes, President
University of Northern Colorado

Dr. Tony Vaughan, Chairman
Department of Special Education

10:30 a.m. Address--(Video Tape)
Dr. Edwin W. Martin
Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

11:45 a.m. Lunch

1:15 p.m. Address--
Dr. Clifford Howe, Chairman
Division of Special Education
University of Iowa

"Public School Expectations of Teachers and
Other Professionals in the Field of Mental
Retardation"

2:30 p.m. Coffee

3:00 p.m. Discussion groups, "A", "B", and "C"

4:00 - 4:30 p.m. Discussion group leaders and recorders meet

Friday, July 31

9:00 a.m. Business Session (Discussion of expense forms,
etc.)

9:30 a.m. Summarization of Reaction to Dr. Cliff
Howe's address--Dr. Bill Gearheart
Professor, Special Education
University of Northern Colorado

10:00 a.m. Coffee

10:30 a.m. Discussion groups, "A", "B", and "C"

12:00 - Lunch

1:15 p.m. Address--
 Dr. Maynard Reynolds, Chairman
 Department of Special Education
 University of Minnesota

"Training Programs in Mental Retardation:
 Role and Program Differentiation"

2:30 p.m. Coffee

3:00 p.m. Discussion groups, "A", "B", and "C"

4:00 - 4:30 p.m. Discussion group leaders and records meets

Saturday, August 1

9:00 a.m. Address--
 Dr. Norman Niesen, Chairman
 Department of Mental Retardation
 State University College, Buffalo, N.Y.

"Issues and Strategies in Preparing
 Personnel in Mental Retardation"

10:00 a.m. Coffee

10:30 a.m. Discussion Groups, "A", "B", and "C"

11:30 - 12:00 a.m. Discussion leaders and recorders meet

12:00 - Lunch

1:15 p.m. Review and Recapitulation--
 Dr. Bill R. Gearheart, Professor
 Special Education
 University of Northern Colorado

DISCUSSION GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

GROUP A - Dr. Willard Jones, Chairman
Neil Henderson, Recorder

GROUP B - Dr. Oliver P. Kolstoe, Chairman
Dr. Lynn Springfield, Recorder

GROUP C - Dr. Kaye D. Owens, Chairman
Tom Jeschke, Recorder

	<u>Thursday (AM)</u>	<u>Friday (AM & PM)</u>	<u>Saturday (AM)</u>
Dwaine Alcorn	A	B	C
Ron Archer	A	C	A
Arthur Best	A	B	C
Fred Bieck	C	A	B
Lou Bransford	C	A	B
Lou Brown	A	B	C
Frances Cassidy	C	A	B
Jerry Caster	B	C	C
Lee Courtnage	C	B	A
Wanda Graham	A	B	C
Fred Heryford	B	C	A
Walter Higbee	B	A	C
Richard Johnson	A	C	B
Wayne Johnson	B	A	C
Stanley Knox	B	C	A
Don Logan	C	B	A
Betty Manley	B	C	A
Wilbur Millslagle	C	A	B
Earl Morrison	B	C	A
David Naylor	C	A	B
Tony Paulmeno	A	B	B
Dwayne Peterson	A	C	A
Jerald Reese	B	C	A
Devoe Rickert	B	A	C
Morris Spence	B	B	C
John Stellern	A	C	B
Glen Thomas	C	A	B
Paul Vance	A	B	C
Bob Weiland	C	A	B
Dick Wolfe	A	C	B
William J. Young	C	B	A

Northern Colorado University
Special Study Institute
Participants
(Invited)

COLORADO

Dr. Arthur Best
State Home and Training School
Wheatridge, Colorado

Dr. Betty Manley
Loretta Heights College
Denver, Colorado

Dr. Robert Weiland
Jefferson County Public Schools
Denver, Colorado

Anthony J. Paulmeno
State Dept. of Education
Denver, Colorado

Mrs. Frances Cassidy
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Bill R. Gearheart
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Mr. Wayne Johnson
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Willard Jones
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Oliver P. Kolstoe
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Mr. Wilbur Millslagle
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Mr. David Naylor
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

COLORADO (Con't)

Dr. Kaye D. Owens
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Lynn Springfield
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Tony D. Vaughan
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

Dr. Richard R. Wolfe
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley

IOWA

Jerry Caster
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

Dr. Lee Courtnage
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Morris Spence
Des Moines Public Schools
Des Moines, Iowa

Dr. Paul Vance
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa

MINNESOTA

Richard Johnson
Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dr. Stanley Knox
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota

NEBRASKA

Dr. Dwaine Alcorn
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Fred Black
State Department of Education
Lincoln, Nebraska

Dr. Earl Morrison
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska

NEW MEXICO

Dr. Louis Bransford
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Wanda Graham
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Dr. Jerald Reese
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

William J. Young
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

NORTH DAKOTA

Dr. Ron Archer
Minot State Teachers College
Minot, North Dakota

SOUTH DAKOTA

Dr. Walter Higbee
Black Hills State College
Spearfish, South Dakota

UTAH

Don Logan
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

UTAH (Con't)

Dr. Dwayne Peterson
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Dr. Devoe Rickert
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Dr. Glen Thomas
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

WYOMING

Dr. Fred Heryford
State Training School
Lander, Wyoming

Dr. John Stellern
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dr. Charles Forgnone, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Bobby Palk, Washington, D.C.
Dr. William Carriker, Univ. of Virginia

Major Speakers

The following major speakers and the title of their position papers are listed below. The papers can be obtained by writing to Dr. Bill Gearheart.

Howe, C., Chairman, Division of Special Education, University of Iowa -- "Public School Expectations of Teachers and Other Professionals in the Field of Mental Retardation"

Niesen, N., Chairman, Department of Mental Retardation, State University College, Buffalo, N.Y. -- "Issues and Strategies in Preparing Personnel in Mental Retardation"

Reynolds, M., Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. -- "Differentiated Preparation for Differentiated Roles: Honest Doctoral Programs"

POST-INSTITUTE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS AND
COMMENTS ON NORTHERN COLORADO UNIVERSITY MR INSTITUTE
JULY 30 - AUGUST 1, 1970

(This summary is based on only six participants)

I. Pre-Institute Materials and Arrangements

The comments related to this aspect of the institute ranged all the way from excellent to not enough detail about the institute. It seems that the majority of those who responded felt that mimeographed programs mailed to the participants prior to the institutes would have been helpful. A general outline would have provided the expectations and objectives. As stated by one individual, "We would be better prepared if we knew what the goals were. (The goals were not really identified until Friday afternoon)."

II. Structural Organization of the Institute

It was generally felt that the structure of the institute was adequate. However, most of the participants seemed to think that more structure would have made the groups more productive from the beginning. One individual felt that there was too much wasted time. Another stated, "If we were to get together to be involved--and this process was the goal (involvement)--then the practice of shifting group membership was appropriate. But for a product, the changing groups only confuse the process."

III. Participant Representation

The representation at the institute was reported to be quite satisfactory; however, those who felt this way suggested there needed to be more consumers in attendance; for example, public school personnel and institutional personnel. One individual suggested that many times doctoral programs are affected by NCATE standards and graduate school rules and therefore, persons representing these groups would have been helpful.

IV. Equipment and Facilities

All individuals felt that this aspect of the institute was excellent and commended the graduate students for their assistance in regard to transportation, etc.

V. Focus

It was generally felt that the institute related to a very timely topic. One individual suggested that the present situation was rather frightening in relation to its implications for the present teacher-training programs. There seemed to be some criticism about the lack of structure. Some of the participants suggested that more structure would have resulted in a more productive institute; however, they suggested that the lack of direction could have been a distinct function of the way the leaders perceived their roles.

VI. Post-Institute Materials

In all instances it was requested that a final copy of the report be sent to each participant.

VII. Other

In a couple of instances, comments were made about the role of the three group leaders. They should be catalysts and not purveyors of their own philosophies. One individual seemed to feel that there were times when the discussion groups "dragged" due to a certain amount of lethargy or feelings of complacency on the part of the participants in regard to what already is taking place in their own programs. One individual felt it would have been more helpful had the speakers engaged in dialogue after their presentations.

Appendix D.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
University of Oregon
Aug. 16 - 19, 1970

Afternoon	1:00 - 1:30	"Charges in Administration"...Robert Schwarz
	1:30 - 3:30	Small Group Reaction and Interaction... Discussion Leaders
	3:30 - 8:00	Recreation and Dinner
Evening	8:00 - 10:00	Homogeneous Groups to Prepare Plan

Wednesday, August 19

Morning	9:00 - 10:30	Breakfast Panel...Espeseth, Prehm, Bransford, Hofmeister, Schwarz, Hegrenes, Brabandt
	10:30 - 12:00	Reaction from Outside Experts

University of Oregon

Institute Participants
(Invited)

Dr. James Q. Affleck, Chairman
Special Education Department
College of Education
101 Miller
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Dr. V. Knute Espeseth
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Chester Bowers
College of Education
Room 207, Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. H. D. Fredericks
Teaching Research
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

Dr. Earl Brabandt
College of Education
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Katherine French
University of Oregon Medical
School
3181 Jackson Park Rd., S.W.
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dr. Steve A. Brannan
Mental Retardation Program
Special Education Department
School of Education
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207

Dr. Robert P. Gelhart, Chairman
Department of Special Education
College of Education
University of Nevada
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Dr. Louis Bransford
Guidance and Special Education
Department
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Dr. Jack Hegrenes
University of Oregon Medical
School
3181 Jackson Park Road, S.W.
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dr. Philip Browning
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Alan Hofmeister
Utah State University
Special Education Department
Logan, Utah 84321

Dr. John Dodd
Eastern Montana College of Education
1500 North 30th
Billings, Montana 59101

Dr. Doug Howard
University of Virginia
Department of Special Education
Peabody Hall
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. Melton Martinson
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon 97403

Dr. August Mauser
Indiana State University
Department of Special Education
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Mr. James McAllister
Oregon Board of Education
Title VI Coordinator
942 Lancaster Drive, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Mr. Charles Forgnone, Coordinator
M.R. Unit
Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 22202

Dr. John A. Miller
Department of Special Education
Black Hall, C.W.S.C.
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Dr. John Potts, Director
Division of Special Education
Department of Public Instruction
1730 West Adams
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dr. Herbert J. Prehm
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Jerome H. Rothstein
Special Education Department
School of Education
San Francisco State College
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132

Dr. Robert Schwarz
Department of Studies in Behavioral
Disabilities
University of Wisconsin
415 W. Gilman Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

Dr. Fred Smokoski, Coordinator
Mental Retardation Area
Department of Special Education
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Mr. Wayne Spence
Department of Special Education
State of Washington
Olympia, Washington 98501

Mr. Jerry D. McGee, Director
Community Mental Retardation
Services
Mental Health Division
Oregon State Hospital
2570 Center St., N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Mr. Edgar Taylor, Director
Special Education
Portland Public Schools
220 North Beech
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dr. Harry Wall
California State College
Department of Special Education
King Hall, C-1072B
5151 State College Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032

Dr. Christopher Williams
University of Oregon Medical
School
3181 Jackson Park Rd., S.W.
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dr. C. Ellery Young
School of Education
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

Dr. Boris Bogatz
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Mrs. Nonda Stone
College of Education
Special Education Department
Clinical Services Building
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Sumie Takeguchi-Feldman
Department of Educational Psychology
College of Education
University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

University of Oregon Students

Kevin McGovern
Glade Miller
Steve Morelan
Lou Semrau
Richard Sonnen
Mel Weishahn

Secretaries

Jan Mizell
Roberta Shirley

Major Papers

The following major papers and their authors are listed below. The papers can be obtained by writing to Dr. Herbert Prehm.

Bransford, L., College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N.M.,--"Doctoral Programs in Mental Retardation: A Biased Approach"

Hofmeister, Assistant Professor, Special Education Department, Utah State University, Logan, Utah--"Training Researchers in Mental Retardation"

Schwarz, R., Dept. of Studies in Behavioral Disabilities, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin--"Administration in Special Education"

A summary of the selected comments made by Dr. French representing the field of anthropology; Dr. Bowers representing Educational Philosophy and Dr. Williams representing medicine are also available.

WESTERN REGIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION INSTITUTE AT OREGON

Participant Post-Evaluation Recommendations and Comments

I. Pre-Institute Materials and Arrangements

There was a very high degree of enthusiasm and praise in this area. "All pre-Institute materials and arrangements were of the highest order. The staff and graduate students of the University of Oregon should be commended for the high level of professionalism shown." This quote might be used as the consensus. The only objections were from a few who felt that the financial arrangements should have been made clearer or that the papers which were distributed in advance were not acted upon sufficiently during the discussions. This latter, of course, does not reflect on the materials themselves.

II. Structural Organization of Institute

The planning was well done and well organized. Participants seemed to enjoy being able to react on the spot to the idea under discussion and seemed to feel that bringing in "outsiders" from other academic areas was a good idea, but there were some who felt that more meeting as a total group would have been useful. And there was a great deal of doubt as to the effectiveness of the ranking of priorities by all three groups. Each group tended to rank its own work as being of the highest priority. One delegate suggested that "A record of our group's reactions or comments on the other groups' proposals would have afforded the editorial committee better guidelines than the arbitrary ranking." Another felt that a final report's value would be "highly questionable" if based on the 1, 2, 3 priority. Finally, one or two members found the evening meetings till ten p.m. too fatiguing and would have preferred longer afternoon sessions.

III. Participant Representation

Most people agreed that the representation was good, especially considering the difficulties in rounding up so many people during summer vacation. They commented favorably on the role of the graduate students, the good selection of chairmen, and the roving experts in the fields of anthropology, philosophy, and medicine. However, more than half of the participants who submitted evaluation sheets professed considerable unhappiness at the conspicuous absence of representatives from various minority groups, particularly the blacks. Other suggestions

were the inclusion of college deans, legislators, and senior teachers without advanced degrees but known for classroom ability.

IV. Facilities and Equipment

Comments ranged from "Great!" and "Excellent" to "O.K." Several people suggested the use of tape recorders at all sessions to assist or replace human recorders. More chalkboards were needed. The choice of the Timberline Lodge and the staff thereof were appreciated.

V. Focus of Institute

The need for such a conference was recognized. "Where other conferences leave off..." was approved as the approach. Reactions to the focus seemed as varied as the different individuals. Some felt that too much time was spent on "large societal issues that do not particularly lend themselves to remediation within a given individual's doctoral program," while others felt that "little group time was spent in grappling with larger philosophical issues" and too much time on "program maintenance activity." A good many participants felt that the focus was too broad and general, that there were just too many complex problems to be covered in such a short institute. Specifically, one member suggested that the inclusions of minority cultures as a problem warrants an institute in itself as does each of the three areas focused on by the institute.

VI. Post-Institute Materials

Comments on this area were generally recommendations. Most members are looking forward to receiving a summary of the proceedings of all the groups, and others expressed a desire for reports from the other Institutes as well, and another would like a report of the three presentations by the outside experts. One delegate suggested the members be sent copies of the summaries for footnoting and clarification of semantic problems prior to the final report. Finally, a pertinent observation: "These materials are useless unless applied. In many cases, monographs, etc. sit on book shelves."

VII. Other

One member felt that the "fact that the third-party evaluation of outside experts was included in this institute but not

in others is disturbing." This member suggested outside evaluation (not by U.S.O.E. or project director) of all six institutes. Another wished that the group had produced "some 'far out' radical proposals which we could put forward as moving us in some direction but which would not necessarily ever be achieved as such." However, the majority of participants who commented in this space seemed concerned with the future. They felt the Institute was just a start; that national and regional priorities should be more intensively explored; that content and implementation should be explored; that a second conference including coordinators of all doctoral programs in mental retardation in the country would be much more informative; that a follow-up institute in the spring should be held for all the same participants to honestly evaluate the supplication of our basic tenets and proposals; that follow-up is essential.

Appendix E.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
University of Texas
August 13 - 15, 1970

University of Texas
Special Study Institute
Program

Thursday, August 13, 1970

Jester Center Auditorium

8:45 - 9:00 a.m.	Welcome Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman, Dean College of Education The University of Texas at Austin
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	"Research Training and Mental Retardation" Dr. Herbert J. Prehm University of Oregon, Eugene
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break
10:30 - 11:30 a.m.	"A Non-Sailor's View from the Starboard Side, Or The Future for Training Programs in Special Education: A Harried Comment" Dr. John Kohl Pennsylvania State University University Park
11:30 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 4:00 p.m.	Group Discussion Discussion Leaders: Dr. Charles Cleland Room A-303 Dr. John R. Peck Room A-305 Dr. Clifford Drew Room A-307
7:00 - 9:00 p.m.	Summary and Discussion Dr. John Kidd Special Education School District St. Louis County, Missouri

Education for the Seventies"
Dr. Philip Jones
Indiana University, Bloomington

11:30 - 1:30

Lunch

1:30 - 4:00 p.m.

Group Discussion

Discussion Leaders: Dr. Charles Meisgeier
Room A-303

Dr. John King
Room A-305

Dr. Jasper Harvey
Room A-307

4:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Institute Summary

Drs. John Kidd, Jasper Harvey and
William Wolfe

Participants
Special Study Institute
for
Doctoral Training
in
Mental Retardation
August 13-15, 1970

Representatives from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Dr. Max W. Mueller, Chief
Projects and Program Research Branch
Division of Research
Bureau of Education for the Handi-
capped
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Bobby E. Palk, Coordinator
Mental Retardation Unit
Division of Training Programs
Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. William Carriker, National Coordinator
Institutes Designed to Upgrade
Doctoral Level Programs in Mental Retardation
Department of Special Education
University of Virginia

Speakers

Dr. Leon F. Cain, President
California State College, Dominguez

Dr. Philip R. Jones, Acting
Chairman
Department of Special Education
Indiana University, Bloomington

Dr. John Kidd, Assistant
Superintendent
Department of the Mentally Retarded
Special School District of St. Louis
County, Missouri

Dr. John Kohl, Director
Center for Cooperative
Research with Schools
The Pennsylvania State
University
University Park

Dr. Herbert J. Prehm, Professor
College of Education and
Director Rehabilitation
Research and Training Center
University of Oregon, Eugene

Dr. Louis Schwartz, Professor and
Coordinator of Programs in Mental
Retardation and Interrelated Areas
The Florida State University
Tallahassee

Dr. Richard F. Weatherman,
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis

Discussion Leaders from The University of Texas at Austin

Dr. Charles Cleland, Professor
Department of Special Education

Dr. Charles Meisgeier,
Associate Professor
Departments of Special Education
and Educational Administration

Dr. Clifford Drew
Assistant Professor, Department of
Special Education and Director of
Research, Special Education
Instructional Materials Center

Dr. James E. Payne, Assistant
Professor
School of Social Work

Dr. Jasper Harvey, Chairman
Department of Special Education

Dr. John Peck, Professor and
Graduate Advisor
Department of Special Education

Dr. John D. King, Assistant
Professor
Departments of Special Education
and Educational Administration

Dr. William G. Wolfe, Professor
Department of Special Education

Invited Participants

Arkansas

Mr. Charles E. Acuff, Superintendent
Arkansas Children's Colony, Conway

Mr. Milburn Adams, Consultant for M.R. Services
State Department of Education, Little Rock

Mrs. Edith Atkerson, Instructor
Division of Elementary and Special Education
Arkansas State University, State College

Kansas

Dr. Robert T. Fulton, Director
Research and Training
Parsons State Hospital and Training Center, Parsons

Dr. Munro Shintani, Assistant Professor and Coordinator
Mental Retardation Program
University of Kansas, Lawrence

Mr. Lloyd Kinnison, Doctoral Student
University of Kansas, Lawrence

Dr. Hester Romines, Director
Special Education
Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays

Louisiana

Mrs. Fay McCormick
Director of Special Education
State Department of Education, Baton Rouge

Dr. Alfred Stern, Chairman
Department of Special Education
Louisiana State University, New Orleans

Mr. Coates Stuckey, Superintendent
Pinecrest State School, Pineville

Mississippi

Dr. W. R. Burris, Associate Professor of Education
The Universities Center, Jackson

Mr. Charles Mosley, Jr., Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education - Psychology
Jackson State College, Jackson

Dr. William Plue, Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg

Mr. Ray Coxe, Doctoral Student
University of Southern Mississippi

Missouri

Mr. Donald Cox, Director of Special Education
State Department of Education, Jefferson City

Dr. Edward Meyen, Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Missouri, Columbia

Dr. Robert Wagner, Professor
Special Education Division
St. Louis University, St. Louis

Oklahoma

Dr. Lois Campbell, Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
Central State College, Edmond

Dr. Rondal Gamble, Director of Special Education
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater

Dr. Jimmy Prickett, Assistant Director
Special Education
State Department of Education, Oklahoma City

Texas

Mr. Robert L. Breckenridge, Superintendent
Travis State School, Austin

Dr. James Craft, Assistant Commissioner
Mental Retardation Services
Texas Department of Mental Health-Mental Retardation,
Austin

Dr. Stanley Fudell, Associate Professor
Texas Tech University, Lubbock

Miss Donna Edgmon, Doctoral Student
Miss Barbara Lake, Doctoral Student
Texas Tech University

Dr. James Hale, Consultant
Regional Program Division
Texas Department of Mental Health-Mental Retardation,
Austin

Mr. Tomas Hinojosa, Jr.
Director of Special Education
Austin Independent School District, Austin

Dr. Theresa Monaco, Assistant Professor
Departments of Special Education and Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Houston, Houston

Dr. Alfred Moore, Coordinator
Special Education Department
University of Houston, Houston

Mr. Larry Talkington, Superintendent
Austin State School, Austin

Special Participants

Mr. J. E. Bridges, President
Marbridge Foundation, Austin

Dr. Michael Clark
Director of Education and Training
Pinecrest State School, Pineville, Louisiana

Mr. Charles S. Eskridge, Executive Vice-President
Education Consultants Division of MSA, Inc., Austin

Dr. Andrew Halpern, Director of Research
Research and Training Center for Mental Retardation
The University of Texas at Austin

Mr. Richard A. Johnson
Director of Special Education
Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis

Dr. Robert Montgomery
Assistant Commissioner for Special Education
Texas Education Agency, Austin

Mr. John Weimer, Acting Director
Mental Health - Mental Retardation Center, Austin

Special Study Institute
for
Doctoral Training in Mental Retardation
August 13-15, 1970 - Jester Center

Schedule
Discussion Leaders and Student Recorders

<u>Date</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>	<u>Student Recorder</u>	<u>Room</u>
<u>Thursday, August 13</u>	Dr. Charles Cleland	Reuben Altman	303
Topic of the day: <u>Research</u>	Dr. John Peck	Jan Langley	305
	Dr. Clifford Drew	King Moody	307

<u>Friday, August 14</u>	Dr. James Payne	Carol Whitcraft	303
Topic of the day: <u>Teacher Training</u>	Dr. William G. Wolfe	Peggy Smith	305
	Dr. John Peck	Hoyt Ponder	307

<u>Saturday, August 15</u>	Dr. Charles Meisgeier	Mack McCoulskey	303
Topic of the day: <u>Administration</u>	Dr. John King	Gary Sluyter	305
	Dr. Jasper Harvey	Jack Leath	307

Floaters: Bob Moore
Larry Marrs
Bill Schinder

Specific Responsibilities of Floaters:

- 1) Assist with registration procedures
- 2) Be sure discussion rooms are set up and ready
- 3) Assist (or substitute for) individual recorders
- 4) Be "on call" all three days

Chairman of Student Recorders: Bob Moore

All morning and evening sessions will be held in the Jester Center Auditorium (first floor, north side of the building). The small group discussion sessions will be held on the third floor as indicated above.

Major Papers

The authors and titles of their position papers plus the "commentors" and titles of their papers are listed below. Copies of these papers as well as Dr. Kidd's daily institute summarizations can be obtained by writing to Dr. John King at the University of Texas.

Position Papers

Prehm, H., Professor and Director, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon--
"Research Training and Mental Retardation"

Schwartz, L., Professor and Coordinator of Programs in Mental Retardation and Interrelated Areas, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida--"Doctoral Level Preparation of the Teacher Educator in Mental Retardation"

Weatherman, R., Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota--"Administration of Special Education for the Seventies"

Commentor's Papers

Cain, L., President, California State College, Dominguez, Calif.--
"A Comment on Doctoral Level Preparation of the Teacher-Educator in Mental Retardation"

Jones, P., Acting Chairman, Department of Special Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana--"Comments on Administration of Special Education"

Kohl, J., Director, Center for Cooperative Research with Schools, Penn State University, University Park, Pa.--"A Non-Sailor's View from the Starboard Side OR The Future for Training Programs in Special Education Research: A Harried Comment"

SUMMARY OF POST-INSTITUTE EVALUATION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND COMMENTS
FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS INSTITUTE ON UPGRADING DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
ON MENTAL RETARDATION--August 13-15, 1970

I. Pre-Institute Materials and Arrangements

The majority of the participants felt that the pre-institute materials and arrangements were excellent. In a number of instances comments were made about the fine assistance given to the participants by the graduate students. Some participants felt, however, that it would have been more helpful had there been copies of the papers which were presented.

A couple of comments were made in regard to the first session, that is, Wednesday evening, having been canceled. These individuals felt they would have been better able to use that time had they been informed prior to their arrival.

The great majority of the participants felt quite satisfied with the information that was provided prior to the institute. One suggestion was made, however, that possibly a list of provocative questions or comments might have been prepared in relation to the presentations. This might have provided food for thought for the group discussions.

II. Structural Organization of the Institute

The majority of participants in the institute felt that this aspect of the institute was excellent and had no particular negative criticisms.

There was some concern expressed by a minority of participants as it related to their questioning the value of night meetings. They felt these summaries could have occurred in the afternoon, at least in the manner in which the summaries were made. One participant suggested that maybe the summary could have occurred for one hour, and then the other could have been used for small-group rethinking. It would have been, according to him, helpful to have had this built in before hand.

A couple of comments were made in regard to the need for more structure to have been available for the small-group sessions. One individual felt that he participated in one group in which the leader functioned as a leader; however, in another group he felt the leader was an antagonist rather than a leader.

One individual felt that this type of structure would be most appropriate were it to be carried on within a university setting; that it would be a good experience for both faculty and students.

III. Participant Representation

Generally speaking, there seemed to be satisfaction with the kinds of representatives that were in attendance at the institute. One individual felt, however, that it would have been helpful to have had more representatives from the general area of education. A couple of other individuals felt that it would have been better to have had more representation from related consumers such as the institutions and various agencies. One individual suggested it would have been good to have had a couple of doctoral students who had just completed their doctoral programs be involved in an institute of this kind.

IV. Facilities and Equipment

The great majority of participants felt that the facilities and equipment were excellent. They commented about the fine food service and hospitality.

Comments in relation to the informality of the sessions were quite positive, which was conducive to participant interaction. The living facilities were questioned by a few participants in regard to the rooms; for example, sharing baths; no telephones, radio or television in the rooms. A wake-up service would have been helpful.

One individual commented that the facilities were most adequate; but he stated, "As educators we preach use of media. Only one problem--we don't know how to use it..."

V. Focus of Institute

Representatives from the institutions felt that the focus was appropriate. There was some concern raised as to the inability of the group discussions to stay within the doctoral level or even the graduate level. Two individuals felt that the institute was not tuned to the needs of the institutions and recognized, however, that this was not the major purpose of the institute. The other individual felt that the institutions' representatives had an opportunity to communicate but let it slip by, and felt that the academicians were still playing god. He felt that we ought to have more workers involved in an institute like this,

especially those who "are getting their hands dirty," working with the retarded.

The doctoral student participants felt that the focus of the institute was most appropriate and was of special interest to them and would be helpful in assisting them to take certain things back to their own programs and made comparisons in relation to their own doctoral programs. One, however, questioned the value of the Florida State model in that it was overly specific and, as a result, may have made too much of an emphasis for the teacher-educator focus for that one day. This individual felt that this was the least helpful of the three days.

Reactions from faculty members tended to be relatively positive as expressed by one individual, "Particularly good. The three areas were highly relevant and apropos for discussion for doctoral-training programs. Innovative, stimulating presentations..." One felt that it was a very worthy goal but expressed a concern that very little seemed to crystalize; however, he did feel that much more value may have come out of it than he thought. Another individual felt that the institute had difficulty in staying on the doctoral-program theme but they did stay on focus of education of students in relation to sequential development. He seemed to feel that the models that were presented were really for evaluation and a starting-off point for discussion.

VI. Post-Institute Materials

All of the participants expressed a very definite interest in receiving the post-institute report from the University of Texas, and a great majority of them felt it was a fine idea to have a composite report made available to them a little later on.

VII. Other

In general, the comments within this section related to the management of the institute, the comments being very positive. A special comment of appreciation to Doctors King and Drew and to Mrs. Sponholts was found in most of the participants' evaluations.

Generally, the comments could be expressed in the following way: "Thanks for the fine hospitality. The institute was done up in the traditional 'Texas manner.'"

Appendix F.

Special Study Institute: Doctoral Level
Training in Mental Retardation
University of Virginia
August 5 - 7, 1970

GENERAL SCHEDULE

Tuesday, Aug. 4

4-8 p.m. Arrival and Registration--Howard Johnson's
 8-10 p.m. Social Meeting--Swimming Pool Patio

Wednesday, Aug. 5 General Session--Conference Room

8-9 a.m. Opening remarks by Dr. Howard, Institute Director; Dr. Cyphert, Dean, School of Education, University of Virginia; Dr. Carriker, National Co-Director of Mental Retardation Institutes; Dr. Martin (via video-tape), Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped; and Dr. Pappanikou, Head Instructor for the Northeast Regional Institute

9 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Group Leader-- Klebanoff Reactor--Meyen	Group Leader-- Holowinsky Reactor--Lema	Group Leader-- Pappanikou Reactor--Ware
Group Sessions	Meeting Room A	Meeting Room B	Meeting Room C

Thursday, Aug. 6

9 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Group Leader-- Garfunkel Reactor--Meyen	Group Leader-- Pappanikou Reactor--Lema	Group Leader-- Levy Reactor--Ware
Group Sessions	Meeting Room A	Meeting Room B	Meeting Room C

8-10 p.m. General Session--Conference Room

Friday, Aug. 7

8-11:15 a.m.	Group Leader-- Pappanikou Reactor--Meyen	Group Leader-- Benton Reactor--Lema	Group Leader-- Strauch Reactor--Ware
Group Sessions	Meeting Room A	Meeting Room B	Meeting Room C

2-4 p.m. General Session--Conference Room

MASTER SCHEDULE
SPECIAL STUDY INSTITUTE

DATE	TIME	ACTIVITY	TOPIC	COORDINATOR AND/ OR GROUP LEADER	LOCATION
Tuesday, August 4	4:00 - 8:00 p.m.	Arrival & Registration	-	-	Howard Johnson's Motor Hotel
	8:00 - 10:00 p.m.	Social Meeting			
Wednesday August 5	8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	General session All Participants	Opening remarks, introductions, theme of institute	Dr. Howard, Institute Director & Dr. Pappanikou	Conference room (mezzanine)
	9:00 - 10:15 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Current Status of Doctoral Programs in Mental Retardation	Dr. Klebanoff Dr. Holowinsky Dr. Pappanikou	Meeting Room A Room B Room C
	10:30 - 11:45 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Common Competencies	Dr. Klebanoff Dr. Holowinsky Dr. Pappanikou	Room A Room B Room C
	11:45 - 1:00 p.m.		LUNCH BREAK		
	1:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Program Staffing Procedures	Dr. Klebanoff Dr. Holowinsky Dr. Pappanikou	Room A Room B Room C

Focus:
Adminis-
tration

SCHEDULE

DATE	TIME	ACTIVITY	TOPIC	COORDINATOR AND/OR GROUP LEADER	LOCATION
Wednesday (cont)	2:30 - 3:45 p.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Specific Competencies in Administration Reaction, Review and Critique. "Round table discussion" and video tape playback.	Dr. Klebanoff Dr. Holowinsky Dr. Pappanikou	Meeting Room A Room B Room C
	8:00 - 10:00 p.m.	General Session All Participants		Institute Director and Group Leaders	Conf. Room (mezzanine)
Thursday, August 6	9:00 - 10:15 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Selection Procedures	Dr. Garfunkel Dr. Pappanikou Dr. Levy	Room A Room B Room C
Focus: Research	10:30 - 11:45 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Program of Studies & Related Experiences	Dr. Garfunkel Dr. Pappanikou Dr. Levy	Room A Room B Room C
	11:45 - 1:00 p.m.		LUNCH BREAK		
	1:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Learning Disability Movement	Dr. Garfunkel Dr. Pappanikou Dr. Levy	Room A Room B Room C
	2:30 - 3:45 p.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Specific Competencies in Research	Dr. Garfunkel Dr. Pappanikou Dr. Levy	Room A Room B Room C
	3:30 - 4:00 p.m.		Video tape Playback		Room B

SCHEDULE

DATE	TIME	ACTIVITY	TOPIC	COORDINATOR AND/OR GROUP LEADER	LOCATION
Thursday (cont)	4:00- 8:00 p.m.	General Session All Participants	DINNER BREAK - OPEN TIME	Institute Director and Group Leaders	Conf. Room (mezzanine)
Friday, August 7	8:00- 8:45 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Early Childhood and Disadvantaged Move- ments	Dr. Pappanikou Mr. Benton Dr. Strauch	Room A Room B Room C
Focus: Teacher Prepara- tion	8:50- 9:35 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Noncategorical move- ment	Dr. Pappanikou Mr. Benton Dr. Strauch	Room A Room B Room C
	9:40- 10:25 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Evaluation Procedures	Dr. Pappanikou Mr. Benton Dr. Strauch	Room A Room B Room C
	10:30- 11:15 a.m.	Group Sessions Group I Group II Group III	Specific Competencies in Teacher Preparation	Dr. Pappanikou Mr. Benton Dr. Strauch	Room A Room B Room C
	11:15- 2:00		LUNCH BREAK-- OPEN TIME		
	2:00- 4:00 p.m.	General Session All Participants	Summary and reaction to first draft of final document	Director, Group Leaders, and Instructors	Conf. Room (mezzanine)

131
135

PERSONNEL FOR INSTITUTE ON UPGRADING DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
IN MENTAL RETARDATION

University of Virginia

Institute Director:	Dr. Douglas P. Howard University of Virginia
Administrative Assistant:	Mr. James A. White University of Virginia
Head Group Leader:	Dr. A. J. Pappanikou University of Connecticut
Assistant Group Leader:	Dr. Frank Garfunkel Boston University
	Dr. Ivan Holowinsky Rutgers University
	Dr. Lewis B. Klebanoff Boston University
	Dr. Irwin Levy Southern Connecticut State College
	Mr. Joseph Benton University of Virginia
	Dr. James Strauch University of Connecticut
Reactors:	Dr. David E. Lema Ohio State University
	Dr. Edward Meyen University of Iowa
	Dr. Don Ware Marshall University
U.S. Office of Education	Sister Agnes McNally Graduate Intern
	Dr. Bob Palk Acting Coordinator (Physical Education and Recreation)

Via video tape

Dr. Edward Martin
Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped

Participants--Group I

1. Dr. Anthony D. Chiappone
Coordinator, Special Education
University of Maine
2. Dr. Ruth W. Diggs, Coordinator
Special Education Department
Norfolk State College, Va.
3. Dr. I. Ignacy Goldberg,
Coordinator
Programs in Mental Retardation
Columbia University
4. Dr. Lewis B. Klebanoff
Coordinator of Mental
Retardation
Boston University
5. Dr. Calvin Lauder
Director of Special Education
Rochester City Schools
6. Miss Esther Shevick
State Dept. of Education
Richmond, Virginia

Group II

7. Dr. Frank Garfunkel
Research Specialist
Boston University
8. Dr. Ivan Z. Holowinsky,
Coordinator
Special Education Chairman
Rutgers University
9. Dr. Benedict Nagler
Superintendent
Lynchburg Training School

10. Dr. John G. Smith
Superintendent
Dr. Joseph H. Ladd School
Vermont
11. Dr. Arthur E. Toll,
Superintendent
Laconia State School
New Hampshire
12. Dr. Peter Zuk
Director of Education
Brandon Training School
Vermont

Group III

13. Dr. David Bilowit
Program Coordinator
Newark State College, N.J.
14. Dr. Ted Christiansen, Head
Department of Special Educ.
Madison College, Va.
15. Dr. William E. Davis
MR Program Coordinator
University of Maine
16. Dr. Irwin Levy
Southern Connecticut State
College
17. Dr. Vern McGriff
Program Coordinator
Jersey City State College
18. Dr. James Strauch
Coordinator of Program
in MR
University of Connecticut

Participants: Doctoral Students in Mental Retardation Programs

19. Joseph Benton, University of Virginia
20. Vera Perry, University of Virginia
21. Valerie Kulesza, Columbia University
22. Al Berkowitz, Boston University

Instructor

23. Dr. Pappanikou
University of Connecticut

TOPIC: Summary of evaluation reports submitted following completion of Virginia institute on "Doctoral Training in Mental Retardation."

NOTE: This report is based on the responses of 16 participants. The form contained six open ended questions. Participants were encouraged not to sign the evaluation forms. The nature of the form was not conducive to reporting ratings. Rather, the responses were synthesized. An attempt was made to retain the comments without devoting excessive space to quoting comments.

I. Pre-Institute Materials and Arrangements

There were two definite patterns observed in the composite responses. All respondents were positive in their comments. They felt that the materials were relevant regardless of whether they were responding from the perspective of a consumer or producer for purposes of this institute. The second pattern was comprised of responses which in addition to reporting positive comments also added some suggestions. The suggestions referred primarily to the following:

- a. descriptive information on existing doctoral training programs curriculum and faculty
- b. more extensive data from U.S.O.E. on doctoral training.

II. Structured Organization of Institute

For the most part, the responses favored the small group approach. Flexibility and involvement were cited as positive

factors in this approach. Of the ten responses to this item offering suggestions, five indicated that while the small groups were effective that more opportunity for total group interaction would have been advantageous. These suggestions were couched in a context which implied that possibly the small group developed sufficient structure to inhibit participants from continuing their discussion beyond their own group boundaries.

There was some expression of concern on the role of the group leader. Some felt that they assumed too much of a leadership role. However, this same behavior was interpreted by others as an appropriate role in stimulation of participation.

III. Participant Representation

The responses favored the consumer-producer concept. However, as a source of evaluative data, this item was not very effective. Most respondents added their ideas on additional participants. There was little concensus on particular additional participants. The following were mentioned two or more times:

- a. college deans
- b. public school administrators
- c. federal government
- d. key community leaders

It was interesting to note that even though very few doctoral programs were represented that only one reference was made to the representation of doctoral training programs. It may be that some consumers assumed that colleges and universities without doctoral programs were producers rather than consumers.

IV. Facilities and Equipment

There was general agreement on the high quality of the facilities. Several commented favorably on the general atmosphere of the institutes. The use of video-tape was cited as making a definite contribution to the institute. However, there were a couple of comments relative to the need for editing tapes or allowing elaboration to avoid misrepresentation of the comments recorded.

V. Focus of Institutes

There was general agreement on the relevancy of studying

doctoral programs in mental retardation. Approximately half of the respondents expressed some concern for the topics. The comments were not necessarily critical of the topics considered but there was a feeling reflected that in-depth attention needs to be given to specific aspects of doctoral training. For example, selection of candidates specialist U.S. comprehensive training programs, etc. It was suggested that subsequent institutes might focus on specific topics.

VI. Post-Institute Materials

Since they have not received materials based on the institute proceedings, all comments were anticipatory in nature. They expressed an interest in receiving the composite report of all regional meetings plus the detailed report of the Virginia institute. Several references were made to the intended use of the recommendations. Evidently, the participants were not clear as to the disposition of their efforts. An interesting suggestion was offered relative to the recommendations. It was suggested that periodic reports be released on the implementation of recommendations.

Summary

The structure, procedures, and general conduct of the institute were strongly endorsed by the participants. There was a concern for descriptive data on doctoral programs. Possibly an ad hoc committee suggested by U.S.O.E. might be formulated to collect and summarize such data. While no responses were solicited relative to subsequent study of doctoral training, there was evidence in the evaluation returns that follow-up study was recommended. For example, several references were made to the need for more specificity in topics discussed. The same respondents in general acknowledged the need to begin exploration on global topics. In reviewing all evaluation responses, it appeared that some participants were not clear as to who was a consumer and who was a producer. University and college representatives from non-doctoral programs tended to be viewed as producers whereas consumers were viewed as institutional and agency settings.

The evaluation forms were completed in reasonable detail. Few respondents elected brief responses. Most elaborated on their ratings.

Appendix G.

Names and Addresses of the
Special Study Institute Directors
and National Coordinators

NATIONAL INSTITUTES DESIGNED TO UPGRADE
DOCTORAL LEVEL PROGRAMS IN
MENTAL RETARDATION

(Supported by U.S.O.E., BEH under PL 85-926 as amended)

Location and Directors

Georgia State University-----Nicholas R. Castricone, Director
Associate Professor of Special
Education and Coordinator of
Program in Mental Retardation
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

University of Illinois-----Laura J. Jordan, Director
Professor
University of Illinois--Urbana-
Champaign Campus
Department of Special Education
210 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

*University of Northern
Colorado-----Tony D. Vaughn, Director
Chairman, Department of Special
Education
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

University of Oregon-----Herbert J. Prehm, Director
Professor
College of Education
Department of Special Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

University of Texas-----John D. King, Director
Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
The University of Texas at Austin
The College of Education
Austin, Texas 78712

* Dr. Bill Gearheart assumed responsibility for preparing the
(University of North Colorado's) report subsequent to Dr. Vaughn's
death.

University of Virginia-----Douglas P. Howard, Director
Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
Peabody Hall
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

National Coordinators

William R. Carriker	Douglas P. Howard
Professor and Chairman	Assistant Professor and Associate
Department of Special Education	Chairman
University of Virginia	Department of Special Education
Peabody Hall	Peabody Hall
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903	Charlottesville, Virginia 22903