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In 1974, The Council for Exceptional Children published a book of edited readings titled Mainstream Currents. The articles chosen all appeared in Exceptional Children between 1968 and 1974 and presented concepts, problems, and delivery systems that were surfacing as a response to the changes in the field.

Since 1974, the impact of legislation, litigation, and instructional technology have influenced profoundly the manner in which special education services are delivered to children and youth. We have moved from theory into action, thus providing an arena for observation and study of instructional practices that facilitate effective integration of handicapped and nonhandicapped learners. This volume, the first in CEC's Under One Cover series, includes articles related to implementing special education services in the least restrictive environment that appeared in Exceptional Children and TEACHING Exceptional Children from 1975 through 1979 as well as in Teachers, Please Don't Close the Door, the proceedings of The Council for Exceptional Children's Invisible College on Mainstreaming, published in 1976.

Inherent in any discussion of mainstreaming are issues related to the definition of the population to be served as well as the characteristics of special education programs in integrated settings. The introductory section includes an article by Lance titled "Who Are All the Children?" This article reflects on the attitudes and practices related to education and treatment of handicapped individuals from the 16th century through today. The information presented demonstrates how attitudes and practices have influenced both the identification of handicapped individuals and the quality and expected outcomes of services to them. Birch's article on the definition, development, and characteristics of mainstreaming suggests the physical, instructional, and administrative components necessary to insure good programming within a mainstream environment.

Service delivery models that have demonstrated effectiveness in providing special education in integrated settings are the focus of Section I. The article by Jones, Gottlieb, Guskin, and Yoshida presents issues related to and a model for evaluation of mainstream programs. The remaining articles assess the relative effectiveness of the teacher consultant and resource teacher models in increasing the performance of handicapped students.

Section II begins with McKenzie's article, "Higher Education's Role in Mainstreaming: An Example," which provides suggestions for ways in which teacher training institutions can be helpful in preservice and inservice training of special education and regular education professionals who will be employed in integrated classroom environments. The remaining articles speak to the specific skills and training required of regular and special educators and administrators in order to insure that each handicapped learner receives a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment.

The articles in Section III deal with the development and implementation of individualized education programs. In "Staying Out of Jail," Reynolds suggests that compliance with regulations alone may not result in the desired outcomes for handicapped learners. He suggests that the individualized education program process should serve as a means for professionals, parents, and learners to work together creatively in designing "environments for better learning and living."

Special and regular educators are constantly searching for empirically sound and novel teaching procedures. Section IV contains articles that deal with basic instructional technology and group management techniques. The particular articles were chosen because of their applicability to regular classroom environments.

Teacher and peer attitudes have long been recognized as critical to the success of implementing special education programs in regular classrooms. In Section V, Smith and Greenberg suggest that "teachers' labeling decisions tend to be biased against lower socioeconomic levels and thus
contribute to the inappropriate labeling of these children." Foster, Ysseldyke, and Reese, in their article, "I Wouldn't Have Seen It If I Hadn't Believed It," demonstrate that teacher expectancy can be influenced negatively by the label emotionally disturbed even when the student is emitting "normalized" behavior. Finally, Snyder, Apolloni, and Cooke, in a review of integrated settings at the early childhood level, make specific suggestions for maximizing the potential benefits of such settings.

In Section VI, "Parents as Partners," Cain's article traces the development of organized parent groups. The remaining articles suggest procedures for parents and professionals to work together in a productive and supportive way.

Finally, in the concluding section, Prehm and McDonald's article reminds us that, although much has been achieved over the past decade, much is yet to be done. They suggest that current practices in identification and evaluation of handicapped students often make it difficult to assess multihandicapped, multicultural, and preschool exceptional children accurately. Further, they point out that much of the "yet to be served" population may live and learn in environments not traditionally considered a part of the educational continuum. Such settings as correctional facilities, group homes, preschools, and day-care centers all contain children and youth potentially eligible for special education services. Questions related to curriculum, involvement of regular educators, and optimum teaching-learning conditions must be addressed in designing instructional delivery systems for these "yet to be served" children and youth.

This volume represents an attempt to compile practices that hold promise for achieving the least restrictive environment for every handicapped student. Although the feasibility of mainstreaming all handicapped students remains a controversial subject, there is a growing body of literature demonstrating that appropriate integrated environments can be arranged that benefit both handicapped and nonhandicapped students.

Susan E. Hasazi
June 1980
Introduction
Who Are All the Children?

WAYNE D. LANCE

WAYNE D. LANCE is Professor of Education, University of Oregon, and Director, Northwest Area Learning Resource Center, Eugene.

Editor's note: This is the seventh in a series of articles commemorating the American Bicentennial. The series is funded in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education.

Education for all "exceptional children" Two hundred years as a nation, and as we embark on the third century, we have declared through our laws and by personal commitment that, at last, none shall be excluded. The fact of education for all, meaning equal educational opportunity, has yet to catch up with the intent. Yet, there is satisfaction in knowing that the intent has been expressed in so clear a manner: As in any great endeavor, the beginnings were small, the result of vision and of personal dedication, born out of a love for humanity manifested in the actions of men and women. Vignettes selected from the history of special education serve as reminders that recent achievements may not be claimed as tributes to this generation alone, but are the fruit of seeds planted long ago by a few in recorded history and by many who never made the printed page.

Revolutionary Strides

• Hartford, Connecticut, April 15, 1817: The Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, principal of the Connecticut Asylum for the Education and Instruction of Deaf and Dumb Persons, announced today that seven pupils were enrolled on this opening day. Mr. Gallaudet returned from Europe last August where he had studied the art of instructing the deaf and dumb for nearly 15 months. The new asylum is the first permanent school for the education of deaf-mutes in this country and is supported by both private charity and an appropriation of $5,000 from the Connecticut Legislature (Fay, 1893).

• Boston, August 18, 1831: The New England Asylum for the Blind, incorporated over two years ago, finally has a director, it was announced today. Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, a physician, plans to travel to the continent later this year to observe programs for the
blind and to engage teachers. The school is scheduled to open sometime next year once space has been found and staff employed (Farrell, 1956).

- **Boston, October 1, 1848:** An experimental school for idiotic children opened in a wing of the Perkins Institution today. Ten children are enrolled and James B. Richards has been assigned as the teacher. An amount of $2,500 per annum has been appropriated by the Legislature following the receipt of a report from a special commission chaired by Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe. The commission sees the school as a model for the rest of the country. Quoting from Dr. Howe's report "... it would be demonstrated that no idiot need be confined or restrained by force, that the young can be trained for industry, order, and self-respect; that they can be redeemed from odious and filthy habits, and there is not one of any age who may not be made more of a man and less of a brute by patience and kindness directed by energy and skill" (Kanner, 1864, pp. 41-42).

- **Chicago, September 17, 1900:** Demands by parents for day school classes for their blind children were realized today as a special classroom opened in a regular school in this city. Mr. John Curtis, the teacher, indicated that the program is considered to be an experiment to see if blind children can be educated nearer to their homes rather than having to reside at the state school in the southern part of the state (Farrell, 1956).

- **Worcester, Massachusetts, September, 1901:** Preparatory schools for gifted children opened in Worcester this month, initiating a new concept in education. Believed to be the first such school in the United States specifically for the benefit of unusually bright children, these schools provide seventh, eighth, and ninth graders with opportunities to accelerate their studies in Latin, French, German, and algebra, in addition to the usual studies. After two years in the preparatory school these students will enter high school with a full year's credit in these special subjects (McDonald, 1915).

- **New York City, September, 1908:** Public School No. 2, under the direction of principal J. F. Reigart, began a new program for children with defective speech this month. Mr. Reigart stated that the teacher of the class has engaged in special study to prepare her to help these children overcome their speech problems. According to City School Superintendent Maxwell, "The experiment ... demonstrates that the attempt to cure serious speech defects, which interfere with success and satisfaction in life is possible and well worth while" (McDonald, 1915, p. 88).

- **Any State, USA, September 15, 1980:** In a special news release from the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Superintendent announced that the goal of providing full educational opportunity to all children within the state has been achieved. He issued an invitation to anyone knowing of a child with a learning problem who is not receiving an appropriate education to please con...

Maintaining Momentum
Changing Attitudes and Establishment of Special Education

The recognition of the need to provide different treatments to individuals with obviously differing capacities for benefiting from the traditional educational practices led to the establishment of special education. From an historical perspective, special education may be viewed as developing through three successive stages: (1) treatment through the segregation and restriction of resources for survival appropriate for people called different, (2) caring for people regarded as different by providing resources required for their physical existence, and (3) instructing such people so that they may be incorporated into existing, dominant social systems (Heiny, 1971, p. 344). While examples from contemporary history may demonstrate that we have yet to fully pass from stage one, pronouncements abound that our goals have passed beyond segregation and restriction, through mere caring, to an attempt to assist the exceptional individual to be able to meet certain cultural standards. Whether those standards should be those of the dominant society or of pluralistic cultures is a much debated topic and one in which there is little consensus among special educators.

Recognition and Labeling

The vignettes from the 19th century illustrate rather nicely how special education began in this country with a recognition of the exceptional individual as a homogenous element of the population and with labels to legitimate the classifications (Heiny, 1971). Bartel and Guskin (1971) supported the thesis that the process of identifying and so labeling individuals not only creates a handicap, but also exacerbates the condition as people so marked are treated differently. It seems that the very process which enabled large numbers of children to be educated, first in residential institutions and later in day schools and classes, often led to increasing segregation continuing into the adult years. As one reviews the early history of special education in the United States (Frampton & Rowell, 1938; Wallin, 1924), it is apparent that advances in our abilities to diagnose led to greater homogeneity in populations assigned to special programs and less opportunity for exceptional individuals to participate actively with nonhandicapped individuals.

Social Indictment

Looking back upon the early years of this century it appears that the more society became aware of the extent of handicapping conditions, especially in the area of mental retardation, the greater the alarm expressed through various forms of social indictment (Dayna, 1959). This indictment, manifested in various forms of discrimination and segregation nevertheless caused an awakening among educators regarding the responsibilities public schools should assume for the education and rehabilitation of handicapped children and youth.
Leaders like Wallace Wallin directed educators' attention to a more comprehensive view of factors, both "intrinsic and extrinsic," to use Wallin's words that tended to "mar" the development of the handicapped individual (Wallin, 1914).

Following such leads, pupils began to be viewed as functioning members of their total environment. Educators expanded their concepts of what education was really all about and the result was a broadening of the curriculum especially in day schools and day classes for the exceptional, to include a variety of training in the practical arts along with a continuing emphasis on the basic academic skills. The curriculum developed by the special class teachers of Boston prior to World War I exemplified this trend (The Boston Way, 1923). The "happiness first—all else follows" motto imported from abroad (Bridge, 1917) began to permeate the philosophies of special educators about this same time in our history, and while segregation of the handicapped was the order of the day, the emphasis was nonetheless one of making education a pleasant, and hopefully, practical experience.

This "caring attitude" on the part of educators led to a reexamination of the curriculum for the exceptional and a definite movement toward an individualization of instruction. Schwartz and Oseroff (1975) reviewed some 100 years of literature pertaining to individualized instruction and concluded that the developmental phases of this movement have led to rather highly structured systems for individualizing instruction. Thus we moved from a "happiness first" philosophy to a prevailing attitude that pupils should be able to demonstrate competency in any number of areas appropriate to their career objectives. This appears to coincide with Heffty's (1971) stages of development and we find ourselves pressing rapidly into stage three, namely providing programs such that the exceptional individual will be incorporated into the dominant social system. Mainstreaming is upon us—woven into our laws, our policies, and the very attitudes underlying the way in which we approach the development and implementation of programs for the exceptional individual.

The complexities of mainstreaming become evident as one considers the implications of a definition supplied by Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard, and Kukic (1975):

Mainstreaming refers to the temporal, instructional, and social integration of eligible exceptional children with normal peers based on an ongoing, individually determined, educational planning and programming process and requires clarification of responsibility among regular and special education administrative, instructional, and supportive personnel (p. 4).

As described by The Council for Exceptional Children, mainstreaming is far more than the placement of a child into a regular program for a period of time each day (Caster, 1975). The interactions of the instructional variables with social and temporal factors must all be accounted for in conjunction with the process of planning and the
Professional organizations, like the National Association of Children, have been long-time advocates of full-service concepts. The
model for full-service community health centers is based on the concept of a single point of entry for all of the health needs of the family.

In the establishment of model legislation,团结 enabling legislation, and in offering conference and other platforms for
the promotion of comprehensiveness, the National Association for Children have provided considerable input and
corporate support for specific comprehensiveness. The success also depends on
involvement of local and state health authorities.
In this, our country's bicentennial year, we find ourselves on the threshold of achieving a goal that Dr. Gallaudet and Dr. Hove would certainly have endorsed as they commenced their heroic efforts with a handful of children requiring special help. Where they talked in terms of educational programs for a few, we now look to providing full services to more than 1 million mentally or physically handicapped children and youth aged 6 to 21 (Kazalia et al., 1974). Our changing attitudes are evident. It seems well to ask, "Who are all the children?"

The concept of exceptionality is not a static one. Over the decades in our society has moved from a position characterized by segregation in the general handiicapped and asylum at the middle and modern era of Exceptionalism.
proceedings of the National Council for Research in Child Health and Mental Hygiene, and through the Project on the \textit{Classification of Exceptional Children} under the direction of McLaughlin, Holdon, Holdon, et al. Sponsored by federal agencies, aspects from various disciplines summarized existing knowledge relating to the classification of children which was used in developing a set of recommendations presented to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A number of these recommendations are given vitality in the recently released \textit{Education for All Handicapped Children Act} (Public Law 94-142).
...


During the past 15 years I have been studying mainstreaming intensively in communities all over the United States. These studies include observations in at least 200 different classes. More than 300 teachers, aides, supervisors, and principals and at least an equal number of pupils have been interviewed and observed in school settings where mainstreaming has been successful. These schools ranged from kindergarten and nursery schools to colleges. They included public and private schools, local elementary and secondary schools, and special day-and-residential schools.

My studies of mainstreaming concentrated on two groups of categories: of exceptional children and youth. For about a year I probed into mainstream provisions for educable mentally retarded pupils (Birch, 1974). That investigation took me into eight different states and into school systems in impoverished rural agricultural settings as well as concentrated urban industrial settings. The second group of exceptional pupils I studied intensively was the deaf (Birch, 1976). That research also focused on mainstreaming and the investigation...
I should state three of my broad conclusions now to set the tone for discussion of what will follow. These conclusions are meant to provoke further discussion and are open to refinement.

Mainstreaming can be successful.

First, mainstreaming can be successful, and it often is. Success depends on recognizing and satisfying a group of specific criteria embodied in part in the operational definition of mainstreaming.

Second, mainstreaming is the most desirable special educational arrangement for almost all of the recognized categories or groups of exceptional children. This acknowledges that other schemes for providing special education are also desirable, and that mainstreaming should be the goal toward which other educational arrangements are heading and preparing each pupil. A core concept in mainstreaming is mainstreaming is the most desirable alternative for regular class teachers with some consultation from a special education assistant, and support from team teaching with special educators to almost all of the recognized groups become skilled enough with special education methods and materials of exceptional children.
taught through in-service sessions, if necessary. Instructional materials are available, and to a lesser extent, class teachers, supervisors, and administrators are surprisingly ready to cooperate. The two groups of exceptional children I have not seen successfully mainstreamed to any significant extent are trainable mentally retarded pupils and multiply-handicapped pupils with marked mental retardation or a combination of deafness and blindness.

Why do we need a definition? Although the precise definition of mainstreaming presented here may not be agreeable to everyone, a definition which has general acceptance is necessary if we are to communicate with a reasonable degree of effectiveness and efficiency. Unless we reach some such meeting of minds, we can expect the examples which follow to be all too common.

First, some friends of mine sent an inquiry to superintendents of a group of residential schools for handicapped pupils to learn the nature and extent of their moves toward mainstreaming. One superintendent spoke proudly about the extensive mainstreaming being practiced. In fact, he was referring to two things: a weekly Boy Scout troop meeting after school which integrated several handicapped youngsters, and a nearby church Sunday school also attended by some of the handicapped youngsters from the residential school.

Second, in the name of mainstreaming I have been shown educable mentally retarded pupils being scheduled to regular shop, home economics, music, physical education, or art teachers, either as
the handicapped pupils being mainstreamed spend half or more of the day in regular classes.

6. In conventionally organized schools the special education teacher has a headquarters room to which pupils can come for periods of time from the mainstream rooms to which they are assigned.

7. In open-space schools the special education teacher may be a member of the team serving in the open-space setting or may have a separate room as headquarters.

8. Mainstreamed handicapped pupils leave the main group only for essential small group or individual instruction, educational assessment, and to pick up or deliver assignments prepared by the special education teacher.

9. The regular class teachers and the special education teachers agree upon individual schedules and assignments as needed for children being mainstreamed.

10. Regular class teachers are responsible for grades and report cards for the mainstreamed handicapped pupils, but they may consult with special education teachers on grading.

11. Special education teachers help regular class teachers also by providing educational assessments and instructional consultation for regular class pupils who may not be eligible for special education in the usual sense.

12. Mainstreaming implies the following operating principle. Handicapped pupils usually begin their education in regular kindergarten or first grade groups with special education support, and they are removed to special classes or special schools only when the necessity to do so is shown and only for the periods required to prepare the pupils for return to regular classes.

13. Criteria for selecting handicapped pupils for mainstreaming are in terms of matching pupils' educational needs and the capability of the mainstream program to meet those needs, rather than in terms of the severity of the pupil's physical, mental, emotional, or other handicap.

14. Mainstreaming has a place in the spectrum of plans for organizing instruction, space, and facilities to accommodate the educational needs of handicapped pupils.
We all know that education is a complex matter. We know that it can be dangerously misleading to reduce involved educational procedures to simplistic “either-or” choices. At the same time, we all know how necessary it is to cut through nonessentials in order to reach and to deal with major problems. It is in the latter spirit that I point out that there are five other highly volatile issues which are intimately linked with whether special education emphasizes mainstreaming or whether special education pursues its traditional separated and self contained posture. The five other issues polarize as follows:

1. Centralization versus decentralization
2. Inclusion versus exclusion
3. Categorical versus noncategorical
4. Integration versus segregation
5. Institutionalization versus normalization

For some people, these are significant socioeducational phenomena. For others, they are catch phrases, keys to demagogy. For some people, these are concepts to be examined objectively. For others, the expressions strain under almost intolerable emotional loadings. It is my hope that the relationships among the above five pairs of positions and mainstreaming will be given careful, professional consideration here. I hope they will be examined to see whether they are points on a continuum rather than unbridgeable extremes. I hope these concepts will be studied to ascertain their potential usefulness in relation to special education in general and in relation to the mainstreaming self contained continuum in particular.

I know of only one school district in America which deliberately moved to the goal of systemwide mainstreaming for all exceptional children as long as 17 years ago, and then did its best to implement that goal. That is Tacoma, Washington. Perhaps there are other districts that made such a comprehensive commitment early. If so, it would be good to find them and to learn from them. But the story of Tacoma and its neighboring counties will come out later, so I will simply acknowledge its historical role here.
As I have said elsewhere,

the principle of educating handicapped pupils in local schools along with their brothers and sisters and the rest of the neighborhood youngsters is neither new nor revolutionary. Nor is the idea of individualizing teaching for all pupils. Until recently, however, both mainstreaming and individualizing were considered to be concepts which were desirable but not readily attainable for very many exceptional children; the gap between the wish and the fact has begun to shrink. A number of school systems are proving that special education of excellent quality can be arranged for exceptional children in their neighborhood schools in regular class groupings.

Mainstreaming, like any new movement which calls for changes in attitudes, behaviors, and in socioeducational structures, has certain natural enemies. They are ignorance, tradition, and prejudice. Let us hope that we can help to provide hard facts and realistic interpretations to dispel ignorance. Let us make every effort to assure respect for tradition but not enslavement to it; and let us reason rather than simply react; limiting prejudice and making the judgment process our ally.
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I. Models for Delivery of Special Education Services in the Least Restrictive Environment
Preventive Mainstreaming: Impact of a Supportive Services Program on Pupils

ROBERT P. CANTRELL
MARY LYNN CANTRELL

Abstract: Although there are many reasons for maintaining exceptional children within the mainstream of public education, there is little empirical data directly supporting the rationale of mainstreaming. The present investigation evaluated the effects of a support teacher program in maintaining exceptional and potentially exceptional children within the regular school program. Program effectiveness was evaluated in terms of achievement score changes and frequency of referrals for traditional special services. First graders from 20 schools distributed across five school systems in Tennessee served as subjects. Low IQ (range 50-99, N=333), middle IQ (range 91-104, N=357), and high IQ (range 105-139, N=388) subjects differed significantly in achievement score changes as a function of the availability of support teachers to the classroom teacher. In addition, significantly more control school pupils were referred by their teachers for psychological services the following year. The results are discussed in terms of empirical support for the mainstreaming concept.

The concept of mainstreaming, simply stated, requires that "exceptional" children be educated in the same environment as all other children wherever possible. Support for the notion of mainstreaming has grown out of earlier concerns over the doubtful efficacy of the traditional approach of separating "exceptional" children from their peers for special educational services (Blatt, 1960; Johnson, 1962; Dunn, 1968; Filler, Robinson, Smith, Vincent-Smith, Bricker, & Bricker, 1974). Conceptual support for mainstreaming on an even broader exceptionality base than mental retardation can be derived as a logical extension of an idea advanced 12 years ago by Nicholas Hobbs' (1963). Project Re-ED, the realization of Hobbs' ideas, has proven to be a successful model for a number of programs for emotionally disturbed children across the country. Essentially the Re-ED approach involves: (a) viewing the child as part of an ecological subsystem, (b) analyzing the discordances in that subsystem which led to la-

Editor's note: The current contention between special educators who endorse mainstreaming, normalization, or least restrictive alternatives, and regular educators who claim they have been trained to teach only the normal child might be mitigated by considering the implications of this article. Would the ability to and attitude toward working with an exceptional child for part of a day or week be improved by including special education content and methods courses in teacher preparation programs for regular elementary education programs? Would it be advantageous for more special education training programs to prepare their students to become resource staff members, conference teachers, consultants, or support personnel? MAT
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beling the child as "different" or "problematic," and (c) utilizing the best applied knowledge currently available in the fields of education and human behavior to reduce the discordances to such an extent that the child can be maintained within the ecological subsystem. Although the Re-ED approach was implemented within the framework of a short term residential setting, these concepts are certainly applicable to public schools which are the inevitable locus of maintaining efforts. The Prevention-Intervention Project (PIP) was designed to solve children's problems prior to referral for formalized services which would demand labeling and possible exclusion from the opportunities normally available to nonproblem children. The program has used public school teachers working in conjunction with "support" teachers trained in the ecological analysis and solution of children's problems.

Support teacher training involved two phases. The first phase consisted of six weeks of intensive training of the support teams during the summer prior to the first year of intervention. Training was implemented with the aid of program modules in the following areas: (a) behavioral principles, (b) basic evaluation techniques, (c) program relevant assessment, (d) academic programming, (e) methods of contingency management, (f) group process, and (g) coordinated ecological planning. The second phase of support teacher training consisted of intensive case consultation and ongoing feedback provided for each case opened during the school year.

The purpose of this article is to report the effects on student achievement of the availability of supportive resources from PIP. The focus is on the achievement scores of first grade students, the target groups for the first year of PIP. Student achievement has long been an accepted, although debated, measure of teacher effectiveness, and as such comprised one dimension from which differences between teachers in experimental and control schools could be assessed. An additional dimension for comparing experimental versus control teachers is the relative frequency of referring children for special education or psychological services. Dunn (1906) and Cristopolos and Renz (1980) have legitimately asked why some children are singled out for special education placement while others of comparable intellectual level are maintained in the regular classroom for extended periods of time. Regardless of the discriminable characteristics which initiate the labeling of children as deviant, providing teachers with immediate access to remedial or preventive programming for these children should lower the probability of referral for services outside of the classroom. Thus the specific hypotheses tested were: (a) first grade children in classes for which expert consultation was available would have significantly higher achievement scores than children in classes without such consultation when achievement scores were adjusted for pre-intervention achievement and IQ scores, and (b) teachers with access to expert consultation would refer fewer children for psychological and special services than teachers for whom such consultation was not available.

**Method**

**Subjects**

Pupils of first grade teachers in experimental schools (pupil N = 723, teacher N = 37) and control schools (pupil N = 355, teacher N = 18) for whom scores were obtained on the Otis-Lennon Group Intelligence Test and preyear Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Primer, form F) at the beginning of the first year of the Prevention-Intervention Project were used for this analysis. Two elementary experimental schools and two elementary control schools from each of five school systems in Tennessee were part of this project. Of the two control schools in each system, one was designated an "active" control and the other was used as a "hold-out" control. The active control schools participated in pupil achievement testing and classroom observation procedures during the first year. The hold-out control schools did not participate in the pupil testing or observational procedures. However, the hold-out control school teachers were included in the pupil referral data gathering process during the project's second year.

**Procedure**

Experimental school teachers had available to them trained support teachers from their school system who worked with them to solve the problems of any child or children for whom a teacher was concerned, with no specification of any set of appropriate referral criteria. Two support teachers serviced both experimental schools in each system. Support teachers (N = 10) had received six weeks of intensive training in areas found useful by teachers in the Re-ED schools and were given ongoing...
consultation from the staff who had trained them. They also used a structured, problem-solving procedure in heuristic format (Can- troll & Cantrell, 1974) as an aid in problem identification, analysis, intervention planning, enactment, and problem monitoring. Both experimental and control school teachers received computer printouts of extensive classroom observation procedures reported elsewhere (Cantrell, Wood, & Nichols, 1974), as well as the opportunity to view videotapes made during the observation activities. The video taping and observation feedback provided to control school teachers served as a partial means of dealing with the Hawthorne effect.

Referrals of pupils by experimental and control school teachers to each system's psychological services unit were obtained from each school system. Six categories of reasons for children being referred by experimental and control school classroom teachers to psychological services units within the five school systems were used: (a) suspected intellectual handicap, (b) suspected perceptual handicap, (c) underachievement, (d) physical handicap, (e) suspected emotional handicap, and (f) other—a miscellaneous category. Across the five school systems these categories were either those already used by each system's psychological services unit on their pupil referral forms or were content analyzed into these categories when teachers gave only written reasons for referral. Statistical Analysis

All children in experimental and control schools for whom IQ, pre-achievement and postyear achievement measures were available were pooled into a single multiple regression analysis. Each student's IQ and the mean of the student's pre-achievement standard scores averaged over the achievement areas of listening, reading, and numbers served as predictor variables in a multiple regression analysis against the postyear standard score, means averaged over listening, reading, and numbers in order to obtain predicted achievement scores (Manning & Dubois, 1962). Residual gain scores were next obtained by subtracting predicted achievement scores for each pupil from actually obtained postyear achievement scores. Using this procedure, students who achieved above what would have been predicted on the basis of their IQ and pre-achievement levels received a positive residual score while students who achieved below what would have been predicted on the basis of their entering IQ scores and pre-achievement scores received a negatively weighted residual score. These residual scores served as the dependent variable for a 2 X 3 analysis of variance. Experimental school students versus control school students comprised one dimension. Three IQ levels of students comprised the second dimension. Table 1 presents the IQ distribution characteristics of experimental and control school groups. Although there was a significant difference in IQ scores (t = 2.69, p < .01) of the low IQ experimental and control school groups; this was not judged of sufficient importance to detract from the ultimate results since each child's residual achievement score was individually weighted by his own IQ score and pre-achievement score.

Pupil referral data were analyzed by means of a chi square one sample test (Siegel, 1956).

Results

Means and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups at each of the three IQ levels are presented in Table 2. As can be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ Distribution Characteristics of Experimental and Control Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seen from this table, low, middle, and high IQ experimental school students attained higher residual scores than did control school students at comparable IQ levels. In addition, there was less variability of achievement scores for the experimental school students than for the control school students. Analysis of variance of the achievement residuals demonstrated that these differences were significant. Table 3 presents these results.

Tables 4 and 5 present the pupil referral data from the 10 experimental and 10 control schools used in this study. Over four times more first grade pupils and two times more second grade pupils were referred by "active" and "held-out" control school teachers than by experimental school teachers (X² = 19.76, p < .001). The highest frequency of referrals by control school teachers were in the areas of suspected intellectually handicapping condi-

**TABLE 2**

Means and Standard Deviations of Achievement Residual Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ levels</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid IQ</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>6.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-5.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

Analysis of Variance for First Grade Students' Achievement Residuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental vs. Control (A)</td>
<td>4610.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4610.62</td>
<td>11.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ Levels (B)</td>
<td>14739.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7369.78</td>
<td>16.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups x IQ Levels (AB)</td>
<td>459.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>229.73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>419634.37</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>391.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.001

**TABLE 4**

Total Number of Referrals from Experimental and Control School Teachers for Psychological Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First grade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second grade</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintaining Momentum
Types of Referrals from Experimental and Control School Teachers for Psychological Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Intellectual handicap</th>
<th>Perceptual handicap</th>
<th>Under achievement</th>
<th>Physical handicap</th>
<th>Emotional handicap</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Discrepancies in totals are a function of some teachers referring children for more than one problem.

Discussion

These results support the hypothesis that regular classroom teachers who have access to resource personnel trained in ecological analysis and intervention strategies can effect significant achievement gains for students at all levels of IQ functioning. It is important to note that no IQ level of experimental school students achieved more at the expense of any other IQ level. High IQ students within experimental schools continued to achieve commensurate with expectations for their own developmental rates even though consultation centered primarily on the problems of lower functioning pupils. Standard deviations for each of the experimental school groups were consistently lower than comparable control groups. This supports the contention that experimental school teachers tended to teach pupils at each IQ level in such a way that more homogeneity of growth rates was maintained within their classes than in control school classes. These results lend credence to current concerns for individualization of instruction in regular classrooms and provide some of the first empirical support for the concept of mainstreaming.

The finding that psychological services referral rates were lower the following year in schools where immediate aid was available to teachers for pupils having difficulties has some important implications. First of all, these results imply that teachers view the availability of immediate support services as sufficient in the majority of cases for dealing with pupil problems. Secondly, it may well be that teacher referrals to psychological services units may necessitate "building a case against the child" in order to assure that the child receives any services at all. Such cases against children may be necessary simply because traditional psychological services are often the only recourse available to teachers.

It is tempting to surmise that borderline intelligence children can be maintained within the regular public school classroom if intensively and specifically trained support teachers are made available to deal with the academic, behavioral, and other problems such children pose for the regular classroom teachers. Further, the finding that high IQ children were not penalized by such an activity in their achievement growth supports the argument that mainstreaming is possible in public school classrooms, assuming adequately trained, sufficiently motivated, supportive personnel who provide aid and on-site, case related training for regular classroom teachers.
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Development and Evaluation of a Resource Teacher Program

JOSEPH R. JENKINS, WILLIAM F. MAYHALL

Abstract: The critical features of the resource specialist model include a commitment to provide (a) service on core school tasks, as defined by the classroom teacher; (b) close cooperation with the child's classroom teacher, (c) one to one instruction through cross age and peer tutors, (d) direct and daily measurement of student progress, and (e) daily instruction where direct services are required. Components of the model were examined individually in controlled settings and only those components which proved effective were incorporated into the model. Finally, summative evaluations were conducted, which tested the efficacy of the entire model.

Current educational environments for children with mild learning problems consist mainly of resource/consulting teacher programs or some form of self-contained special classes. The self-contained special class was a radical development of the 1930's, which grew rapidly in the 1940's and 1950's. The rationale for such classes was compelling. Children could be grouped with other children of comparable ability, lessening unfair demands on them and enabling teachers to serve a more limited ability range. The number of children per class could be limited, providing more desirable teacher-student ratios. The special teachers would have special training and experience and could employ curricula designed especially for handicapped learners. These self-contained special classes proliferated, but their record has been mediocre (Cegelka & Tyler, 1970). In general, mildly handicapped children seem to achieve no better in special classes than they do in regular classes, and there is no clear evidence that such classes produce superior social adjustment (Meyerowitz, 1962; Carroll, 1967).

Resource teacher programs, which have become prominent in the 1970's, are an attempt to overcome some problems associated with special classes while maintaining a high level of service to mildly handicapped children. Despite a strong rationale for their adoption and a great deal of interest in the literature (Hamill & Wiederholdt, 1972; Deno, E., 1973; Sebalino, 1971), there is conflicting evidence on whether resource teacher programs are any more effective than the alternatives of regular or special class placement. Empirical evidence supporting the academic and/or social advantages of resource teacher programs comes from Clavin, Quay, Amstutz, and Worry (1971) and Walker...
Maintenance of Momentum

Describing the Resource Specialist Model

The significance attached to a particular skill will vary, across school districts and schools and even across classrooms within the same school. Acceptable mainstream performance is, thus, a relative matter. Nevertheless, it seems that certain core school tasks and classroom behaviors receive special attention from teachers. Classroom teachers observe children performing these tasks, establish criteria for acceptable performance, and judge performance against these criteria. Assessment for core tasks is informal just as it is for noncore tasks. But core tasks are distinguished from noncore tasks by their consequences. Inadequate performance on core tasks may lead a teacher to report to extraordinary measures (such as retention or referral to special education), which result in rejection of the child from the mainstream.

In reading, for example, core tasks include sounding out unfamiliar words, reading orally upon request, and answering comprehension questions. A child's failure to perform adequately on one or more of these core tasks alerts his teacher to the fact that he is not progressing in the mainstream. The criteria for acceptable performance on these core tasks will vary from teacher to teacher, with some teachers requiring more proficient word attack and oral reading than others. Similarly, the reading vocabulary and comprehension questions will vary with the classroom curriculum. Thus, an inability to decode short vowel sounds dooms a first grade child whose teacher uses the SRA Basic Reading Series or the Sullivan Programmed Readers. For another child whose first grade teacher uses Scott Foresman, in which short vowel sounds are emphasized less, performance will be judged on other kinds of words.

The notion of core tasks set in different curricula and with varying performance standards has enormous implications for the resource specialist. These standards define what is to be taught and by what criteria success will be judged. The resource specialist concentrates on core tasks in the classroom curriculum while using the classroom teacher's performance standards.

Though the relationship between special education services and mainstream tasks may appear obvious, special education has relied on special curricula that bore only slight resemblance to regular education's curriculum. As a result, placement in special programs was more often permanent than temporary. When children are placed in curricula whose objectives differ significantly from regular education, then the chances are slim that they will master mainstream tasks. When special education services concentrate on reducing psycholinguistic, motor, or perceptual deficits, they have little direct effect on core classroom tasks (Hammill & Larsen, 1974; Hammill, Goodman, & Wiederhold, 1974). Our point is not that a focus on such ability deficits is necessarily wrong in some absolute sense, rather that it misses the concern of the classroom teacher, who defines the
mainstream. A classroom teacher does not refer a child because that teacher noted an auditory sequential memory deficit. Rather, the teacher refers a child who reads ploddingly with a high error rate. The tendency to accept the aims of regular education characterizes several other resource and consulting teacher programs (Deno, S., & Gross, 1973; Lilly, 1973; McKenzie, 1972). On the other hand, for children with severe handicaps a focus on mainstream academic tasks is probably inappropriate.

Who is Served

A resource specialist may work in a categorical, cross-categorical, or noncategorical resource program (Hammill & Wiederholdt, 1972). The objectives, the delivery, and the service itself are fundamentally the same for any of these programs since the funding source for the program, not the resource specialist, determines who can be served in a resource program.

Type of Service

The resource specialist program employs both direct and indirect services. The nature and severity of the problem determine whether a child will receive direct services from the resource specialist or indirect services through consultation with the classroom teacher. For example, conduct, social behavior, and minor academic problems can be handled through structured consultation while severe academic problems usually require direct service.

Selection of direct or indirect service is based on information obtained through a referral interview which focuses on identification of problem areas. Sometimes, classroom observation and informal testing are also required. In addition, formal testing may, depending on state requirements, be necessary to establish a child's eligibility for service. The resource specialist and the referring teacher then jointly pinpoint core tasks and behaviors; identify current and acceptable performance levels; and finally select, implement, and evaluate an intervention program.

Indirect service. The indirect service function has been analyzed into five basic steps:

1. Identify core tasks or behaviors.
   Referring teachers often describe children in global terms such as immature, aggressive, uncooperative, inattentive, and hyperactive. The purpose of this first step is to replace these global descriptions with more specific descriptions of actual performance, such as unauthorized talking, being out of place, displaying physical aggression and not completing assignments.

   The objective of an intervention program is the reduction of the discrepancy between current and acceptable performance of core tasks or behaviors (as delineated in step 1). Thus, current performance must be measured and acceptable performance must be determined. Performances are measured over several days, preferably by the referring teacher, who also establishes criteria for acceptable performance.

3. Plan and implement an intervention program.
   Interventions may be essentially instructional, such as providing a number line, using flash cards, or providing a classroom tutor, or they may include a revision of reinforcement contingencies. In the latter case, the resource specialist relies heavily on principles of applied behavior analysis. Current and potential reinforcement contingencies are identified which may influence performance.

4. Revise the intervention program.
   The classroom teacher continues to measure performance to determine if the performance discrepancy has been reduced or if program revision is necessary. Daily measurements are employed not only to insure program accountability but also to provide the information needed to make a program self-corrective.

5. Provide intermittent consultation.
   The final step in the indirect service process involves maintenance checks to insure that the child is progressing satisfactorily.

Direct services. The classroom curriculum, the performance criteria used by the classroom teacher, and the core tasks all help to define what the resource specialist will teach. However, the resource specialist may encour-
ag the classroom teacher to modify the regular curriculum by suggesting alternate materials and procedures. Many classroom teachers recognize that all curricula are not suited to slower students and are quite willing to incorporate a second, more suitable series.

The six steps in the direct service process are:

1. Identify core tasks.

During the referral interview, the resource specialist determines the academic areas in which the referring teacher has noted serious performance discrepancies. The specialist determines what curricula are used, the core tasks, and the approximate standing of the referred child in the curriculum as compared with his peers.


Assessment of performance on core tasks is individual and is made in relation to the classroom curriculum. A rating scale can be accomplished through a modified informal reading inventory in which the child reads from different levels of the series and answers comprehension questions. In arithmetic, the resource specialist determines the sequence in which basic operations are taught in the curriculum and assesses which ones have been mastered. In spelling, vocabulary is sampled progressively through the series.

3. Plan and implement an intervention program.

Following the individual assessment, the teachers reconvene to determine what performance levels are necessary to ensure continued participation in the educational mainstream and to devise an intervention program. A time is scheduled for the student to receive special assistance in the resource room.

4. Provide one to one daily instruction.

The rationale for one to one instruction is strong. First, any performance discrepancy serious enough to warrant direct services from a resource specialist is serious enough to warrant the strongest instructional arrangement known: Individualized one to one instruction. Second, referred children have already demonstrated that they do not progress satisfactorily under group instruction. Further, previous research has indicated that instructional effectiveness declines rapidly as teacher-pupil ratio increases. The most rapid decline occurs as this ratio increases from 1:1 to 1:2. The number of referrals usually exceeds the capacity for one to one instruction from the resource specialist. Thus, resource specialists are encouraged to recruit, train, and supervise tutors from the community or from other classrooms in the school.

5. Instruct from a data base.

The resource teacher obtains information for making instructional decisions by recording and charting direct and daily measures of the child's performance. Examination of charted performance permits the teacher to determine if desired performance changes are occurring, to estimate when an objective will be met, and to ascertain that a performance has reached criterion. Perhaps more importantly, the charted record of progress can demonstrate the accountability of a resource program.

6. Terminate direct services.

When the child's current performance reaches a level comparable to that of other children who are making satisfactory progress, direct services are terminated. The classroom teacher may adopt a part or all of the instructional program developed by the resource specialist.

Evaluation of Program Components

There are numerous potential components of a resource program, many of which can be empirically examined. In the development of the resource specialist model, the effects of one to one instruction, cross age tutorial instruction, direct services, and daily measurement and daily instruction were individually evaluated. Summaries of these evaluations follow.

One to One Instruction

An experiment by Moody, Bauldell, and Jenkins (1973) studied the effects of various teacher-pupil ratios (1:3, 1:2, 1:5, and 1:23) on children's learning. Figure 1 depicts the differences in learning under these teacher-pupil ratios. The greatest loss occurs as the instruction ratio changes from a tutorial (1:1) setting to the smallest group setting (1:23).
FIGURE 1. Mean correct performance under varying teacher-pupil ratios.

Losses continue as the ratio is increased. These data argue strongly for providing individual instruction to handicapped children who have fallen far behind their classmates.

Cross Age Tutors

Resource programs receive more referrals than a resource teacher can handle individually. Thus, even though instructional effectiveness declines as the instructional ratio increases beyond 1:1, the demand for expanded programs often results in resource programs, where children's instruction is individualized in small groups. A danger exists in such instances that conditions in the resource program grow to resemble the same classroom conditions which have already failed. A solution to this problem consists of maintaining highly individualized tutorial instruction by using cross age and peer tutors who work under the direction of a resource teacher.

A series of studies in reading, spelling, and arithmetic (Jenkins, Mayhail, Peache, & Jenkins, 1974) compared children's learning when given small group instruction by a resource teacher and when given instruction by cross age and peer tutors. The tutors were trained and supervised by a resource teacher. The results of these studies overwhelmingly support the superiority of one to one cross age tutoring over small group teacher instruction. Figure 2 shows the comparative learning of three educable mentally handicapped children under these conditions. Each child learned more when instructed by a tutor than he did when taught by a resource teacher in a small group. As also reported by Jenkins et al., studies in other skill areas with educable mentally handicapped and learning disabled children produced similar results.

Direct Service

A study by Mayhail, Jenkins, Chestnut, Rose, Shroeder, and Jordan (1976) compared the efficacy of direct and indirect service to the child. Children showed greater progress with direct service from the resource specialist (see Figure 3). This effect is assumed to be due to the fact that while the resource specialists focused their efforts exclusively upon the referred children, the classroom teachers divided their attention between several classroom activities.

FIGURE 2. Word recognition progress with small group and with cross age tutors instruction.

FIGURE 3. Word recognition progress with direct service in resource room and with indirect service in the classroom.

Daily Measurement

To determine the effects of daily measurement and feedback upon children's academic
performance, the resource specialist and the student receiving instruction were either permitted or not permitted to view the results of their daily performance measures (Jenkins, Mayhall, Feschka, & Townsend, 1974). Examination of Figure 4 reveals that children's growth was positively influenced when they and their teachers were aware of daily performance.

**FIGURE 4. Word recognition progress with and without daily charted feedback.**

Anderson (1978) recently performed a similar study on a larger scale and obtained identical results.

**Daily Instruction.**

In some direct service resource programs, especially those staffed by itinerant teachers, children are seen daily or every other day, and sometimes once a week. Such programs assume that children benefit more from frequent, short periods of instruction than from infrequent, longer periods. Mayhall and Jenkins (1978) held total instructional time constant, but varied its frequency on a daily versus weekly basis. A weekly basis. Ten learning disabled children referred to the different resource specialists were studied. All 10 progressed more rapidly with daily than with less frequent instruction. Figure 5 shows the results of this comparison.

**Overall Program Evaluation.**

Several longer-term evaluations were conducted to test the overall effect of the resource specialist model. In each of these evaluations children were randomly assigned to receive either direct service from a resource specialist, as an itinerant teacher, or no direct service at all. In a second evaluation, comparisons between children were possible. Instead, children's progress in a skill area taught by a resource specialist was compared with progress in a skill area not taught by a resource specialist.

**FIGURE 5. Word recognition progress with daily and with less than daily instruction.**

The purpose of the first evaluation was two-fold, (1) to determine the feasibility of implementing the resource specialist model in a public school and (2) to determine whether or not the effects of this program were reflected in performance on standardized achievement measures.

**Method.**

**Setting:** Thirty children, classified as mentally retarded or learning disabled, served as subjects. Twenty-four children were distributed in first and second grade classrooms, where six others were enrolled in two primary special education self contained classrooms for educable mentally handicapped children. The resource specialist was located in the main building of the school in a small room which was equipped with a desk and equipment.

**Procedure:** All subjects were pretreated with the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRATS) prior to the evaluation and posttested at the end of the school year. The tests were administered by an educational psychologist knowledgeable of the children's treatment condition. One-half of the 30 subjects enrolled in regular classes were randomly assigned to receive their regular class instruction from the resource specialist (regular class experimentals), while the other...
impossible, analyses were conducted on post-
test scores. Since the experimental subjects
were selected on the basis of their relatively
taller post-test performance, there is a strong
bias against them on the final achievement
measure. Even with this bias, a comparison of
experimental and control performance on the
final reading measure revealed that the exper-
nmental subjects significantly outperformed
their controls (t-related t = 2.87, df = 35,
p < .01). In arithmetic no differences
between the groups were observed on the
final measure. This may be partially
explained by the initial difference between
the two groups, which was greater than 1
year. However, if arithmetic gain is consid-
ered, the experimental subjects outgained the
controls 1.4 years to 0

Figure 2 shows the relative gains in arith-
metic and reading made by the subjects in the
two schools. In School A, where only reading
was taught in the resource room, the exper-
nental children outpaced their controls in
reading but not in arithmetic. In School B,
where children were taught both reading and
arithmetic in the resource room, the experi-
nental children outgained their controls in
both reading and arithmetic.

Conclusions

Teacher training has seen many innovations in
recent years. However, grouping, special
programs, and programmed instruction
each present one area of the
prescription. National research has shown
interest in resource teacher training,
innovation, and promoting new resource
teacher programs for handicapped learners.
The literature makes it clear that many res-
source teacher programs are poorly designed
and not used to maximize the learning of
children. The formative and summative
evaluation model employed in the develop-
ment of the Resource Specialist Program might serve
as a model for the development of specific edu-
cation programs. Such an evaluation model
could provide helpful information for educators
in the development of specific education
programs.

Data

Table 1: Mean achievement of experi-
mental and control children in School A, where reading
was taught in the resource program and in School B
where both reading and arithmetic were taught in the
resource program.
An Evaluation of the Teacher Consultant Model as an Approach to Mainstreaming

TED L. MILLER
DAVID A. SABATINO

The evaluation of student achievement in various education programs is often criticized for its narrow focus on academic performance. This paper critically examines the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming students with special needs. The study suggests that the teacher consultant model, while offering benefits, also faces several challenges. The model has been praised for its potential to improve student performance and reduce the harsh labeling often associated with special education programs. However, it also highlights the need for careful implementation to ensure equitable outcomes for all students. The paper concludes with recommendations for further research and policy implications.
Method

Subjects

Learning-disabled and educable mentally handicapped children from 26 public and parochial schools in a large metropolitan area in Illinois participated in this study. Learning disabled children were identified as those who had normal intelligence (greater than 85 on the Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults-Slosson, 1953) in academic achievement and low grades on perceptual-language-expression measures. Educable mentally handicapped children were identified as those with IQ's below 75 on the Wechsler and two or more years deficit in academic performance. The teacher consultant model contained a total of 401 children (230 learning disabled; 24 educable mentally handicapped; 147 educable mentally handicapped; 126 boys, 28 girls). The resource room model contained a total of 404 children (245 learning disabled; 122 educable mentally handicapped; 138 boys, 36 girls). The control groups contained 86 children (42 learning disabled, 6 educable mentally handicapped; 44 boys, 42 girls). Overall, 506 mildly handicapped children with a mean age of 4 years, 4 months, participated in this study.

Procedure

Teacher consultant model. Teacher consultants can best be described as facilitators, not implementers. In essence, their task was to convey the practical skills to the regular teachers, who then assumed the primary responsibility for implementation. Accordingly, teacher consultants met with regular educators to discuss their strategies directly in regular classrooms and through telephone conferences.

The participated in the teacher consultant model were not regular teachers. These teach

ers were trained by 12 special education teachers who served as coaches for the regular teachers. The 12 special education teachers were selected because they had the necessary skills to work effectively with the children. Each special education teacher worked with a small group of children and provided direct instruction. The total number of children served by the special education teachers was approximately 250. The classroom interaction was observed using a modified Thaddeus' Rating Device (Thaddeus, 1970) in the morning hours and sociometric behaviors and so on. The emphasis was not on instruction in the regular teacher. On the contrary, resource room services were provided to children directly; only incidental training of regular teachers took place.

In the resource room model, 122 regular teachers were served by 33 resource teachers in an additional 20 schools (total of 58 schools). These resource room teachers worked from the same building form as the teacher consultants, in 45-minute instructional blocks. A single teacher provided assistance daily, twice, or three times a week to approximately 14 children. The program training level, experience, and type of certification held by this group was quite similar to the teacher consultant model special education teachers.

The dominant measures of academic achievement were collected during the last 2 weeks of October and the last 2 weeks of May by graduate students in school psychology and special education. All data collectors were carefully trained in the administration procedures of the standardized tests that were used. The dependent measures were drawn from the Word Recognition and Arithmetic subtests of the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test (SATA). Seven variables (age, sex, IQ, and the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test) were used as covariates. Table 1 presents the results from the data analysis. The data were then subjected to a covariance analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the significance of the differences between groups. The ANOVA was used to determine the significance of the differences between groups.

The data were then subjected to a covariance analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the significance of the differences between groups. The ANOVA was used to determine the significance of the differences between groups.

Evaluation of Teacher Consultant Model
dent behaviors. All the observers were experienced teachers with no knowledge of the nature of the study. All were pursuing a master's degree in special education. The observers were introduced to the observation instrument and shortly thereafter conducted daily observation for 2 weeks on a population of children similar to those in the study. The mean interrater reliability (mean of all comparisons) was calculated on this 2-week training period, ranging from .76 to .94. In the study, 4 weeks of observation were made initially in January. Each observation lasted 20 minutes and was conducted by four observers visiting classrooms on a 3-day-a-week basis. The second observation was conducted near the last week of April and the last 2 weeks of May (just prior to the posttesting). The ratings (means) over each 2-week observation period were collapsed into baseline and posttest measures prior to analysis.

**Results**

This investigation was not a true research design intended to specify the effectiveness of a particular remediation strategy. Rather, it was concerned with the evaluation of the instructional process of two-randomly assigned sections. Interpretation of the following data should bear this caveat in mind.

### Academic Achievement

Table 1 presents pretest, posttest, and achievement gains. As may be seen, visual inspection indicates that WHAT, Word Recognition, and WHAT, Arithmetic, scores increased in all instances, with PIAT Reading Comprehension yielding a mixed response. In order to test these data, an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed for each of the dependent measures (WHAT, Word Recognition, and Arithmetic).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th><strong>Dependent Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>58.92</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAT Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ANOVA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>58.92</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>54.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>34.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAT</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maladaptive Manifestation**
most persons as desirable attributes of the classroom instructor's behavior. However, even though both experimental groups demonstrated gains, measures of teacher behavior improvement were more frequently observed in the teacher consultant model. Such a finding might be expected, since the focus was on change through continued instruction training in the regular classroom, a part of which must certainly be an alteration of behavior produced by the primary instructional delivery unit—the regular teacher. Student behavior change was not dramatic. This may be accounted for in at least five ways. First, the behavioral levels of students appear to be appropriate throughout the study. That is, perhaps no radical change in student behavior was sought by the teachers. Second,
teacher change in response to the consultant’s influence must have been gradual. It is thus
doubtful that the change in teachers’ behaviors was sufficiently consistent, nor of long
enough duration to alter the students’ behaviors effectively.

Finally, an administrative question arises in the thought that the number of teachers the
special education teacher consultant is able to work with might be greater than the number of
children the resource teacher can work with.

In fact, several studies indicated that the
teacher consultant model, when done effectively, was more time-consuming. Consequently
the required amount of involvement might diminish as regular teachers acquire these
skills with handicapped students. However, a system of the sort should be expected to
provide practice, since the constant flow of time teaching processes and materials assures
new topics for continued improvement training in the absence of keeping these professionals
“transfused” technically, and ensuring their energy and appropriateness of consultant models
are the risk of becoming mere teacher supervisory than instructional advisors. Thus, any
treatment to implement and teacher consultant model must assure both the ongoing skill
development of the teacher consultant and adequate contact time with the regular teacher
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Abstract: A variety of programs are being developed and implemented to support the mainstreaming of students with disabilities. These programs have been developed and implemented at a rapid rate and there have been a number of issues and problems related to the evaluation of these programs. In this paper, we address these issues and provide a framework for evaluating mainstreaming programs. We discuss the importance of considering both the program's effectiveness and the impact on individual students. We also provide guidelines for evaluating mainstreaming programs, including identifying the goals and objectives of the program, assessing the program's impact, and monitoring the progress of students.

Problems related to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs are often encountered due to a variety of factors, including a lack of clear goals and objectives, inadequate assessment tools, and a lack of monitoring of student progress. To address these issues, we provide a framework for evaluating mainstreaming programs, including identifying the goals and objectives of the program, assessing the program's impact, and monitoring the progress of students.

developing and implementing mainstreaming programs, and the importance of assessing the impact of these programs on individual students. We also provide guidelines for evaluating mainstreaming programs, including identifying the goals and objectives of the program, assessing the program's impact, and monitoring the progress of students.

PROBLEMS related to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs are often encountered due to a variety of factors, including a lack of clear goals and objectives, inadequate assessment tools, and a lack of monitoring of student progress. To address these issues, we provide a framework for evaluating mainstreaming programs, including identifying the goals and objectives of the program, assessing the program's impact, and monitoring the progress of students.

developing and implementing mainstreaming programs, and the importance of assessing the impact of these programs on individual students. We also provide guidelines for evaluating mainstreaming programs, including identifying the goals and objectives of the program, assessing the program's impact, and monitoring the progress of students.
actually transpired in the classroom. Teacher background was seldom described, and there was only rare recognition that special class students—even in a single classification such as the educable mentally retarded—could not be considered an educationally homogeneous group.

Educators now have the benefit of critiques of previous efficacy studies and know their shortcomings, many of which must be avoided in the evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Moreover, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142, 1975) and legislation at the state level make evaluation of special education programs mandatory. It is important, therefore, as new special education programs are developed and before implementation becomes finalized, that a variety of evaluation considerations be examined.

The present article is not intended to be the definitive treatise on the evaluation of mainstream programs, but the authors do hope to bring before the reader a variety of considerations which, if taken into account, can improve evaluation efforts. The article begins with a discussion of methods for evaluating mainstream programs. Emphasis is given to the adequacy of the models and studies and the insights they yield for improved evaluation designs. This is followed by problems and issues in the evaluation of educational treatments in mainstream settings. This section presents considerations relevant to the evaluating and assessing measures which might be used to evaluate program impacts. Followed by a treatment of issues unique to evaluation of public law 94-142. Finally, a number of general considerations and a set of guidelines for developing and assessing mainstreaming evaluation activities are given.

**Models for Evaluating Mainstreaming Programs**

Perhaps the best place to begin a examination of the evaluation of mainstreaming programs is to ask whether these programs should be evaluated differently than any other educational or social program. To make this judgment requires both a clear view of what mainstreaming is and an understanding of common approaches to evaluation.

Thus are at least three broad categories behind the mainstreaming movement: the movement of ideas, accommodation, and implementation. Live programing (Dunn, 1988; Emsbo & Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard, & Kukla, 1975) have attempted to incorporate these as well as other concerns into a comprehensive definition of the term mainstreaming. For purposes of further discussion, mainstreaming programs are divided into programs that provide more instruction for more handicapped children in regular classes than previously. Further, the major intent of this change is to reduce the presumed stigma of labeling, to reduce the presumed social isolation, and, it is hoped, to increase the effectiveness of educational programming for handicapped children. It is essential, then, that models for evaluating mainstreaming programs incorporate these key features of the mainstreaming movement and its anticipated outcomes.

**General Strategies of Educational Program Evaluation**

The general strategies that have been employed in educational program evaluation can be divided roughly into three subcategories: research methods and decision-making models. Field research methods, field research methods can be further subdivided into experimental and non-experimental. The field research methods can be further subdivided into experimental and non-experimental. The latter extends the model of the psychological experiment. A general illustration of the latter is in the field of special education is the study of the efficacy of special classes for the educable mentally retarded (Goldstein, Moss, & Jordan, 1965). Children served in 12 classes were randomly assigned to first grade or in special classes, and teachers were selected and trained over a three-year period to company intellectual, academic, and social skills of the children in the two conditions.

An excellent example of implementation using field research methods is the study of Educational Opportunity Grants awarded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice. This study used field surveys and interview methods to assess the impact of these grants. These surveys, along with follow-up tests on children and teachers, included a national survey of students in schools that received the grants. The surveys included students in regular classrooms and many other variables with the educational growth of children. Wilson (1972) has reported this work.
interesting findings was the fact that the ob-
ervation and sociometric data provided oppo-
site results. Observed interactions of educa-
tively retarded children with peers was
more positive in regular classes than in special
classes, but peer acceptance of educable men-
tally retarded children by nonretarded chil-
dren was less favorable when the children
were integrated into regular classes. These find-
ings are consistent with the data that have
thus far appeared in the large scale studies.
Integrating handicapped children appear to
be accepted about as well as their nonhandi-
capped peers, but this popularity tends to be
considerably below average.

Critique of Study and Alternative Evaluation
Strategies

Although the information from the
mainstreaming studies has been well received
and further findings are eagerly awaited, it is
important to recognize their limitations when
planning further evaluation studies. Perhaps
most significant weakness is the relative
inattention given prior to selecting data. A
disproportionate amount of time was spent in
instrumentation, data analysis, and interpre-
Hether appeared to be limited to a specifica-
tion of relevant variables. Simple linear rela-
tionships tended to be assumed. The
Complexities of relationships among variables
were left to the computer to sort out.

What alternatives are there to these
strategies? First of all, what theoretical
formulations concerning mainstreaming are
tenable? A number of promising formulations will
come from the research on Project PBIS; these
formulations will feed into the study of
some of the important variables, but
promising new alternative studies are
being attempted. In particular, the
Hether in his attempt to identify
social, economic, and cultural factors in
sociology by making it to ability grouping,
mainstreaming, and subsetting by ability
trax chambers and mainstreaming are useful
cases. Any theoretical formulation that can
provide some distinguishing function should
be useful for evaluating mainstreaming
programs. A reference group is conceptualized
as a group, initial or imaginal, that influences
one's behavior. The influence is cognitive,
that is, by the individual thinking of the group, the
reference group influences the individual. There are
two types of reference groups, normative and com-
native. The normative reference group serves
as a source for a person's own norms, values, and
beliefs. A normative group is one serving as a
normative group based on self-appraisal.
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lar class to the integrated child? How salient are subgroups within the regular class? How great is the association between ethnic background and grouping? Does the integrated child perceive that he or she becomes a real member of this higher ability group?

Aside from such general sociopsychological/theoretical formulations, a number of more limited conceptualizations could be of value. Certain critical factors tend to be neglected. Thus the period of time in regular and special classes is rarely taken into account. For example, should it be assumed that things change immediately upon entry into the regular class and remain constant over months or years, or is there adaptation? Perhaps the opposite occurs: Initial success is followed by depressed performance and self acceptance. Even when important factors are identified, overly simplified relationships are assumed. Curvilinear relationships need to be considered. For example, increasing the amount of supportive services received by a regular teacher may not continue to have favorable impact but may instead reach an optimal level after which it interferes with achievement and acceptance. Perhaps too much intrusion of special efforts begins to break up the structured efforts of the regular program and tends to set the child apart from others.

Finally, there is a need to deal more fully with the complexities of the individual case—the individual child, the individual school—perhaps using the qualitative methods of the anthropologist (e.g., Edgerton, 1975) or perhaps the quantitative methods of behaviorists (e.g., Herson & Barlow, 1970). Methods must then be developed for accumulating these complex data over individual cases in such a way that the resulting information is usable for decision making at the program level (e.g., Class, 1970). It is necessary to know whether, overall, the program is relatively effective, but it is also necessary to know whether certain kinds of programs are more effective for certain kinds of children and school systems than for others.

To conclude, one of the greatest needs in future approaches to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs is to provide an adequate conceptualization of the processes involved. Both theory and methodology need to avoid the oversimplification of traditional educational research. The methodology needs to incorporate qualitative as well as quantitative procedures and intensive analysis of individual cases as well as methods for accumulating information over cases, school systems, and studies. Perhaps the best place to begin conceptualization and the development of methodology is with analyses of the nature of the mainstreaming treatment.

Evaluating Educational Treatments in Mainstreamed Settings

Instructional Time

The main thrust of mainstreamed education to date has concerned class placement. That is, mainstreaming has been defined by schools in terms of the amount of time a handicapped child spends in regular classes, for academic and/or nonacademic purposes. Although few data are available regarding the benefits that accrue to handicapped children who are placed in regular classes for differing amounts of time, the data that do exist suggest that amount of time integrated per se has relatively little impact on the way other children feel about them (Gottlieb, 1975; Gottlieb & Baker, 1975). That is, children who are mainstreamed for approximately 10% of the school day do not differ significantly in social status from children who are mainstreamed for approximately 90% of the school day.

One reason for such apparently disappointing results could be that these studies did not consider the quality of educational treatments that were provided to the handicapped children when they were in the regular classes. It is to this theme—the manner in which handicapped children are instructionally integrated and the way that instructional integration is to be evaluated by teachers—that we now turn.

The discussion will not focus on formal aspects of evaluating mainstreaming programs which necessitate appropriate statistical analyses but rather on more informal concerns which usually emerge when school personnel undertake self study or self evaluation of their school’s programs.

Instructional Integration

Kaufman et al. (1975) wrote that instructional integration concerns the extent to which the handicapped child shares in the instructional
In order for the handicapped child to share in the instruction that is offered in the regular class, at least three conditions must be satisfied. First, the handicapped child's educational needs must be compatible with the instruction that is offered to the nonhandicapped children. An illustration of a lack of compatibility is the situation where a handicapped child is assigned art work while classmates are engaged in reading lessons. The second condition that must exist for instructional integration to occur is for the regular class teacher to be willing to modify instructional practices to accommodate a child whose learning style or ability may be seriously discrepant from the remaining students in the class. The third facet of instructional integration is the need for a coordinated effort between the regular classroom teacher and the supportive personnel available in the school or district.

Educational treatments that are delivered under the rubric of mainstreamed education can be evaluated, then, with regard to the extent that they achieve the conditions just presented under the heading of instructional integration. Each element of instructional integration can then be considered in relation to the quality of the educational treatment that it was intended to achieve, and indexes regarding its successful implementation can be suggested.

**Stating Goals and Objectives**

Historically, one of the criticisms that has been levied against special education research has been its failure to specify the nature of the educational program that handicapped children receive. Although this criticism was originally voiced by Kirk (1964) in his comments regarding special classes, it is equally applicable with regard to handicapped children in mainstreamed settings. Before any evaluation of educational programs in mainstreamed settings is possible, there must be a clear statement about the academic goals and objectives that the handicapped child is expected to attain in the regular classroom. In the absence of such a statement there is little reason to expect that a meaningful educational program will be developed. Often, the primary goal in placing handicapped children in a regular class is not for academic purposes but to promote their social behavior by exposing them to appropriate peer models and/or by providing them, with competitive situations that they ultimately must experience if they are to succeed as adults. While these are laudable goals for a handicapped child, they should be recognized for what they are: social goals, not academic goals. There is little reason to expect handicapped children to improve their academic competence if the primary purpose of mainstreaming them is to promote social competence. To summarize this point, an evaluation of mainstreamed educational treatments must begin by obtaining a clear statement on whether or not the purpose of placing the handicapped child in the regular class is to improve academic performance.

If it is established that a handicapped child is placed in a regular class for a specific academic purpose, the logical question that must be asked is whether the ongoing lessons are consonant with the stated goals. What active steps is the regular class teacher taking to facilitate the child's likelihood of accomplishing the goals that were established on the child's behalf? There is no simple answer to this question, because, the material the teacher offers the handicapped child, or any child for that matter, depends on the type of classroom the teacher manages. However, although no precise data are available, data that do exist suggest that few regular teachers are taking the time to provide the handicapped child with special materials or teaching methods. Agard (1975), in a study of several hundred regular classrooms, found that approximately 75% of regular class instruction occurred in large groups with the teacher standing front and center. Under such circumstances there is only a remote likelihood that the regular class teacher is providing anything "special" to the mainstreamed handicapped child. Therefore, a second consideration in evaluating programs for handicapped children is to obtain descriptive information regarding the content of academic activity that they are engaged in while in the regular classroom.

**Assessing Teacher Willingness to Accommodate the Handicapped Child**

The content that a handicapped child participates in is dictated in large part by the regular class teacher's willingness to tailor the class lessons to accommodate the individual needs of a handicapped child. This brings us to the
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second major aspect of instructional integration: willingness to modify instruction to accommodate the handicapped child.

Whether or not a teacher will provide an appropriate educational program for a handicapped child depends on a number of factors including the teacher's self-perceived ability to teach a particular child, the extent to which the handicapped child deviates from the modal performance level of the children in the class, and the teacher's attitude toward that child.

Research evidence does exist to show that the overwhelming majority of regular class teachers feel that they are ill-equipped to deal with handicapped children. As an example, Gickling and Theobold (1975) found that 65% of the regular education teachers they queried felt they lacked the necessary skills to teach exceptional children. These findings are consonant with Agard's (1975), who found that the majority of regular class teachers stood front and center and lectured to the class as a whole. In other words, these teachers were not doing anything extraordinary to accommodate the needs of exceptional children in their classes. The picture that develops regarding regular class teacher activity vis-a-vis exceptional children also conforms to data from more traditional attitude studies where regular class teachers' attitudes toward retarded children were negative and became increasingly more negative after a year's experience teaching them. This was shown, for instance, in the study conducted by Shotel, Iano, and McCutigan (1972). Overall, these studies indicate that regular class teachers harbor generally negative attitudes, and their instructional practices are not geared toward accommodating children whose ability levels and needs are widely discrepant from those of the majority of pupils in their classes. Therefore, a second point to consider when evaluating educational treatments is to identify precisely what the teacher is doing to tailor instructional strategies to accommodate handicapped children. Here, too, straightforward descriptive data will suffice.

Until now, the discussion has focused exclusively on the regular class teacher, but clearly this is only half the picture. It is obvious that an educational program for mainstreamed handicapped children requires the cooperation of regular and special education teachers. A substantial portion of handicapped children's academic instruction is obtained in resource rooms, which are most often staffed by trained special education teachers. One index of the effectiveness of an academic program for mainstreamed handicapped children is the extent to which regular and special class teachers interface and share responsibility for the child's educational program. Ideally, an articulated program involving coordination between regular and special class teachers evolves from regularly scheduled meetings in which the teachers discuss materials, methods that have been appropriate for the child, and, in general, the child's level of progress in the regular classroom. All too often the coordination between regular and special class teachers is conducted on a catch-as-catch-can basis, with the special education teacher discussing a particular child over lunch, sometimes; during a break, sometimes; or after school, sometimes. It is difficult to imagine an effective, well articulated program being developed from such haphazard meetings. This is less of a problem when the mainstreaming concept involves having the special education teacher assist the handicapped child directly in the regular classroom rather than in the resource room.

Monitoring Child Progress

Yet another concern when evaluating the effectiveness of mainstreamed education for a particular child is the steps that are routinely taken to monitor the child's progress. Once a program has been established for a child, how long will it be implemented before someone decides whether it is an appropriate program for that child? It is unreasonable to expect that a single educational plan is likely to be appropriate for all children all the time. But when is this decision made? And by whom? Evaluations of mainstreamed programs should consider whether there are any mechanisms built into the system to decide whether the educational treatment is proving effective, by whatever criteria are valued by that school system.

The issue of what is being taught to a handicapped child is far more important than where it is being taught. A review of the literature on the effects of mainstreamed versus nonmainstreamed education on the academic performance of mentally retarded children suggests that there is little if any difference in the achievement gains made by these children regardless of their placement. There is tentative...
tive evidence, however, that instructional strategies can affect achievement of retarded children, as was demonstrated by Haring and Krug (1976). Unfortunately, despite the voluminous amount of prose on mainstreaming that has appeared in the published literature, pitifully few writings have discussed the merits of various approaches to mainstreaming while also presenting relevant data to support their assertions. In fact, empirical studies of mainstreaming, especially with regard to its impact on the academic achievement of handicapped children, have been few and far between. Federal legislation has mandated that handicapped children are to be educated in the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent feasible. It is difficult to imagine how the maximum extent feasible is going to be determined in the absence of empirical verification that the practices subsumed under the general rubric of mainstreaming are worthwhile insofar as they have a positive effect on handicapped children's educational performance. Thus, while it is critical that program evaluation provide data describing the type of treatment implemented, it is also essential that data be collected describing the consequence of the treatment.

Dependent Measures

If the true impact of mainstreaming is to be known, information will be needed from a variety of sources. Among more obvious data needs are those on student achievement and on attitudes of administrators, teachers, parents, and pupils. Data on school attendance rates, student adjustment and acceptance, and program cost-effectiveness, will be needed as well. Ideally, such information should be obtained on nonmainstreamed pupils since there has been concern that mainstreaming may impact negatively upon the adjustment and achievement of the regular class pupil. Some, including students, teachers, parents, and administrators, believe that the time teachers take to provide instruction to the mainstreamed student makes the teacher less accessible to regular students. Moreover, the classroom environment is thought to be less stimulating and demanding because of the presence of such students. Convincing data will need to be accumulated on such matters to allay the misgivings noted.

A description of certain dependent measures that ought to be included in mainstream evaluation reports is presented in Table 1, which also includes the measures' means of assessment.

There are a number of factors to be considered in using the measures described. First, concerning attitudinal measures, no scales of known validity and reliability have been developed for use with mainstreamed populations. There are a number of problems related to the utilization of mainstreaming programs.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Method of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement</td>
<td>Standardized tests, locally constructed tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes of administrators, teachers, parents</td>
<td>Attitude questionnaires, interviews, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student adjustment</td>
<td>Observations, inventories, and questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student acceptance</td>
<td>Sociometric methods, observations inventories, and questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Examination of expenditures in relationship to specified alternative objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attendance</td>
<td>Attendance rolls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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attendant to the use of such instruments, including the establishment of their validity.

A special problem is developing scales that are not so transparent that their purposes are easily detected, with the consequence that the respondents may manipulate their responses and thus distort the nature of their true attitudes. There are, however, problems that precede actual scale development and use. These concern the political realm and respondent protection from invasion of privacy. In the latter case, the rights of subjects to their own minds and thoughts may prohibit use of conventional attitudinal scales with students or with teachers and others (e.g., parents and school administrators). These same potential problems may impede the collection of data on student adjustment and social acceptance; the requirement that students reveal their likes and dislikes for their classmates will be unacceptable to many school administrators, parents, teachers, and the students themselves.

The requirement that students (and others) be protected from undue invasion of privacy will make it difficult to obtain some of the kinds of data needed for comprehensive evaluation of mainstream programs. Little thought appears to have been given to alternative nonreactive methods of accumulating data on attitudes, acceptance, and adjustment, but the use of observational schemes and unobtrusive methods may prove beneficial and is recommended.

There are also special considerations in the use of achievement tests. The advantages of standardized achievement tests are well known: They have been developed on large numbers of children; they possess adequate reliability for group assessment; and they cover the range of objectives often found in many school programs. On the other hand, they have not typically included, in their standardization population, children who are candidates for mainstreaming. A consequence of this neglect is that attention may not have been given to the phrasing of questions, to format, or to other concerns that might make the test more useful for application to the mainstreamed student. Moreover, since most standardized achievement tests are designed to provide information about the performance of students in the vast middle range, the content is probably not valid or reliable for students outside that range.

Fortunately, the above problems are not as grave as was once believed to be the case. Yoshida (1970) and his associates (Mayers, MacMillan, & Yoshida, 1975a; Nystrom, Yoshida; Meyers, & MacMillan, 1977) have explored a variety of techniques for using conventional standardized tests with populations of exceptional children, including educable mentally retarded children returned to regular classes (Yoshida, 1970) and educationally handicapped children (Nystrom et al., 1977). The authors of these studies have demonstrated that through use of procedures such as out-of-level testing, in which standardized tests more appropriate to the student's level of functioning are administered, rather than those based on chronological age or grade placement, data on the mainstreamed child's level of achievement can be obtained. Thus, a mainstreamed child in the fifth grade may be given an achievement test appropriate for students in the second or third grade, the decision about appropriate level being made on the basis of teacher judgment and/or the student's past academic performance. The question that arises is whether or not the psychometric properties of the tests (e.g., reliability, validity, and the percentage of respondents scoring above chance levels) are affected by such testing procedures. Yoshida's (1970) work with educable mentally retarded students returned to regular classes indicated that these test properties are not affected at all, indicating that reliable information on student achievement may be obtained using the out-of-level procedure. It should be obvious that necessity for use of the out-of-level procedure suggests, ipso facto, that the mainstreamed child probably is not approximating grade level achievement expectations. If the child were, unmodified tests could be used.

Addressing similar concerns (i.e., modifying tests for use with the handicapped), Nystrom et al. (1977) investigated the effects of group size (testing in groups of two, four, or eight students) and group behavioral characteristics (behavior in testing situation) on the achievement scores of mainstreamed educationally handicapped students. They found no differences in test performance or frequency of disruptive behavior by group size under the experimental testing conditions as contrasted with the report that 63% of the students were unable to complete the testing in their regular classrooms. The small-group method of ad-
ministering achievement tests to educationally handicapped children is clearly the method of choice.

On the basis of their work with the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) to a large population of decertified educable mentally retarded children, Meyers et al. (1975a) evolved a series of quite innovative procedures designed to maximize motivation and test-wiseness of the examinees without sacrificing the standardization of the test proper. For example, students were told that they were not being evaluated for placement in any special program, were asked to respond to all questions even if they had only partial comprehension of specific questions, responded only in test booklets to eliminate errors due to unfamiliarity with separate answer sheets, were given extended rest periods to counter fatigue and frustration caused by a novel situation. Within the test proper, no suggested procedure was modified; time limits for completing the subtests were followed strictly, test batteries were administered whenever possible on separate days, especially at the lower levels of the MAT. (p. 8)

Although experimental, the work of Meyers et al. has great promise for adapting standardized achievement tests with mainstreamed and other populations of handicapped children.

Racial and socioeconomic bias. The mainstream program evaluator also needs to be sensitive to the questions of potential racial and socioeconomic bias in cognitive tests. These questions revolve, ultimately, to whether the tests are valid for the population(s) to which they are applied. Hilliard (1975) presented a list of "implicit assumptions" made by test users as a basis upon which tests are interpreted. Those relevant to present concerns include the following: (a) Each child understands the question being asked in the same way. (b) A child's cognitive function is observable only through the Anglo language and the Anglo value framework based upon Anglo experiences. (c) All people have the same experiences; therefore the same questions can be asked of everyone. A corollary assumption is: A question means the same thing in all environments. (d) A label or name for a cognitive component is a precise description of the whole component (Hilliard, 1975, p. 10). Obviously, these assumptions cannot be accepted for children from greatly different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Evaluation within the Context of Public Law 94-142

Evaluation is a key feature of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Section 618 of the Act is devoted specifically to evaluation. In this section the Commissioner of Education is enjoined to "measure and evaluate the impact of the program authorized...and the effectiveness of State efforts to assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children" (p. 63).

Many considerations relevant to evaluation of Public Law 94-142 have been given in preceding pages, particularly those related to the Act's requirement that the Commissioner of Education provide for the evaluation of programs and projects by developing effective methods and procedures of evaluation, the testing and validation of the methods and procedures, and the conduct of actual evaluation studies designed to test the effectiveness of the programs and projects. However, two of the specific major evaluation activities specified by the Act deserve special attention: (a) the requirement that the number of children being served and not served (The Numbers Game) be reported annually and (b) the requirement "that the Commissioner shall conduct a statistically valid survey for assessing the effectiveness of individualized education programs" (p. 65).

The Numbers Game

Public Law 94-142 requires federal, state, and district officials to provide data on the number of children served; that is, number of children mainstreamed, number removed from self contained special classes, decrease in the number of minority group children in self contained special classes, and so forth. While this information has its purposes and is among the easiest to obtain, it is also among the most useless, primarily because of issues that it does not address, for example, the appropriateness of the alternative educational placement and resulting improvement (or lack of it) in social adjustment, academic achievement, and other outcomes presumed to accompany mainstream placement. While various agencies will be re-
quired to provide such data in connection with
the requirements of Public Law 94-142. ‘Deeper,
explanations of instructional practices, as
suggested in earlier sections of this article,
must be undertaken.

Evaluating the Individualized Education
Program Concept

Evaluating the appropriateness of individu-
alized education programs (IEPs) will be
among the knottiest problems that evaluators
of mainstream programs will face. This is true
for programs designed to facilitate academic
achievement, social growth and development,
or both. Although there has been progress
(Yoshida, 1976), questions about the availabil-
ity of appropriate measures for assessing the
accomplishments of students in special popu-
lations have not been entirely resolved (Jones,

The most critical problem, however, con-
cerns the assumption that valid information is
available on the growth and development of
academic and social abilities of special popu-
lations, that something is known about the con-
ditions under which such growth and de-
velopment take place or about the upper level
of growth of various kinds of achievement for
different populations of mainstreamable and/or
handicapped children. Regrettably, no such
knowledge exists. It cannot be said with any
certainty how much growth change can be ex-
pected to occur in students with various pro-
files taught by method A or by method B, the
answer to which is critical to assessing the
effectiveness of individualized education pro-
grams.

Further, Morrissey and Safer (1977), in ad-
dressing problems related to the evaluation of
individualized education programs, noted:

To measure program/IEP’s effectiveness in terms
of pupil change Indicators (e.g. achievement) it
would be necessary to confirm that what was pro-
scribed was implemented, and that the variance
which was observed/masured could be ac-
counted for in terms of the implementation. This
would be a particularly difficult change since IEP
related activities will have varying correspon-
dence to elements of the prescribed educational
plan and take up varying amounts of the instruc-
tional day. These problems, coupled with the in-
herent difficulties in pre-test/post-test methods of
measuring/recording pupil performance, suggest
that it may be methodologically difficult to assess
IEP effectiveness in this way. Moreover, the preci-
sion and frequency of documentation that would
be required to collect reliable and valid data, make
the use of such methods prohibitive. Therefore it
may be most desirable to consider multiple and
varied measures of effectiveness—cost, resources,
satisfaction, and pupil measures. At any rate, de-
termining appropriate measures of effectiveness
will be an initial and difficult task. (pp. 35-36)

It is true, but not enough, to say that more
research is needed. Students are in classrooms
now, and individualized education programs
must be developed for them now. How, then, is
evaluation of the effectiveness of IEP’s to be
made? The authors believe, given the current
state of knowledge about relationships be-
tween instructional achievements and
academic and social growth in populations of
exceptional children, that IEP’s can be evalu-
ated only for their content appropriateness
(face validity); that is, the assessment of expe-
rienced teachers about what is likely to work
and what is not likely to work (with sensitivity
to the need to monitor instructional activities
constantly and to modify programs when
changes are appropriate) seems to reflect the
state of the art with respect to the evaluation of
IEP’s. It would be helpful if programs of re-
search and development could be carried on
alongside the ongoing instructional activity,
but often this will not be possible, primarily
because of limited personnel and fiscal re-
sources. Some research and evaluation activity
will be conducted, to be sure, but there would
also seem to be great value in having a forum
in which teachers and program developers
could present the results of their experiences
with various kinds of mainstream models and
procedures, including their data and hunches
about what seems to work and what does not.

Although conventional wisdom suggests
that rigorous evaluation designs are necessary
to determine the effectiveness of educational
programs, teachers can play a critically impor-
tant role in the evaluation of mainstreaming. It
is the teachers, not the evaluators, who are in
constant contact with the children, materials,
and daily problems that arise. Whether or not
mainstreaming will prove effective rests
primarily in the hands of the teachers. The
educational treatments they provide must at
least be evaluated by them, however inform-
ally. There is nothing to be gained from ig-
oring this important source of information.
EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Is the purpose of the evaluation described?
2. Is the reader given sufficient information to determine whether the evaluation is formative (i.e., for instructional improvement) or summative (i.e., a final program evaluation) or both?
3. Are the evaluation procedures and results clearly reported?
4. Is sufficient information provided to enable replication of the evaluation?
5. Are the evaluation procedures practical?
6. Is the intended audience specified?
7. Is there a description of the model(s) of mainstreaming employed, with sufficient data to permit an understanding of the kind of educational procedures followed?
8. Is information provided on the length of time that the mainstreaming model employed has been operational in the school(s) evaluated?
9. Is the number of hours of instructional integration given?
10. Are data given on school district location and size and on school and community characteristics?
11. Are the subjects, including regular classmates, described adequately (i.e., age, grade, sex, previous educational history, socioeconomic class, racial group membership)?
12. Are the means by which students are selected for mainstreaming described?
13. Is there information on whether the mainstreamed pupils were formerly enrolled in self-contained special classes?
14. Is length of time the children were mainstreamed prior to evaluation activities given?
15. Are sample sizes adequate?
16. Was there reasonable sample stability during the evaluation period?
17. Is information on the experiential background of the teacher(s) provided?
18. Are evaluation instruments described?
19. Do the instruments possess satisfactory validity and reliability for the population of mainstreamed students involved in the evaluation?
20. Are statistical procedures appropriate?
21. Is attention given to the appropriateness of placement?
22. Is there assessment of instructional quality?
23. Is information provided on student achievement?
24. Is information provided on the attitudes of students, teachers, administrators, and parents?
25. Is information provided on student adjustment?
26. Is information provided on the social acceptance of the mainstreamed student?
27. Are data on the attendance rates of mainstreamed students presented?
28. Are cost-effectiveness data provided?
29. Is attention given to program impact on nonmainstreamed students?
30. Are political realities described and taken into account in program planning and program evaluation?
31. Are names and addresses of program planners and evaluators provided so that additional inquiries can be made?

FIGURE 1. Considerations for preparing and assessing reports of mainstream program evaluation.

Guidelines for Preparing and Appraising Mainstream Evaluation Reports

Most of the information on the evaluation of mainstream programs comes from unpublished studies. There would seem to be a critical need for a set of guidelines by which such reports can be appraised. Ideally, such guidelines should be followed by individuals preparing mainstream evaluation reports as well. To the extent that common guidelines are followed, it will also become possible to accumulate information from a large number of separate evaluation activities.

Evaluations are conducted for many purposes. Some evaluations are conducted for local use only, and others are intended to be generalized widely. In presenting guidelines herein, the authors are assuming that the evaluator intends to communicate the procedures and results to an audience wider than those having intimate involvement with the project. If this is the objective, reporting may need to be fuller than would be the case for strictly in-house reports. Evaluators who do not wish to...
provide complete data on populations, procedures, and so forth should keep their reports out of major dissemination channels. (e.g., ERIC, Exceptional Child Education Resources) since partial and incomplete evaluation studies do more to confuse than to clarify.

It is obviously impossible to specify what ought to be included in each evaluation report, since report content will vary as a function of evaluation purposes and intended audience. Nevertheless, to give the reader a sense of the range of factors that ought to be considered in preparing or appraising mainstream evaluation reports, a fairly comprehensive set of evaluation guidelines for such work is presented in Figure 1. The authors recognize that the results of any single evaluation will rarely be reported in such detail.

**Concluding Remarks**

This article has attempted to present a variety of considerations related to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs, and to set forth guidelines for the preparation and appraisal of mainstreaming evaluation reports. It should be apparent from the foregoing analyses that problems related to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs are not insurmountable. By giving early attention to matters addressed here, many pitfalls characterizing previous special education evaluation efforts can be avoided, and it will become possible to use evaluative procedures to improve instructional practices and, in time, to know the effectiveness of mainstreaming efforts.
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II. Training of Professionals
higher education's role in mainstreaming: an example

hugh s. mckenzie
Higher education's role in mainstreaming is both challenging and rewarding.

It is helpful to have school districts, their state department of education, and an institution of higher education working together to achieve mainstreaming.

Without regular educators so enabled to provide successful mainstreamed special services, mainstreaming will be but a passing fad and our children will suffer.

Key members of the community must have clearly communicated to them the rationale for mainstreaming, the benefits it will bring to all children and members of the community, and how it will be reasonably implemented in that community's schools.

Mainstreaming is perhaps more subject to the quest for accountability than many other educational programs.

Public schools and their state department of education have sufficient power and incentives to enlist the support of a teacher training institution in the cause of mainstreaming special education.
VERMONT'S MAINSTREAMING

The purposes of this chapter are first to describe those factors we in Vermont have found helpful in successfully achieving mainstreaming of children eligible for special education, and second to describe how one institution of higher education—the University of Vermont—has assisted in achieving mainstreaming. The chapter concludes with a summary of Vermont's progress to date in mainstreaming and with a general discussion of enabling an institution of higher education's help in this exciting endeavor.

FOUR FACTORS HELPFUL IN MAINSTREAMING

Since 1967, Vermont has been working to achieve mainstreamed special education. Progress has been slow, but it continues. Four factors have been of continued importance in achieving this progress.

It is helpful to have school districts, their state department of education, and an institution of higher education working together to achieve mainstreaming. The school district may develop and implement mainstreamed special education on its own. If one or more individuals in a district are skilled in the exercise of power, brilliant in developing a school district's own teacher training program, and skilled in finding innovative ways to meet state department of education requirements, success in mainstreaming may eventually be achieved. It should be obvious, on the other hand, that neither the state department of education nor an institution of higher education can expect to successfully implement mainstreamed special education services on its own. Each must, at the very least, have the cooperation of local school districts. It is the school that must ultimately implement mainstreaming. It is the school's teachers who will...
do the mainstreaming. It is the schools' administrators who will supervise and support the mainstream efforts. It is the schools' boards of directors and taxpayers who will provide necessary moral and financial support.

It is helpful to a school district in implementing mainstreamed special education to do so in cooperation with its state department of education. The state department of education can be instrumental in changing laws and policies so that state funding of special education facilitates rather than impedes mainstreaming. For example, funding is now categorical—and not tied solely to a special class approach.

A state department of education may also tap statewide funding sources which then can be allocated to mainstreaming efforts in the local schools. State departments of education typically provide technical assistance to the schools, and this assistance may include facilitating mainstreaming. State departments of education have access to a statewide power base, and thus may not only provide needed funds for mainstreaming but may also facilitate statewide commitment to mainstreaming.

Institutions of higher education can be helpful to state departments of education and local school districts by training special and regular educators who have positive attitudes toward, and skills in, mainstreaming. An historical function of higher education is the collection and development of knowledge. This function can be directed toward collecting and developing knowledge on how to achieve successful mainstreaming.

Higher education also has access to funding resources different from those available to a local school district or a state department of education, and these funds may be implied in the implementation of mainstreaming in local schools.
It is helpful if regular educators have the skills, attitudes, and knowledge to successfully achieve mainstreaming. In general, it is clear that regular class teachers do not have the skills, attitudes, and knowledge required to accommodate the wide range of individual differences that mainstreaming involves. In fact, those of us in special education have long indicated to regular class teachers that they are not prepared to accommodate children eligible for special education by our removing those children from the teachers' classes. That is fortunate, but we have now found a better way to provide special education for many younger students. Thus, it is incumbent upon special educators to help regular classroom teachers understand the skills needed by some special education services to the mainstream and to provide those teachers with the skills, attitudes, knowledge, materials, equipment, and supporting personnel needed to be successful in mainstreaming younger students for special education.

Similarly, school administrators and other regular education personnel must be provided with the training and resources vital to successful mainstreaming. Without regular educators trained to provide successful mainstreaming, mainstreaming will be just a passing fad and our children will suffer.

It is helpful to have community understanding and support of mainstreaming. Schools and their programs do not operate in isolation. They are a public part of a community and thus affected by the climate of a community. Whether an individual's program is good or not must not just rely on the opinions of the community. The community has a responsibility to accept or reject those programs as acceptable to the community's political powers. Thus, members of the community must have clearly communicated to them the rationale for mainstreaming, the benefits it will
Bring to all children and other members of the community, and how it will be reasonably implemented in that community’s schools. This communication to community members must be
and clear in specifying the benefits that mainstreaming will bring to all. This communication is a delicate exercise to ensure that the good that mainstreaming can achieve will be realized and maintained.

Since it is helpful to have the state department cooperating in implementing mainstreaming, the statewide community must also be considered in communicating rationale, benefits, and implementation steps of mainstreaming.

It is helpful to have an accountability system for mainstreamed special education. Mainstreaming is perhaps more subject to the quest for accountability than many other educational programs; for many wonder if children eligible for special education can learn desirable educational outcomes in the regular classroom. Can these children be happy learning with their more fortunate peers? Will these fortunate peers continue their learning of desired educational outcomes with children eligible for special education in their classes?

Thus, it is most helpful in implementing mainstreaming to have an accountability system that addresses itself to the above questions. This accountability system should include procedures and criteria for:

1. Determining who is eligible for mainstreamed special education services.
2. Evaluating the results of the mainstreamed special education services in terms of the learning of desired educational outcomes, not only by the children eligible for special education, but also by their peers.
3. Determining when children may profitably exit from the mainstreamed special education services. With such an accountability system and the dissemination, mainstreaming will be facilitated.

The University of Vermont has been involved in Vermont’s mainstreaming efforts since these were begun. In 1969, the author of this chapter, a faculty member of the University, began planning with the State Director of Special Education and one of the staff a system for providing special education to certain children in regular classrooms. Once they developed a tentative plan, it was reviewed by the entire staff of the Division of Special Educational and Pupil Personnel Services of the Vermont State Department of Education. The many helpful suggestions that came from this review were incorporated into a revised plan. This plan was presented by the state director and faculty members to superintendents of schools in Vermont. Again, helpful suggestions resulted and these were incorporated into a second edition of the plan.

In the spring of 1970, this plan was presented to superintendents, or their representatives, of five school districts close to the University of Vermont. These school districts agreed to participate in the plan and to begin implementing a mainstreaming approach in the fall of 1970. The mainstreaming approach these institutions adopted is called the “consulting teacher approach.”

Maintaining Momentum
The consulting teacher trains regular classroom teachers to provide special education to eligible children through consultation on referred children, workshops which can apply for teacher recertification, and formal courses which receive graduate credit at the University of Vermont. A consulting teacher is employed full-time by a school district and receives an appointment as an associate faculty member of the Special Education Area, College of Education and Social Services, the University of Vermont. School districts receive 75% of salaries of the consulting teacher and the full-time aide from the state department of education. More complete descriptions of the consulting teacher approach to special education can be found in this book in the chapter by Susan Mazzu, as well as in Christie, McKenzie, and Butterworth, 1979; Fox, Epes, Kuhl, Bereman, McKenzie, and Garvin, 1977; Mazzu, 1977; and McKenzie, Epes, Knight, Perelman, Schneider, and Garvin, 1978.

The major role of the University of Vermont has been to train the consulting teachers and to place them in Vermont school districts. To be successful in this major role, the University had to undertake many related activities. These activities can be conveniently summarized under the four factors helpful in mainstreaming:

a CONSULTATIVE PROCESS:
THE STATE, SCHOOL Districts, and students, and staff of the Special Education Area of the University of Vermont have made extensive commitments to helping the state department of education and Vermont's school districts implement successful mainstreamed special education. Inputs on the selection, training, and placement of consulting teachers have been sought continually from officials in Vermont school districts and state department of education. Over the seven years that the program has existed, these efforts have involved on-the-location pre-university training of consulting teachers, both formally and informally. These evaluations have led to constructive changes in the training program.
Classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, school di-rectors, parents, and children and youth eligible for special education in regular classrooms have all provided valuable feedback, welcomed by the Special Education staff for its contribution to the improve-
mant of the selection, training, and placement of consulting teachers.

The University of Vermont has cooperated with the state Department of Education and local school districts to implement successful mainstreaming special education in the following additional ways:

1. Helping regular educators become mainstream educators.

2. Training and supporting mainstream educators.

3. Helping develop an accountability system for Vermont’s main-
stream special education.

In implementing mainstreaming in Vermont, then, it was the
University’s responsibility to select and train consulting teachers, who ultimately would train over 4,000 regular classroom teach-
ers in the skills, attitudes, and knowledge requisite to successful
mainstreaming. In addition, these consulting teachers would share
their skills and knowledge in mainstreaming with school adminis-
trators and other educational personnel.

In regard to the selection of candidates trained as consulting
teachers, the state Department of Education, representatives from
school districts, and special education faculty at the University
determined that only experienced regular or special classroom
teachers would be accepted into the Consulting Teacher Training
Program. It was thought that a minimum of two years teaching
experience would be absolutely essential, with candidates with more
than two years experience being favored. In fact, over the success-
history of the program, the median number of years of teaching
experience of candidates has been approximately two.
It was felt that greater emphasis should be placed on candidates' demonstrated success as educators, rather than on academic aptitude or potential. Of course, there had to be minimum academic potential, but given that, greater weight was placed on demonstrated success as an educator. Thus, besides the usual letters of recommendation, candidates are required to have at least one fellow teacher, a supervisor, and a parent of a child whom the candidate had taught submit letters of recommendation. Additionally, those who submit letters are contacted by telephone by University faculty to gain further information on the potential candidate. Candidates are sought who have been perceived as leaders by their fellow teachers (e.g., have been elected to negotiation committees). A person with a high level of social skills is sought for someone who really likes people, and, in particular, likes educators and parents. All candidates who have met initial screening criteria must come for an interview to Vermont if they are to receive final consideration. Annually recruitment posters are sent to every school in Vermont with the request that the principal place these on the teachers' bulletin board. National advertisements are also placed to ensure that a large pool of qualified people will apply. This has paid off. During the last several years, there have been over 800 applicants per year. On two occasions, when a district chooses to do so, it may select one of its teachers who meets qualifications to become a consulting teacher in training. This person then goes to the University and receives training, returning a year later as an intern in the district. Selecting good candidates is important, but the University also has to ensure that the training was adequate. If a consultant teacher would be able to train regular classroom teachers to be successful in maintaining students. This was felt that the typical 30-hour Master of Education degree would not be sufficient to enable the training consultant teachers would, particularly in the area of
supervised field experience. Consequently, a one summer and two academic year, full-time graduate program was devised, totaling 60 graduate credit hours. Fifteen of these credit hours involve more formalized coursework, with 45 of the credit hours are earned by providing services to children and youth in regular classrooms and by teaching regular classroom teachers skills which they need to be successful with the wide range of individual differences that mainstreaming involves.

Consulting teachers in training serve 30 children in their graduate program, having to produce hard evidence that these services have been successful. This evidence takes the form of reliably measured acceleration in the rates of achieving desired educational outcomes for children and youth eligible for special education. For a minimum of 20 of the service projects, the consulting teacher must train a regular classroom teacher who him/herself implements the special learning procedures for an eligible child or youth in his/her classroom. Parents of children served, school administrators, and faculty periodically observe teaching/learning procedures implemented to insure that changes in children’s learning rates are real.
The consulting teacher in training spends the first summer and fulltime academic year at the University carrying out supervised practice in schools close to the University. Toward the end of the first academic year, the consulting teacher in training, with a faculty member and several of Vermont's school districts, begins procedures that ultimately will lead to placement as an intern in a Vermont school district for the second academic year. Both intern and school district enter into the internship with the understanding that if the internship is satisfactory, the district will hire the intern as a fulltime consulting teacher the following year.

Consulting teachers are trained in a Data-Based Individualized Model of Education. This model makes no effort to characterize various types of learners, but it is generally applied to every learner. For a specific learner, teacher, and curriculum, specific and unique applications of the model may be found in Fox, Egler, Paulson, Perlman, McKean, and Gardin, 1971, and in McKean, 1972.

Throughout their training, consulting teachers are taught applied behavior analysis, instructional technology, individualizing instruction, consulting and training skills, dissemination, planning, and administrative skills, as well as skills in communicating and cooperatively working with other specialists, such as mental health workers, speech pathologists, guidance counselors, and social workers. Throughout the first year of training, consulting teachers in training assist faculty in providing courses on campus to both graduate and
undergraduate students. During the second year of training, these candidates serve as associate instructors offering courses for University graduate credit to teachers in their interest areas.

In summary, then, the training of consulting teachers is competency-based in that it emphasizes successful special education being provided to children and youth. Moreover, the consulting teachers during training must demonstrate training of a regular classroom teacher to accelerate the learning rates of children eligible for special education. That the teacher has actually learned effective skills from the consulting teacher in training has to be demonstrated with reliable measures of the child's changes in learning rates, which are believable to the child's parents, the principal, and faculty of the University, as well as to the classroom teacher and the consulting teacher in training. Thus, each consulting teacher is trained not only in these skills necessary to accelerate the learning of desired educational outcomes of children and youth eligible for special education, but just as importantly, to train regular educators in these same skills.

To achieve such competencies, a tremendous amount of faculty supervision must be provided. In Vermont's experience, a full-time faculty load is the supervision of no more than three consulting teacher interns. This allows for adequate supervision of the interns, extensive planning and development work with administrators of the internship districts, and travel between the internship districts and the University. In the first year of training, one faculty to four consulting teachers in training can be handled efficiently.

Since the consulting teachers have been selected, trained, and placed in Vermont school districts, they implement training of regular classroom teachers on one or more of three possible training levels:

Consultation. A regular classroom teacher refers a child or youth to the consulting teacher as one needing special education services. The consulting teacher can provide the consulting-teacher-and-classroom teacher then discuss the referral, setting appropriate instructional objectives for the referred child, measuring his entry status, developing appropriate teaching-learning procedures, and planning for a measurement system that will lead to the evaluation of these procedures.

Parents of the child are informed of what is planned for the child and permission of the parents is secured before implementing the special teaching-learning procedures. The teacher does the actual implementation of supervises at a professional level. Procedures are taken, regular measures of the child's progress. Occasionally, the consulting teacher also takes measures to insure reliability. Thus, through these consulting procedures, a regular-classroom teacher begins to gain the skills required to mainstream special children and youth.

Workshops. Consulting teachers offer workshops to regular classroom teachers on individualizing instruction, applied behavior analysis, measurement procedures, and ways to adapt regular curriculum materials to the needs of children eligible for special education. It has been arranged through cooperation at the University, state department of education, and school districts that such workshops can be applied toward teacher certification.
Formal coursework: Consulting teachers are appointed as associate faculty of the Special Education Area of the University of Vermont. As such, they can offer up to four three-credit hour graduate level courses to educators in their districts. These courses are designed to provide the skills, attitudes, and knowledge required to accommodate the wide range of individual differences involved in mainstreaming efforts.

Since consulting teachers are fulltime employees of Vermont school districts and are offering these courses as part of their services for the districts, the University provides eight tuition vouchers per semester to each consulting teacher to be distributed to educators taking the consulting teachers’ courses. Each tuition voucher entitles its holder to three credit hours of University coursework without charge.

Thus, the major vehicle in Vermont’s mainstreaming efforts to provide regular educators with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge essential to including children and youth eligible for special education in regular classrooms is provided through consulting teachers.

Additionally, each summer the University of Vermont offers a program for Vermont’s regular educators to receive training in mainstreaming. As part of this program, the University operates a small school with students from three to 19 years old. These students present a wide range of individual differences including children who are struggling to learn their first reading words, children who are learning how to talk, and children and youth quite advanced in their academic and social skills. Regular classroom teachers, resource teachers, preschool teachers, principals, and guidance counselors are among the educators who attend the University summer programs.
Recently, the University has begun a preservice program—the 
Responsive Teacher Program—for undergraduate students preparing 
to be elementary or secondary level teachers. It offers concentrations 
in special education skills which will enable provision of main-
streamed special services. The program is field based, involving 
extensive practice in the education of children and youth eligible for 
special education in regular elementary and secondary classrooms. The 
undergraduates in the Responsive Teacher Program are taught to 
provide an individual learning environment for every learner and to 
define accountability to the community which they serve to insure that 
every learner attains proficiency in basic skills.

The special education faculty, students, and staff of the Univer-
sity have undertaken extensive activities to engender understanding 
and support of mainstreaming in Vermont’s communities. There are 
57 superintendences in the state—comprising over 300 elementary 
and secondary schools. University personnel, often with a representa-
tive from the state department of education, have made presenta-
tions on Vermont’s mainstreaming approach to each of the 57 
superintendences. Presentations have been made to superintendents, 
their assistants, principals, teachers, school boards, parent groups, 
and local service organizations.

Before a school district takes an intern, extensive planning 
activities are undertaken with the school’s administrators, teachers, 
and other educational personnel to establish how the mainstreamed 
special education will be specifically tailored to the characteristics of 
that district. In several cases, these planning activities have gone on 
for years before a given school takes an intern.
Planning activities are scheduled in the spring before the internship year. This planning involves the specification of the roles of the consulting teacher intern, the principal, the superintendent or his assistant, the classroom teachers, and other educational personnel, as well as the role of the University's faculty supervisor of the intern. These role definitions, as well as the objectives of the internship year, are written into a formal plan of operation. The school's principal and superintendent or assistant, the intern, supervising faculty, and chairman of the University Special Education Area all indicate their approval and support of the final plan by attaching their signatures to it.

Planning activities continue throughout the internship year. The eventual planning goal is a long-range plan approved by school district and state department of education for achieving full mainstreaming of special education services for all eligible children and youth in the district who can benefit from them.

Faculty, students, and staff of the University provide assistance to the state department of education in establishing the support of mainstreaming from communities. Presentations on the rationale, procedures, and achieved results of the consulting teacher approach have been presented to the state board of education, officials in the budget and management office of the state, the governor, and a substantial number of legislators.

University faculty have also helped the state department of education as well as other interested educators around the state, write new special education legislation which in part was aimed at facilitating mainstreaming efforts to support this legislation, University faculty and staff were instrumental in organizing political action groups in the 13 counties, helping provide information on the proposed legislation. These groups then would disseminate the information to their state representatives in the Vermont House and Senate. Legislation was passed and funded.

A fact of the new legislation provided that special educators, such as consulting teachers, would receive 25% of their salaries and the salaries of their aides, from state monies. Thus, a very straightforward formula and satisfactory manner was provided to school districts for receiving state reimbursement for mainstreamed special education.

In addition to hundreds of presentations in various groups in the state, University faculty developed five programs on mainstream special education for Vermont's educational television stations. Radio stations and newspapers are additional media through which linear
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The University's Special Education Area continually invests research and development resources in Vermont's mainstreaming efforts. This investment has led to the development of a number of teaching/learning procedures which the regular classroom teacher can employ to effectively educate children eligible for special education in regular classrooms, as well as to adapt regular curriculum materials for the special child (e.g., Burdett & Fox, 1972). One of the major efforts that the University has engaged in is the development of an accountability system for mainstreamed special education. This accountability system is briefly described as follows (see Christie & McKenzie, 1975, for a fuller explanation).

With the assistance of a consulting teacher, teachers and principals of a given school specify the skills, attitudes, and knowledge that each and every child, at minimum, should learn in language (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, and spelling) and arithmetic. This specification involves the writing of instructional objectives which are explicit and measurable regarding desired minimum outcomes. Sets of these objectives are paired with a given grade level, so that for each grade level, a minimum number of instructional objectives in language and arithmetic will be achieved by each child by the completion of the school year.
Additionally, objectives for a given grade level are broken down into 10 subsets of objectives, so that one subset is to be achieved, at minimum, by each and every child in that grade every 18 days. For example, let us assume that for a K-6 school, the teachers and principal, with the assistance of the consulting teacher, specify 180 arithmetic instructional objectives that are to be achieved, at minimum, by each and every child by the end of his six years of instruction in that school. For simplicity's sake, let's assume that the first 30 of these instructional objectives are to be achieved by every child in kindergarten, the second 30 by every child in first grade, and so on. With a 180 day school year, this would also mean that, at minimum, each child would achieve three arithmetic objectives for every 18 days of instruction.

Once the objectives have been specified and paired with grade levels and 18 day instructional periods, teachers, with the help of the consulting teacher, specify systems to measure the achievement of these objectives for every child for every 18 day period. Procedures are also devised so that the principal, consulting teacher, and perhaps other educators can also take the same measures as the teachers to insure reliable indicators of each child's progress in achieving the objectives.

A more refined special education accountability system should provide for the following factors:

1. Eligibility for special education
2. Evaluation of special services provided
3. Determination of when exit from the special education services is appropriate
With the specification of instructional objectives described above, well as the pairing of each of these instructional objectives with a particular number of years (or parts of years) of instruction, all factors of a mainstream accountability system are provided. A child judged eligible for consulting teacher services when he is not achieving objectives at the specified minimum rate, as measured by the teacher and the consulting teacher, and when the teacher states that he/she has exhausted his/her repertoire in trying to accelerate his child's rate. Thus, in our example of the K-5 school with its 180 instructional objectives for arithmetic, a child with 3.2 years of instruction would be expected at minimum to have achieved the first third of the 180 arithmetic objectives. If the teacher's measures indicated that the child had achieved only 24 of these objectives and he/she had exhausted his/her repertoire in attempting to accelerate his child's learning, the child would be eligible for mainstreamed special education and referred to the consulting teacher.

The following evaluation criteria of consulting teacher services have been accepted by the state department of education, the university, and school districts in Vermont: If the child's rate of achieving instructional objectives has been increased to the extent that it is:

- Apparent that the child will have achieved all minimum instructional objectives by the end of the years of instruction that school offers (e.g.: a K-5 school offers six years), or
- Double that of the minimum rate expected of every child, that is, he achieves two months of objectives for one month of instruction.
In the above example of the K-5 school with 180 arithmetic objectives, and our child with 3.2 years of instruction, who achieved only 24 objectives (at minimum he should have achieved 36 objectives), to judge consulting teacher services successful, the child's rate would have to be accelerated either to: (a) achieving approximately 56 instructional objectives per instructional year, or (b) achieving 60 instructional objectives per instructional year. Concurrently, measures of other children's rates of achieving instructional objectives continue to be checked to insure that their achievement rates remain satisfactory.

In regard to determining appropriate exit from mainstream special education services provided by consulting teacher and classroom teacher, when the eligible child has achieved the minimum number of objectives expected of every child with his same number of years of instruction, and when he continues to achieve these objectives at the minimum rate expected of all children, he is no longer eligible for special services provided by the consulting teacher. (For a graphic explanation of this accountability system, see Christie & McKenzie, 1975, and Egner & Lates, 1975.)

This approach of specifying instructional objectives for language and arithmetic, and specifying how many of these instructional objectives must be learned for each one-tenth year of instruction is not intended to limit total amounts of learning for any child, nor does it in Vermont practice. What it does do is place a floor, or minimum rate, of learning that is expected of each child. In helping teachers and principals develop instructional objectives and minimum rates for their acquisition, consulting teachers insure that minimum learnings needed by children are emphasized over minimum learnings the school might believe it can deliver to children. In other words, the primary criterion for selecting the minimum instructional objectives is that they be the minimum required for a child to have a reasonable chance for success in his current community and in his future.

The primary criterion for selecting minimum instructional objectives is that they be the minimum required for a child to have a reasonable chance for success in his current community and in his future life. This is a difficult task and one in which much research and development is required.

An additional safeguard, to insure that the minimum is not too minimum is that consulting teachers through their principals arrange for school directors to review and approve specified instructional objectives, as well as for parents and other members of the community to do so. Such broader base participation in the specification and approval of objectives provides balance to the judgment of professional educators.

Mainstream special education, has expanded from the 1968 level when five Vermont superintendencies and nine elementary schools in these superintendencies were involved in the program, to the fall of 1975, when 28 superintendencies with over 150 of their elementary and secondary-level schools provide mainstream special education. During the 1975-76 school year, it is projected that 2,000 children and youth will receive mainstream special education through five full-time consulting teachers and 72 interns employed by Vermont school districts, as well as by 12 consulting teachers in training. Some 870 regular classroom teachers will receive training from consulting teachers through consultation, workshops, and courses offered for University of Vermont graduate level credit.
Most of the 47 mainstream special education programs offered in the fall of 1978 in Vermont will be directed toward elementary level children, with three preschool programs which are home based with the parents as teachers, and five which are based in secondary schools. School district requests for consulting teachers far outstrip the University's current capacity to train them, and the state department of education has requested that the University train and place over 200 consulting teachers by 1983. (See Fox et al., 1973, pp. 40-42 for additional comments on progress.)

Thus, it appears that the Special Education Area of the University of Vermont has been able to make contributions to Vermont's efforts in mainstreaming special education. Over 3,000 children and youth in Vermont eligible for special education have been served by consulting teachers in training and graduate consulting teachers through provision of consultation and training to regular classroom teachers. In the selection and training of consulting teachers, the University has made errors as new programs tend to do. However, because of the close cooperation with the state department of education and school districts, and the valuable input and evaluative data these agencies have provided, this training program has been able to improve continually so that services to children and youth have become increasingly effective, as has the training of regular educators in the skills of mainstreaming.

Because of evaluative data, installation of this mainstreaming approach is no longer an agonizing effort of all concerned. Now mainstream services can be tailored to meet the individual needs of a school, and the program's development and implementation proceed smoothly to the satisfaction of most of those involved. It has meant a tremendous commitment on the part of the faculty, staff, and students of the Special Education Area at the University of Vermont to make this contribution to mainstreaming efforts. The rewards have also been tremendous. Members of the Special Education Area are well received and well respected by their professional colleagues in the state department of education and Vermont school districts. Their worthwhile efforts have provided the opportunity to develop competency and field based teacher training programs which have led to the provision of successful mainstreamed services to thousands of Vermont's children and youth eligible for special education.

It is hoped that the preceding material demonstrates to those readers from colleges and universities that higher education's role in mainstreaming is both challenging and rewarding. It is also hoped that it demonstrates to readers from school districts and state departments of education that institutions of higher education can contribute to the effective implementation of mainstream, special educational services.

If the latter is the case, then the question of how one enlists the support of higher education becomes meaningful. There is no simple answer to this question, as institutions of higher education vary as do the settings in which these institutions operate. Moreover, and unfortunately, many institutions of higher education carry out teacher training programs which are not field based and thus find it difficult to make the shift from campus realities to the realities of the public school. In short, it seems that enlisting help will require a considerable expenditure of energy and resources.
with mainstreaming from teacher training institutions will require considerable expenditure of energy and resources. It is a problem of changing institutions and thus may be considered a problem in the exercise of power. It is certainly a problem in how to share effectively with higher education the challenges and rewards that mainstreaming involves.

It also seems that the public schools and state departments of education have in their power those things which can change a teacher training institution, and it is particularly recommended that several public schools and their state department of education cooperate in enlisting the support of a teacher training institution. Public schools have student teacher placements and other practice opportunities to offer teacher training institutions. Public schools hire, or not, the graduates of a given teacher training institution. Public schools can, or not, offer teacher training institutions opportunities for research. Public schools have access to special funds, such as Title I and Title III, ESEA, which can be shared with teacher training institutions for joint projects.
State departments of education set and enforce rules and policies for all of public education, including the certification of educational professionals who are trained by the institutions of higher education. State departments of education have access to such funds as those falling under the Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, which could be used for joint mainstreaming projects with a teacher training institution and public schools.

Thus, it is clear that public schools with their state department of education have sufficient power and incentives to enlist the support of a teacher training institution in the cause of mainstreaming special education. With the skilled and judicious use of these incentives, public schools and a state department of education should be able gradually to bring a given teacher training institution into a cooperative main-streaming effort. These incentives will need to be shared with the teacher training institution, but only as the teacher training institution commits itself to meaningful participation.

Although Institutions of higher education are not generally noted for progressive changes in their teacher training programs, it seems clear that public schools and a state department of education in concert could successfully bring about changes by wielding the power they hold in a carefully planned sequence. If public schools and their state departments of education believe that higher education can help in mainstreaming, and if they are willing to exercise the power they have with higher education, higher education will join with them to achieve successful mainstreaming.
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Trends and Priorities in Inservice Training

CAROLYN R. RUDE

Abstract: A comprehensive personnel development system in each state should provide inservice training to keep changing emphases in the education of handicapped children. Training topics and personnel group priorities are identified from inservice training plans initiated by each state. Possible trends are seen in the focus and level of training needed for various groups. Delivery of inservice training is becoming diversified in terms of training providers, modes, and resources. However, state plans do not reflect awareness of those varied means of training delivery. The need for evaluation and monitoring of inservice activities indicates a future priority.

Educators are continuing to feel the impact of a shift in emphasis from children who have problems meeting school expectations to the problems schools have in meeting children's needs. This change, reflected in the new laws regarding education of handicapped children, has heightened concern for opportunities to develop attitudes and skills to accomplish new tasks. Traditionally, inservice training has been used to update skills and to introduce innovation into education. As a way of ensuring that appropriate inservice training programs are available to teachers, administrators, and others, a comprehensive personnel development system is called for in the regulations for Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Part B. This system provides a structure for each state education agency (SEA) to use to plan, implement, and evaluate inservice training opportunities at state and local levels.

Emerging nationwide trends and priorities for inservice training were identified through a study by a state review of the personnel development section of the Annual Program Plans for 1977-78, submitted to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). This review, completed by the Council for Exceptional Children under a grant from BEH, shows that the scope of inservice training varies greatly from state to state. Trends and priorities were identified in terms of training topics, target personnel groups, training delivery, and additional training needs indicated in the development of a statewide training system.

Training Topics

Assessed needs of statewide significance are the basis for planning inservice programs initiated by the SEA. Needs assessment that re...
results in a list of training content areas allow planners to set goals and establish priorities among the goals. Effective and successful inservice programs are more likely to result when training is directed toward the needs of the training recipients (Hentachol, 1977; King, Hayes, & Newman, 1977). Various formal and informal needs assessments were planned or used by the SEA's reviewed to evaluate training needs. Assessment procedures that resulted in a list of priority content areas were described by fewer than half of the states. These assessments most frequently evaluated the priority needs of local education agency personnel, the largest group of potential training recipients.

Priority topics of inservice training needed differ across states. For example, Connecticut's first priority is to build communication and interpersonal relationships. The District of Columbia's first priority is self help skills for severely and multiply handicapped students. While Kentucky's first priority is awareness of committee members' roles and responsibilities for assessment and referral. An overall view of the needed training topics indicates the relative importance of each topic and results in a rank ordered list of the highest priority training topics nationwide (See Table 1).

The two sets of topics ranked as highest priority concern the day to day instructional and behavioral management of the handicapped child. These topics are closely related to the second ranked topic, particularly the implementation of the individualized education program (IEP). The third and fourth ranked needs concern finding and evaluating the handicapped child for the purpose of providing services. Least restrictive environment, the fifth topic, includes the development of alternative settings and matching of the handicapped child to the most appropriate setting.

The sixth ranked topic is more general in nature and covers the essentials of compliance with the federal law. Communication skills are necessary for conferences with parents, educators, and others who are increasingly involved in the education of handicapped children. Coordination of services is essential for the effective interaction of those who deliver services to these children.

Many states also listed topics that were planned for inservice training programs. Overall, there is some difference between the topics most frequently needed and those most frequently planned. Needed training topics relating to communication and coordination of services, were often not planned, while protection in evaluation, procedural safeguards, and the role of surrogate parents were frequently planned but were not listed as high priority needs. Comparison of these two sets of priority training topics indicates a future trend if the stated needs are to be met. It appears that the current focus of inservice training on day to day child evaluation, placement, and instructional problems will continue while emphasis on due process related topics will give way to training concerns for effective provision of services.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order of Highest Priority Needed Training Topics Nationally</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional procedures/classroom management</td>
<td>It is estimated that 260,000 special education personnel and over 2 million regular educators require inservice training to implement provisions of Public Law 94-142 (National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, 1977).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum, program materials, resources</td>
<td>Regular educators are a current focus of federal training-funds of the $350 million made available to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped for training through the Education of the Handicapped Act (June 22, 1975). Of about $9.5 million, was earmarked for training of regular school personnel, with $6.5 million allotted to regular classroom teachers (Sant &amp; Moore, 1978). These educators are the key to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individualized education program</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifying, locating, and handbooked children</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Least restrictive environment</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implementing Public Law 94-142</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cooperation of services</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintaining Momentum
stance, the need to influence the attitudes of the general population toward the handicapped. The review of the state inservice training plans revealed that training was planned for four broad groups of individuals who affect the education of handicapped children: instructional, support, administrative, and others.

Instructional personnel to be trained include regular and special education teachers, teachers in the more specific areas of severe-profound and preschool handicapped, paraprofessionals, and teacher aides. Physical education and vocational education teachers are listed, and Indiana indicated training of content area teachers on IEP's and least restrictive environments. Support personnel listed as training recipients by the majority of states include psychologists and educational diagnosticians and speech and audiology personnel, as well as school nurses, medical personnel, and social workers. Vocational rehabilitation workers and work study coordinators were listed less frequently. Occupational therapists, recreational and physical therapists, and counselors were also identified.

Administrative personnel listed were principals, special education directors, supervisors, and coordinators. Other target groups were hearing officers, surrogate parents, parents, and volunteers. Four states mentioned training for school boards, State, regionals, and intermediate unit personnel were identified for training as were college and university personnel. Several states planned training for private and parochial school personnel, for the general public, and for community organizations and agencies. Alaska was the only state that planned to provide training to the state legislature.

Overall, the highest priority personnel to be trained are special education teachers; administrators; regular education teachers, supervisors, and coordinators; psychologists; educational diagnosticians; hearing officers; surrogate parents; and parents. The priority topic areas planned for these personnel groups are displayed in Table 2. IEP's rank as one of the top three priorities for all but one of the groups listed. Other topics are ranked for each group.

The level of needed and planned training varies for different groups. Awareness and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Training Topics</th>
<th>Priority Personnel Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized educational program</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Gifted Teachers, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation procedures</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional procedures</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least restrictive environment</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protections in evaluation</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process safeguards</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Public Law</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrogate parent</td>
<td>Special Educator, Regular Educators, Psychological Diagnosis, Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers refer to rank order in each personnel group.

TABLE 2

Priority Training Topics Ranked for Personnel Groups
knowledge level training was planned to influence attitudes and provide information on basic aspects of the federal and state laws and policies and on rights of handicapped children and their parents. The broad variety of recipients of this type of training includes educators, parents, and noninstructional school staff, as well as leadership personnel in community and civic organizations. Groups of personnel with a narrower focus require more specific training on aspects of procedural safeguards, educational placement, management, and evaluation. Some training programs are oriented toward specific skill development for a particular group.

The majority of training experiences planned appear to be directed toward awareness and knowledge levels, even for groups such as regular classroom teachers who need specific skills to work with the handicapped. Future planning should show heavier emphasis on skill development for more groups but with continuing broad scale use of training for attitude and knowledge development.

Training Delivery

In the past, the bulk of inservice activities has been initiated by colleges and universities and by state education agencies. But, there is growing recognition that related training can and should be delivered in a variety of ways by various trainers. Increasingly, training activities are being conducted by state and national special and regular education organizations and advocacy groups, Regional and state systems, such as the Regional Resource Centers, intermediate and local education agencies, as well as the agencies and training institutes that are providing and coordinating innovative opportunities for experienced educators to expand their capabilities to educate handicapped children. Teachers' views on inservice delivery reported in a recent National Education Association study (1978) emphasize experiential over theoretical training and use of support personnel as ongoing trainers to expand teachers' skills on materials and techniques. On-site training personnel available for long periods were a major characteristic of inservice programs that effectively influence and stabilize attitudes and complex teacher skills. (Lawrence, 1974; Mann, 1976).

Variables training implementers and differences in training materials and resources that can be used in traditional courses and workshops but also lend themselves to more innovative uses. The most successful inservice activities have been found to use materials that are tailor made and prepackaged for the participants, offer early success and active participation, and allow self-initiated, self-directed learning (Lawrence, 1974; Mann, 1976).

State inservice training plans offered little information on the human and nonhuman resources to be used for training delivery. Implementation of training was generally planned via institutes, workshops, and consultation. The major source of trainers was listed as the state education agency and institutions of higher education, although other sources of trainers were also mentioned. Some states planned to present training to key trainers who would in turn implement local inservice training in a "trainer of trainers" model. This multiplier approach has the potential to successfully provide the ongoing contact of on-site trainers, as long as in-depth training and followup are available. Instruction on the skills needed to be a trainer is an important component of this approach. Few training materials were listed in the state's plans for use in developing expertise in the priority topical areas. Of those listed, the majority seemed to be local, state, or regionally developed products. Such products vary in quality and are seldom field tested and validated for use with different groups. It appears that duplication of effort rather than replication is the rule where training materials are concerned. Information on the availability and usability of training materials, such as that coming from federalally funded projects, should help educators identify appropriate resources. Projects conducted by the Council for Exceptional Children, the University of New Mexico, and the University of Iowa are charged with developing training resource information that should be useful to trainers.

Additional Training Needs

Although training evaluation and monitoring were not high priorities in state planning, they are necessary components of a personnel development system. Accountability is a growing issue, as financial support for inservice training as the amount of state program funds
ties and outcomes (Howey, undated). An evaluation design that relates data on child achievement to the needs based objectives of inservice training activities, assesses the immediate effect and long range impact of training programs. The greatest need now is for instruments to collect the data to document discrepancies between objectives and trainee performance (Burke, 1977).

Program evaluation procedures were discussed by just over half of the states. The procedure most frequently specified was the Discrepancy Evaluation Model developed at the University of Virginia Evaluation Research Center (Yavorsky, 1970). Other evaluation methods assessed achievement in competency based training programs. Monitoring systems for inservice training activities were indicated by less than half of the states, frequently as part of the overall monitoring system. Clearly, evaluation and monitoring will have to receive more attention in statewide training plans.

Conclusions

Personnel development for those involved with handicapped children is an emerging priority in education. Although statewide inservice training systems are currently in the initial stages of development, their potential is great for affecting the quality of education for handicapped children. Federal funds are currently available for training and suggestions have been made that long term state financing should support local level training directly related to educators' problems, motivational needs, and remedial skill development (Florio & Koff, 1972). Needs assessment, evaluation, and monitoring technology still must be developed and refined in many states. However, the greatest need is for personnel training priorities to be answered by high quality training opportunities. The trend toward prototypes of trainers, delivery modes, and training resources should enhance the effectiveness of training. Increased availability of information and assistance in training delivery will help state planners identify and implement appropriate training. Comprehensive statewide training systems should make it possible to anticipate and prepare for new trends and changing priorities in the education of handicapped children.
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Trends and Priorities in Inservice Training
Mainstreaming Competency Specifications for Elementary Teachers

MARTHA ROSS REDDEN
A. EDWARD BLACKHURST

In the majority of public schools, mainstreaming is the practice of educating handicapped children in the regular classroom while using the services of personnel such as resource teachers to provide specialized instruction for the students and assistance to the regular class teacher. To the authors' knowledge, no previous efforts have been reported that have attempted to obtain empirical data on competencies related to this topic.

The purpose of this investigation was to identify specific competencies reported by regular, elementary classroom teachers as necessary to mainstream handicapped children effectively.

Procedures

Subjects for this investigation were 493 elementary teachers from 24 schools in 4 Kentucky communities. Each school was in the state's second year of mainstreaming and was selected according to seven criteria. The Critical Incident Technique (Flanagan, 1962) was used as the research methodology. Questionnaires were developed to obtain specific incidents of three effective and three ineffective behaviors that related to the instruction of handicapped children who were being mainstreamed. The questionnaires required that the respondents specify when the incident occurred, the antecedents leading up to the incident, the behavior that occurred, and the consequences of the behavior that led them to conclude that it had a significant impact on their mainstreaming efforts.

Following receipt of the questionnaire, the incidents were translated into competency statements, redundancies were eliminated, and competencies were grouped into categories. Reliability of this process was checked on a random sample of statements by a panel of judges. A second panel of experts on mainstreaming provided their opinions on the importance of each statement.

Results

Responses were received from 104 of the teachers who were surveyed. This resulted in the identification of 828 critical incidents. When redundancies were eliminated and reactions of judges obtained, 271 specific tasks related to mainstreaming were identified. These were subsumed by 32 competency statements, which were then grouped into 6 broader categories, called functions.

The following 6 functions and 32 competency statements were identified. A complete list of the competencies is available elsewhere (Redden, 1976). Each competency statement completes the declarative stem: In order to effectively teach mildly handicapped students who are mainstreamed with regular students in a mainstream elementary classroom setting, the teacher must be able to:

Function 1.0: Develop Orientation

1.1 Participate in schoolwide planning for mainstreaming activities.
1.2 Set up a training plan that will provide supplementary instruction in areas necessary to teach effectively in a mainstream setting.
1.3 Participate in parent and community orientation programs on mainstreaming.
1.4 Seek-out consultative relationships with specialists or school staff.
1.5 When appropriate, develop a program to prepare the special student for entry into a regular class.

1. Prepare members of the regular class for the entry of special students into the class.

Function 2.0: Assess Needs and Set Goals
2.1 Gather information to determine the educational needs of each student.
2.2 Evaluate each student's present level of functioning.
2.3 Determine for each student in the class individual goals that are appropriate, realistic, and measurable.
2.4 Determine group goals for the class as a whole and for subsets within the class.
2.5 Involve parents in setting goals for their child and for the class as a whole.

Function 3.0: Plan Teaching Strategies and Use of Resources
3.1 Design a system of teaching procedures that provides for individual differences in students.
3.2 Specify and prepare a variety of activities that will involve the entire class in grouping patterns that are varied and flexible.
3.3 Develop and design a variety of alternate teaching strategies.
3.4 Develop a plan for use of human and material resources.
3.5 Develop a flexible time schedule that provides for the learning, physical, and social needs of each student.
3.6 Provide an optimal classroom climate through appropriate arrangement and adaptation of the physical properties of the classroom.

Function 4.0: Implement Teaching Strategies and Use Resources
4.1 Select and use a variety of individualized teaching methods to instruct each student within the student's level or capability of functioning.
4.2 Develop, schedule, and maintain on a regular basis a variety of grouping patterns that provide opportunities for students to reach class goals, both social and academic.
4.3 Use the efforts of the special education resource staff within the special students' classroom activities.
4.4 Acquire, adapt, and develop materials necessary to achieve learning goals.
4.5 Plan and maintain a system to use the assistance of volunteers (other students, parents, etc.) to reinforce and supplement classroom activities.

Function 5.0: Facilitate Learning
5.1 Identify and differentiate between a variety of behavior management techniques and develop skills in selecting appropriate techniques to manage individual and/or group behavior.
5.2 Select and apply adequate behavior management techniques and measures to meet the learning goals set for the class and each individual student.
5.3 Acknowledge appropriate behaviors in each student in order to stimulate continued effort.
5.4 Conduct class activities in a way to encourage interaction between and among students.
5.5 Provide ample instruction and practice for each child to develop and refine adequate coping strategies.
5.6 Plan with class for systematic appraisal and improvement of the psychological climate of the class.

Function 6.0: Evaluate Learning
6.1 Organize a system to collect and record data by which to evaluate student progress toward goal attainment.
6.2 Develop a feedback system that will furnish continuous data to student, teacher, and parents on goal attainment.
6.3 Use evaluation data to assess goal attainment in order to measure terminal outcomes and set new goals.

Conclusions and Implications
Previous efforts to identify competencies for mainstreaming have been in the form of a priori statements based upon values, opinions, and judgments of special educators. This investigation obtained specific observable behaviors from teachers who were involved in the mainstreaming process. Although there was considerable congruence between the results of this study and previous reports of
competencies, several major differences were found. This investigation found a greater concern for orientation strategies to facilitate mainstream entry, focusing on the child as part of the class group, and competencies required for good teaching in general.

Keeping in mind potential limitations related to small sample return, validity of instruments, generalizability, the retrospective nature of the data, and questions related to possible subjective bias, this investigation has several implications for application to practical situations. The functions, competencies, and tasks could serve as the basis for preservice and inservice training program development. They could also be used to develop job descriptions for elementary teachers who are mainstreaming handicapped children. Procedures for screening, interviewing, and selecting teachers could be developed. In addition, they could serve as criteria for third-party evaluation of teaching performance and as a self-assessment tool by teachers who are planning individual professional development programs.

As a final note of caution, there is a need for additional research to determine whether these competencies are valid and whether items should be added or deleted. These competencies should be viewed as an initial list that can serve as a point of departure for future efforts, that may eventually lead to a more complete and valid list of mainstreaming competencies.
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Training Teachers for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped: A New Frontier

SUSAN STAINBACK
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Abstract: Due to recent litigation and legislation, there will be an influx of severely and profoundly handicapped individuals into community-based public education programs. As a result, teachers who possess the knowledge and skill to foster the growth of these individuals will be needed. The onus of responsibility is on the universities to prepare competent teachers. This article examines the basic components that will have to be integrated into the existing structures of teacher training programs to adequately prepare teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped.

The severely and profoundly handicapped consist of a group of individuals who until recently could generally be found on the back wards of large state institutions. They were frequently found in cribs responding very little to the limited stimuli present. Sontag, Burke and York (1973) describe these children as those who, self-mutilate, regurgitate, ruminate, aggress towards others, display stereotype pathologies (rocking, handwaving), manifest durable and intense temper tantrums, have serious seizures, and/or have extremely brittle medical existences. Included are those who do not suck, swallow or chew, imitate, ambulate, speak, see, toilet themselves, respond to simple verbal commands and/or those who do possess multiple handicaps. They have been labeled 'untrainable,' 'profoundly retarded,' 'seriously disturbed,' multiply handicapped, 'crib cases and custodial.'

It was not until behaviorists (Bensberg, Colwell & Cassel, 1965; Fuller, 1949; Rice & McDaniell, 1969) began conducting research with this population that the learning potential of the severely and profoundly handicapped was recognized. While the necessary initial research was being conducted, parents of these individuals began lobbying through such strong parent groups as the National Association for Retarded Citizens (NARC). They worked to gain for their children educational and training opportunities to enable them to develop their full potential. This parental pressure resulted in several major court decisions (e.g., Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1972) that have expanded public educational services to
Include the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Along with this emphasis on the right to education for these individuals, the "deinstitutionalization philosophy" has evolved which postulates that equal education for this group should come under the jurisdiction of public education. It is noted that education is the job of public educational agencies, not of social services in an institutional setting. As a result of this philosophy, court decisions, and parental pressures, laws have been passed in many states (Education Commission of the States, 1972) that place the responsibility on the public schools for the education and training of the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Other events have signaled a growing commitment to the education of this group.

1. In March/April, 1975, the NARC held a national training meeting on the education of the severely and profoundly retarded.
2. A new American Association for the Education of the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped has been formed (Flaring, 1975a).
3. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has cited as one of its top priorities the education of the severely and profoundly handicapped (Martin, 1975).

The Need for Trained Teachers

As the focus changes from custodial care to education and training for the severely and profoundly handicapped, highly trained teachers will be needed in public education.

Here the onus of responsibility rests on teacher training institutions to design and implement teacher education programs specifically aimed at preparing persons to further develop multiply handicapped, severely retarded children (Smith & Aitken, 1974, p. 501).

The number of trained teachers needed will be substantial, especially if one accepts a teacher/student ratio of no more than 1:5. This ratio is tenable when the learning, behavioral, and physical characteristics of the severely and profoundly handicapped are considered.

When estimating the number of teachers needed, the necessity of early intervention should be considered also. Even the more profoundly handicapped preschooler has the potential for learning among other things visual and auditory awareness, motor control of the head and trunk, and rudimentary understanding of vocabulary. It should also be noted that early intervention can prevent the development of abnormal body structure from prolonged periods of bed rest (Luckey & Addison, 1974). In many cases early correct body positioning can prevent physical deformities frequently found in older handicapped individuals (Robinson, 1975).

On the other end of the life continuum, continuous education and training during adulthood is imperative to maintain and expand the skills of work productivity and daily existence. It has been recently demonstrated that the markedly handicapped can learn to participate in work activities (Gold, 1973) previously thought beyond their capabilities.

In essence, a teacher/student ratio of 1:5 and the necessity of life long intervention will require that institutions of higher education train teachers competent to aid the growth of severely and profoundly handicapped individuals. In addition, it should be noted that (a) recent medical advances are keeping many children with serious handicaps alive who would otherwise not have lived, and (b) today there is virtually a void of trained teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Training Requirements

Universities have focused their teacher training in special education toward the mildly and, in some cases, the moderately handicapped. The potential special education teacher has received more diagnostic techniques and remediation approaches than the regular classroom teacher. With few exceptions, the basic techniques and materials presented to teachers of the mildly handicapped and teachers of so called "normal" students have been the same with changes mainly of emphasis.

The functioning level of the severely and profoundly handicapped will require a wide deviation from what has been the mainstay in university teacher training. The following is a discussion of the training needs of prospective teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped to provide an impetus for critical evaluation of the content of some elements necessary in teacher training discussed here: (a) diagnostic evaluation, (d) curriculum, (c) methodology, (d) interdisciplinary team work, (e) field experience, (f) parent training, and (g) prosthetic aids.
Diagnosic Evaluation.

The standard diagnostic and evaluation tools presently employed with the mildly handicapped such as readiness and achievement tests will generally be of little use to teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped. Even the social maturity tests at the preschool level are frequently too high and/or have too large a gap between skills to accurately assess the functioning level of many severely or profoundly handicapped individuals for training purposes.

Due to the infantile functioning level of some of these individuals and the small achievement increments made over time, it is imperative that teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped have a thorough working knowledge of human growth and development patterns from birth through beginning preschool as well as the basic readiness and early academic learning process. A high degree of insight into child development during the infancy stage such as visual tracking, responding to stimuli, lifting head, reaching for objects, grasping objects and turning over is needed since it is within this range of functioning that teachers will find many of the severely and profoundly handicapped.

These diagnostic evaluation needs require going beyond the present educational literature. Teachers must become aware of the psychological and medical information concerning infancy and early childhood development. Developmental instruments such as the Gesell Developmental Schedules (1947), the Cattell Infant Intelligence Scale (1940), the Bayley Scales of Development (1969), the Denver Developmental Screening Test (1970), and the Pintner-based Albert Einstein Scale of Sensory-Motor Intelligence (Cormier & Escalona, 1969) will need to be closely examined. Also, teachers must be aware of, for example, the developmental sequence for evaluating and/or teaching such skills as ambulation.

It is obvious that educational diagnosis and evaluation as we know it for the mildly handicapped and normal student will need modification for teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped. It should be noted that a few special educators and psychologists (Beitz, 1974; Sailor & Mix, 1975) have already begun developing diagnostic and evaluation instruments for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Curriculum

As in all educational situations, the goal of the curriculum for the severely and profoundly handicapped is to move each individual to higher levels in the developmental sequence. The major differences relate to the range of the developmental functioning levels of concern. In the education of mildly handicapped and normal students, the major focus is on readiness for and achievement in reading, writing, arithmetic and social skills. With the severely and profoundly handicapped the curriculum emphasis is on response to environmental stimulation, head and trunk balance, sucking, swallowing and chewing, grasping, movement of body parts, vocalizations, and higher levels, imitation, language acquisition, self feeding, ambulation, dressing skills, toilet training, social/recreational behaviors and functional academic skills. Vocational skills, as with any individual, are important. When individuals reach this level, the bagging of golf tees, stapling packages, or more complex tasks such as the assembly of 14 piece bicycle brakes (Gold, 1975) are a few of the possible additions to the curriculum.

The curriculum needs are widely divergent from the mildly handicapped or normal child. Despite the newness of this area, ideas and materials for curriculum development are becoming available (Ball, 1971; Meyers, Sinco & Stalma, 1973).

Methodology

Presently, educators and psychologists are finding that the behavior modification methodology is very effective with the moderately and severely handicapped (Haring & Phillips, 1972) with many implications for teaching the most profoundly handicapped.

When classroom teachers have used behavior modification, the stress has been on the manipulation of stimuli that occur after the response to increase or decrease the intensity, duration, frequency of responses. With the severely and profoundly handicapped teachers must continue to apply reinforcement principles. They will need only to become more sophisticated. The concepts of reinforcement sampling, discrimination training, generalization, stimulus control, shaping, backward chaining, contingency, aversive stimulation, prompting, fading, modeling, etc. will have to be understood, but also incorporated into daily teaching sessions. In addition, the manipulation of anteced-
and speech clinicians can contribute their expertise. No one person can be expected to possess all the expertise required to facilitate the development of a profoundly retarded child who is also blind, deaf, and/or cerebral palsied.

Some supportive and ancillary personnel may be unfamiliar with the characteristics of the severely and profoundly handicapped. The school counselor, assistant principal or itinerant art teacher, for example, may never before have worked with children who eat their crayons, self mutilate, stare at their left hand for hours, and/or indiscriminately wall throughout the day (Sontag, et al., 1973).

Receiving medications is a frequent occurrence with the severely and profoundly handicapped. A child who is alert and responsive one day may be dical and unresponsive the next. In their teacher's training sequence, teachers will need to be made aware of the reasons certain drugs are administered and their side effects.

These and other aspects will have a bearing on how the teacher works with such individuals. The teacher will be required to design an educational program, but not be the sole contributor. The element of interdisciplinary teamwork is mandatory.

Because of this need for teamwork, it is important that teachers be trained to communicate efficiently and effectively with other disciplines. Courses in speech acquisition and psychology will be needed. Exposure to clinical syndromes and the medical aspects of physically handicapping conditions will also enhance the teacher's ability to communicate.

Finally, it is imperative that teachers be thoroughly aware of their own and other team members' roles. They must know their particular areas of competency as well as the competencies possessed by other professionals and be able to conduct their duties in terms of them.

### Extensive Field Experience

Teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped will be faced with a population previously considered untrainable. Given may be slight and tediously slow in coming. This combined with the precise skill application required to effect gains emphasizes the need for immediate feedback and support while actually working with children.

Field experiences will permit prospective teachers to determine if they have the abilities
and attitudes required. The enhanced precision required in the teaching process will be too difficult for some; the development of appropriate attitudes will be impossible for others. For example, an attitude that permits normal risk taking is essential. As for any child, the severely and profoundly handicapped must be allowed to experience pleasure from self-discovery even at the risk of minor bumps and bruises. Field experience can assist prospective teachers in developing attitudes that will avoid overprotection.

A teacher training program which includes curriculum, methodology, and field experience may help us avoid some of the pitfalls experienced in the earlier training of teachers for the mildly and moderately handicapped (e.g., knowledge of definitions and characteristics, but no teaching skills). Hopefully, we can reduce the frequency of the first teaching day syndrome: "I know the definitions and characteristics, but what do I do?"

Parent Training

With the severely and profoundly handicapped, the training of parents and/or parent surrogates by the teacher is an important factor. Without the necessary information and support, home care will be beyond the abilities and tolerance level of many parents. Since the teacher is most closely involved in the overall daily planning and training of the child, he will be called upon to provide information and support to the parents or parent surrogates. With strong lines of communication between the school and home, a consistent and comprehensive, 24-hour program can be devised and implemented. In order for teachers to assume the role of parent trainers, they must become knowledgeable in several areas. This constitutes another component not previously emphasized in many teacher training programs. A few of the specific competencies needed by teachers to be effective in parent or parent surrogate training include:

1. Explaining student abilities and progress to help parents overcome the problems of under or over protection and inappropriate expectations (either too high or too low).

2. Training parents to deal with explosive, stereotypic, self-stimulating behaviors as well as appropriate motor responding and verbalization behaviors. This, of course, will make home living a more realistic alternative for the handicapped child, siblings, and parents.

3. Being a source of information concerning community resources that can provide health care, social interaction, recreation, etc. This will also include knowledge concerning foster and group home alternatives for parents who are unable to cope with their handicapped child within the existing family structure.

4. Providing parents with knowledge of sources of special clothing and equipment that can aid in easing home care problems and encourage greater independence and self-care.

5. Training parents in lifting, carrying, and positioning the nonambulatory.

6. Training parents in techniques for fostering sensory awareness, motor development, communication, eating, toileting, bathing, and dressing, etc.

7. Explaining the importance of having the nonambulatory child up and correctly positioned for part of each day in a chair, even if strapped in, rather than flat on his back in a crib or bed. In addition to enhancing motor development, the child can see and respond to stimuli in his environment other than the ceiling.

Use of Prosthetic Aids

In order to successfully deal with the severely and profoundly handicapped population, teachers must be well versed in the use of modification tools such as prosthetic aids. A prosthetic aid is a device used to modify an individual or environment so that previously handicapping conditions can be bypassed or eliminated. Smith and Neisworth (1975) list five broad categories of prosthetic devices. These are locomotion, life support, personal grooming and hygiene, communication, and household aids.

It can be observed from these categories that the use of prosthetic aids can permeate almost every phase of life from breathing to brushing teeth to recreation.

Due to the high incidence of multiple handicapping conditions in the severe and profoundly handicapped population, many of them use one if not several prosthetic devices in their daily lives. Teachers of these children will find themselves in classrooms with such items as wheelchairs, built-up and/or modified spoons, knives, and forks. In addition, special prosthetic devices will be used in getting some of these individuals to and from school (e.g., adjustable base lifts).
Teachers, when helping children load or unload from the transportation vehicle, will need to be familiar with these devices in order to avoid possible accidents. Potential teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped should be provided the opportunity to acquire a strong working knowledge of prosthetic aids. They should know how to use and maintain the devices so that maximum efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved in the classroom setting.

New devices are being designed to help modify the results of the handicaps of blindness, deafness, paralysis, and voice, muscular, and bone aberrations. As research, development, and use of these devices continues, the need for teachers to become familiar with them will increase.

**Source of Expertise**

We have discussed why and in what areas teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped should be trained. Now the question is where will the universities get the expertise to train prospective teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped?

Educators are rapidly gaining the legal right to provide education and training for the severely and profoundly handicapped. With or without this expertise, public schools will establish classes for the most profoundly handicapped. Colleges and universities will begin training teachers. We will accomplish the task of providing education and training for the severely and profoundly handicapped. However, if we are to do the most efficient and effective job, we must recognize our current lack of knowledge of training procedures and begin to correct it.

The recent work of Blatt and Garfunkel (1973), Bricker (1972), Brown (1973), Gold (1973), Haring (1975), Hening (1976), Lenn (1975), Sailor and Mix (1975), Tawney (1974), and others should serve as prime sources of reference for the identification of materials, techniques, and procedures found effective for training the severely and profoundly handicapped. In addition, the excellent work of prominent institution personnel (Azrin & Foxx, 1971; Bensburg et al., 1965; Gardner, Brot & Watson, 1971; Luckey, Watson & Musick, 1969; Watson, 1962) should be closely examined.

This focus on available expertise does not minimize the need for further research and study to update and expand what is currently known. It is only to insure that these relatively early efforts are not ignored.

Although we are for the most part inexperienced in dealing with the severely and profoundly handicapped, public education provides real advantages for this population. Through public education the severely and profoundly handicapped will receive, by the nature of the organizational arrangement, a considerable increase in environmental stimulation by such aspects as living in a community setting, being transported to and from school, and exposure to many normal activities throughout the day. For example, the simple act of being transported back and forth to school provides a wide array of experiences (e.g. active and/or passive interaction with people). It is this involvement in ordinary daily living (normalization), not our current expertise, that largely justifies community based public school education for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

**Conclusions**

Laws and court decisions have been and are being enacted that will mandate a right to education for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

The right to education, if it is implemented, will bring into our special education orbit those children and adolescents who were not previously considered to have the necessary academic potential or even to be capable of acquiring the basic life skills for community living or who are not in the traditionally prescribed age for education. Many special educators have never before seen them... They were invisible... (Goldberg & Lippman, 1974, p. 331).

Few teachers are trained to teach these children and few professors of special education are prepared to instruct teachers in educating the severely and profoundly handicapped. This is not to say we cannot do the job. We can and should. However, careful planning will have to occur, if we are to meet this new challenge.

Although laws are being passed to insure public school education for the severely and profoundly handicapped, little money is being appropriated for personnel training. This, of course, enhances the risk of repeating the same mistakes made when we first began trying to meet the needs of the less markedly handicapped in regard to the use of ill prepared and unprepared teachers. Because of the pressure to provide special services to the
mildly and moderately handicapped, many teachers were not prepared for their jobs. Unfortunately, some handicapped children have suffered, as well as the overall reputation of special education. Although some states are just beginning to overcome the critical lack of trained and certificated personnel for the mildly and in some instances the moderately handicapped, we will be faced with new demands for trained personnel for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Unless adequate support is forthcoming for personnel training, classrooms for the severely and profoundly handicapped are likely to be staffed by untrained teachers. If this happens, these children may fail to progress in an educational environment. This could happen if untrained teachers establish babysitting centers or a watered down curriculum. The severely and profoundly handicapped do not need this kind of educational programming. They need well planned and designed programs developed by rigorously trained special education teachers.
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Special Education Administration Competencies Required of the General Education Administrator

ANN NEVIN

This study was conducted in the context of rapidly changing social policy concerning the education of handicapped children. The passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, requires immediate changes for all important sectors of the educational scene. Public school administrators are now required to provide appropriate individualized education programs for all handicapped children and to do so in ways that protect the children's procedural and substantive due process rights while providing for placement within the least restrictive alternative. The purpose of the study was to ascertain the competencies needed by general educational administrators to implement special education programs under the requirements of Public Law 94-142.

Procedure

A collaborative goal analysis model (Mager, 1972) was used to generate the competency statements. A jury was nominated by an advisory committee of persons in leadership positions in special education and educational administration organizations in Vermont. This jury generated a list of 47 competency statements, which was subsequently submitted to all superintendents, all assistant superintendents, one principal from each of Vermont's 50 school districts, and faculty members of the Special Education Department at the University of Vermont. Those who responded were compared to nonrespondents according to three variables: size of school district, position, and presence of school district consulting teacher programs. Chi square analyses revealed no significant relationships.

The majority of respondents were males between 35 and 54 years of age who had earned at least a master's degree. They reported from 1 to 6 years in their current position and a common background as general educators. Fewer than 20% indicated other experiences (e.g., state department or professor roles). Course work reflected a common background in general education, learning theory, and systems theory, with relatively few respondents reporting course work in special education, vocational education, or rehabilitation.

The validity of the questionnaire was addressed through the comparison of respondents' scores on a 60 item concept assessment test and their respective actual proficiency ratings for related competency statements. Respondents with a low concept assessment score tended to rate themselves as low in actual proficiency for competencies related to those concepts, while respondents with high concept assessment scores tended to rate themselves as high in actual proficiency. It may therefore be concluded that respondents were accurate observers and reporters of their own proficiency for selected competency statements.

statements, at least as demonstrated by performance on a written test. This provides some assurance that the rating scales are valid indicators of respondents' views and increases the overall confidence in the results.

Each competency statement was rated according to three scales: (a) priority, (b) required proficiency to effectively discharge the competency as required in the respondent's position, and (c) actual proficiency in demonstrating the competency statement. The respondents were asked to evaluate the competencies in reference to their job responsibilities on a scale of 0 to 3, thus stressing the ordinal nature of the rating scales. The two extremes of 0 (not needed) and 3 (essential) were absolute, while the intermediate ratings (1 = useful; 2 = important) were intended to reflect potential minor and major impact on program effectiveness.

**Results**

Ratings were summed and divided by the total number of respondents to identify the rank order of importance. Among the 47 competency statements, 8 were rated essential (mean priority ratings ranging from 2.5 to 3.0); 33 statements were rated desirable (mean priority ratings ranging from 2.0 to 2.5); and 6 statements were rated useful (mean priority ratings ranging from 1.5 to 2.0). No statement was assigned the rating unnecessary (0 to 1.5 mean rating). Substantively, the statements that surfaced as essential concerned assuring due process, interpreting federal and state laws, using appropriate leadership styles, showing that records comply with due process and confidentiality requirements, resolving conflicts among program personnel, using evaluation data to make program revisions for exceptional learners, and determining staff functions and qualifications for educational programs for handicapped learners. Such competency statements may be characterized as advocacy and leadership functions as well as technical knowledge related to the handicapped child's educational program. By contrast, the six statements that surfaced as useful focused on the administrative functions of record-keeping, communication, dissemination, and architectural transportation requirements.

These results appear to be consistent with findings related to administration of special education. For example, the general education administrators in this study showed as much concern as special education administrators who tended to focus on the technical development, implementation, and content specification for monitoring special programs (Sage, 1968).

In addition to generating a list of prioritized competency statements, the study also identified training needs of the respondents. A training need was defined as any positive discrepancy between required proficiency (scale b) and actual proficiency (scale c). The number of respondents reporting such discrepancies was tallled for each competency statement, and a percentage of respondents reporting discrepancies was calculated. More than 40% of the respondents indicated training needs for eight competency statements. The greatest training need was reported for the competency statement involving maintaining knowledge of current trends, research, and programs for handicapped children. The next highest training needs were in the areas of keeping data-based records for the handicapped student, planning programs, interpreting mandates, assisting in program redesign, assessing needs of the handicapped child, and using evaluation data for program revision.

The major conclusion related to training needs is the recognition by general education administrators of the need to acquire and maintain current knowledge of research, trends, and programs for the effective education of handicapped learners. This is consistent with the findings of other researchers who identified knowledge and research related activities as major tasks for special education administrators (Newman, 1970; Marro & Kohl, 1972). Similarly, superintendents of large city schools and professors of educational administration included knowledge and research related activities as critical aspects of competencies for effective school superintendents (Culbertson, Farquhar, Gaynor, & Shibles, 1969).

**Discussion**

Training programs can be evaluated on the degree to which trainees achieve the essential competencies. The relationship of training programs to increased performance in achieving important outcomes should provide important information for decisions related to type of training program and materials (formal course work or informal workshops); duration of training...
of training (intensive 2 or 3 day seminars or seminar or yearlong interactions with trainers); mode of training (simulation, didactic lecture, or on-the-job practice); and timing of training (proservice or inservice). Finally, the decision on who delivers instruction (teams of field personnel composed of both general and special educators, university faculty, individuals, or media) can also be assessed directly in terms of the achievement of competencies.

The fact that training needs were reflected for both cognitive and procedural competencies suggests that the training system should include both didactic and laboratory elements. It appears that inservice training school situations would be ideal. This suggests training systems that are negotiated carefully between field personnel and higher education.

Finally, it appears that general education administrators perceive that the degree of compliance with and the extent of commitment to the intent of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 can only be demonstrated by each individual school district and can only be as great as the competencies of the personnel involved.
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III. Individualized Education Programs
ONE of the more critical issues facing the broad area of special education is to change the ways educators and others view the needs of the handicapped.

Gotts (1976), at The University of Texas at Dallas, has referred to the personal and social, consequences of innate or adventitious conditions that affect the individual's ability to interact with human and physical environments as being the most critical factors in this issue. As achievement and development are considered, comparison is between the present and potential achievement status, that is, discrepancy analysis. Learning or nonlearning takes place in all environments, not just in a formal school setting. Both the human and the physical aspects are influential in forming one's cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors. These factors have far reaching implications in early childhood education for the multiply handicapped and the more severely involved children and youths. Basically, one must consider developmental assessment and from that develop curriculum.

Recent Legislation

In less than two years' time, November 1975 to August 1977, three documents have been developed that have implications for profound changes in the ways educators and others will respond to the needs of the handicapped. These documents are both statutory and regulatory.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) is the statutory document that revises Part B of the Act. It stipulates that all handicapped children 3 through 21 years of age shall receive a free, appropriate public education with (a) first priority to children who are not receiving an education and (b) second priority to chi...
The language of the Act is specific in defining the components of the individualized education program. Section 603(6) of the Act requires that each state and its local educational agencies must develop and maintain a comprehensive program of instruction, including regular instruction, related services, and any other services designed to meet the needs of all handicapped children in each State. The program must be designed to meet the needs of each handicapped child. The program must include:

1. Extensive child identification processes.
2. Assurance of full service with a documented plan.
3. Establishment of a presumption of appropriate public education for all handicapped children.
4. Establishment of procedures for comprehensive personnel development, including accessing services.
5. Assurance that special education programs provided for all handicapped children are placed in the least restrictive environment.
6. Development of nondiscriminatory testing and evaluation processes.
7. Identification and protection of confidentiality of data and information.
8. Maintenance of an individualized education program for each handicapped child.
9. Establishment of a system of assistance to parents or guardians.
10. Assurance that the comprehensive program of instruction includes services available in the child's least restrictive environment.

Individualized Education Program

Central to the provision of least restrictive environment for each child in the individualized education program is the need for a statement that is based on the child's present levels of performance. The statement must include:

- Identification of the child as a handicapped child.
- Description of the services to be provided to the child, including related services.
- Placement of the child in the least restrictive environment.
- Participation of the child in regular educational activities to the maximum extent appropriate.

The statement must include the name of the child, the child's age, the name of the regular educational program, the child's performance levels, the services to be provided, and the placement of the child. The statement also must include a description of the least restrictive environment in which the child will be placed. The statement must be reviewed at least once a year, and the child's progress must be monitored to ensure that the child is receiving a fair education.
The specifically stated statutory requirements are the minimum that may be considered by an individualized education plan. They are safeguards to assure that a written plan will be developed by an educator with input from the child's teacher and parents, and where appropriate the child. As amended, the Rules and Regulations (Education of Handicapped Children, 1972) set forth in Section 1214.4 of the content of the individualized education program. The guidelines for the development of the plan are similar to the requirements for the IEP.

In order to secure funds under Part B of the Act for any fiscal year, each State must submit an annual program plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education through a State educational agency (Public Law 94-142, Section 901(b)). The Fiscal Year 1974 Annual Program Plan Amendment (1974) is the latest document showing amendments. In change. A further requirement is

The three federal regulations require that the State submit a plan for the operation of the education program. The plan should include a description of the education program, the services to be provided, and the methods of evaluation. The plan should also include the procedures for the administration of the education program.

The plan should provide for the development of an individualized education program for each child. This plan should be developed by the child's teacher and parents, and where appropriate, the child. The plan should include the procedures for the evaluation of the child, the services to be provided, and the methods of evaluation. The plan should also include the procedures for the administration of the education program.

Implementation of the plan is not a task for a curriculum department. The plan must be matched with the child's needs and is clear about what must be done with the child.

Public Law 94-142 requires that an annual report of each individualized education program. For all but the most obviously handicapped child, the report can be too infrequent. There is need for ongoing developmental assessment that focuses on areas needing additional data analysis and interpretation. The number of teachers and other educators who will develop individualized education programs is not specified. Many cannot attend a plan and program to meet the special needs and unique learning characteristics of children. These are needs, including educational programs, which are not in the hands of the hands of the child's needs and is clear about what must be done with the child.
Conclusion

It should be clear that developmental assessment is fundamental to appropriate planning of an individualized education program. The entire area needs further exploration and development. Diagnosis and assessment consider the ideal, the best possible approach for each child. The plan becomes the practical statement for what can be carried out in terms of available resources. These include personnel in schools, funds available for programs and community support. These choices necessitate dealing simultaneously with each of these. Teachers need to know which adjustments must be given priority in working with the child's integrative functioning. In practice, the teacher becomes the child's advocate and in a sense the child's sponsor as well as facilitator for implementing the child's individualized education program. None of these facets of the teacher's role can be fully carried out without administrative support.

Simply stated, a child's best educational requirements are the direct outgrowth and result of successful implementation of his or her individualized education program.

As implementation of the requirements of Public Law 89-563 proceeds, a majority of the investigators report that the availability of materials and equipment and the availability of local educational staff is a function of administrative implementation priorities. The training of regular and special teachers in the regular special education programs is a function of administrative priorities. The training of regular and special teachers in the regular special education programs is a function of administrative priorities.

As a result of the work of the state and national committees, the emphasis on the importance of this training for the regular education interface and the allocation of funds for it has increased. The implication of this training for the regular education interface and the allocation of funds for it since fiscal year 1973.

In a recent discussion, HHHS '81978, who was involved in the Richardson, Texas Independent School District's implementation of least restrictive environments beginning in 1972, indicated that...

Further investigation of Public Law 89-563 will require the concerted efforts of many individuals—general and special educators and administrators, support personnel, parents, siblings, and the child—themselves.
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Issues Regarding the IEP: Teachers on the Front Line

JOSEPHINE HAYES
SCOTTIE TORRES HIGGINS

Each school year brings with it significant dates to be placed on the calendar by professionals. This school year no less brought an end to one date that was vital for any professional who provides special education to handicapped children. The key date, September 1, 1982, has come and gone. On that date an individualized education program (IEP) had to be developed for each eligible handicapped child who needed a written statement of the child's educational needs. The IEP was first written in the autumn of 1982 under Public Law 94-142, the Handicapped Children of 1975, Public Law 95-115. The forthcoming due date for renewals will be September 1, 1983. On that date each local, intermediate, and state education agency must provide a free appropriate public education to each handicapped child in violation of the rights and protections set forth under federal law. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975, Section 611 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 94-142, states that the individualized education program developed in accordance with the law must be reviewed and a new one must be developed on September 1, 1983. On that date the local education agency must provide a free appropriate public education in accordance with the law to all handicapped children. The local education agency must develop an IEP for each child. The IEP must include at least three sections:

Section 1: The Individualized Education Program

This section identifies the child's unique needs and specifies the services and supports necessary to meet those needs. The IEP must be developed in consultation with the parents and the child, if appropriate. The IEP must be reviewed at least annually and whenever there is a change in the child's needs. The IEP must include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, a statement of the child's educational needs, a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child, and a statement of any other services or supports that will be provided to the child. The IEP must be reviewed at least annually and whenever there is a change in the child's needs. The IEP must include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, a statement of the child's educational needs, a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child, and a statement of any other services or supports that will be provided to the child.

Section 2: The Progress Report

This section provides feedback to the parents on the child's progress towards the annual goals set in the IEP. The progress report must be provided at least annually and whenever there is a change in the child's needs. The progress report must include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, a statement of the child's educational needs, and a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child.

Section 3: The Evaluation Plan

This section identifies the evaluatons that will be conducted to determine the child's educational needs. The evaluation plan must include a description of the assessments that will be used to determine the child's educational needs, a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child, and a statement of any other services or supports that will be provided to the child.

Federal IEP Requirements

Federal law, Public Law 94-142, requires that each eligible handicapped child receive an education program that is specially designed in order to ensure that the child's unique learning needs are met. The child's IEP must be based on the child's needs and must be developed in consultation with the child's parents and the child, if appropriate. The IEP must include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, a statement of the child's educational needs, a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child, and a statement of any other services or supports that will be provided to the child. The IEP must be reviewed at least annually and whenever there is a change in the child's needs. The IEP must be reviewed at least annually and whenever there is a change in the child's needs. The IEP must include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, a statement of the child's educational needs, a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child, and a statement of any other services or supports that will be provided to the child.
procedures that result in new or revised reports from new teaching staff. Therefore, teachers must be cognizant of the critical requirements of federal law and understand how those impact their professional behavior. For this reason, several significant components of Public Law 94-142 have been selected for discussion here.

**Least Restrictive Environment**

One provision of Public Law 94-142 is the concept of placement of a child in the least restrictive environment. Too often educators interchange this new term with an old one mainstreaming: Public Law 94-142 is not a mainstreaming law. The term mainstreaming does not appear in the law. For this reason, the term is often confused in the profession and reversion from the education community as such. If the term mainstreaming is phased out because of the shift toward interventions for everyone hearing and using it, special educators may have a greater understanding of what appropriate education for handicapped children in the least restrictive environment means. A minor change alone is not enough.

Teachers must understand that although the law handicapped children require special education and related services. Handicapped children who required special education and related services may have a greater understanding of what appropriate education for handicapped children in the least restrictive environment means. A minor change alone is not enough.

**Procedural Safeguards**

The law requires a second requirement of federal law that demands the necessary procedures established to ensure that handicapped students are not placed in inappropriate public education. Requiring constitutional guarantees, Public Law 94-142 sets forth procedures to ensure that due process is afforded each handicapped child at private point education if decisions are made as soon as a child is referred for potential special education. Handicapped children who required special education and related services may have a greater understanding of what appropriate education for handicapped children in the least restrictive environment means. A minor change alone is not enough.

Teachers must understand that although the law handicapped children require special education and related services. Handicapped children who required special education and related services may have a greater understanding of what appropriate education for handicapped children in the least restrictive environment means. A minor change alone is not enough.
The policy areas of Public Law 94-142 provided by parents are identified as those general educational experiences that are necessary for the development of each handicapped child. While the IEP and all of the documents used to develop the IEP are confidential, parents and the child of the property interest in informing their families of these rights to request access to all such records. This has implications for how each teacher with respect to those and those personal and professional records.

A third provision of Public Law 94-142 requires that appropriate service planning and the requirements be set forth in federal law that became theIndividualized Education Program (IDEA) in 1975. Nevertheless, teachers are responsible for implementing the IEP to the extent consistent with their instructional planning and the requirements set forth in federal law. Public Law 94-142 (1976) requires that the IEP be in accordance with the following:

1. The IEP must be developed and implemented to the extent consistent with the instruction and education of a handicapped child. The IEP shall be consistent with the instruction and education of a handicapped child.

2. The IEP must be developed and implemented to the extent consistent with the instruction and education of a handicapped child.

3. The IEP must be developed and implemented to the extent consistent with the instruction and education of a handicapped child.
including health care personnel, psychologists, social workers, administrators, perhaps each teacher that works with the child, and the parents.

The second difficulty regarding teacher participation occurs more often at the secondary level. Typically, a student may have four or five regular education teachers as well as at least one special educator. Which teacher(s) should be designated to participate in the IEP development? The answers would insist that those decisions must be made on a per child basis, with priority given to the teachers who have the primary responsibility for implementation of the IEP. Recognizing that often the logistics of release time during school hours is a complex problem, particularly at the secondary level, the federal law does not require that all of the child's teachers develop the IEP. Clearly, some mechanism must exist for involving all appropriate personnel in the IEP development. It is essential for teachers to have input and to understand the policy and procedures used in the district governing appropriate teacher participation.

Accountability and Teacher Advocacy

Many districts as teachers frequently present the IEP as an unchangeable document that can be used against them if the student does not attain the specified annual goals or meet the IEP objectives. It is important to remember that the IEP is a tool to improve the education of the handicapped child and to plan for student achievement. Changes in the IEP do not have to be the result of teacher failure, but may be a result of improved or revised student needs.

The Written IEP

As each teacher knows by now, the requirements of the IEP are contained within Section 541.34 of Public Law 94-142, which mandates that the IEP must be written and prepared by the school district. The IEP must contain the following information:

1. Child's present levels of educational performance
2. Annual goals toward attaining the goals
3. Short-term objectives toward attaining the annual goals
4. Appropriate educational placement
5. Appropriate transition plans
6. Appropriate related services and adequacy of facilities
7. Implementation of the IEP
8. Parental input

The IEP must be reviewed at least at annual basis or whenever there is a change in the child's IEP. It is crucial that teachers understand the IEP and its importance in the educational process. It is equally important that teachers advocate for their students and ensure that the IEP is implemented in a manner that meets the educational needs of the student.
1. Public Law 94-142 and Section 501 of Public Law 93-112. Copies of both the federal statute and regulations may be obtained from a local congressperson. Teachers should read firsthand what others are implementing for them.

2. A copy of the state's special education laws and regulations.

3. A copy of the local application, which may be obtained from a special education administrator. Public Law 94-142 requires that each education agency assure in the state that a free, appropriate education is provided every eligible handicapped child. A description of the policy methods and procedures must be developed. Teachers may want to pay particular attention to the following sections: facilities, personnel, and services; personnel development; parent involvement; IEP, procedural safeguards, and participation in legal education programs.

4. The state plan, which may be obtained from the state department of education. Each state education agency certifies to the federal government the assurances that every handicapped child in the state is receiving appropriate special education and related services. Teachers may want to receive the following sections: determination of need, assessment of handicapped children, and evaluation of handicapped children. Teachers may want to receive a copy of the most recent state education plan or training materials or write to their state education office for more information.

5. A comparison of the two documents will reveal that teachers must keep current on federal and state guidelines. The intent of a local policy and the distinction between federal state and local requirements is in order to better address the needs of handicapped children.
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Staying Out of Jail

MAYNARD C. REYNOLDS

Abuse of my special-education friends these days seem to be out-acting practice in the frame on individualized education programs. I've been working at trying to finish my education. I was a student in Mr. Williams' class, but recently I have been sharing a desk with his sister, who is in the same class. She has been working on the requirements in Public Law 94-142 and I have been guided through several sessions of self-help to help me with my work. In short, it has been a difficult process but I have made good progress.

Ms. Brown said her son was designed in keeping children out of jail. To comply with the law, that is— but usually I wore blue not of how people might come together creatively in design and development. For better or worse, I was the same school system.

It is a worry that all of this learning activity is nothing but as the basic integration of educational processes and special education is also underway. Many difficult rule changes can be anticipated. There is a great deal on the agenda for integration, such as curriculums, child study and placement procedures. Without much delay, it is a major improvement in language.

The changes are considerable. I think that the institution will gain capability to handle most of the problems of our society. The children find that care at the level of the family, and make sense by the decision of the parental unit. One issue postulated in the family-centered process, but it is hard to find a place; and many roles are more difficult for children and create opposition by the makers of Public Law 94-142. I am viewed by James Barlow (1973) as the option of the juvenile justice system in the past fourteen years for a more centered focus on the critical role of reinventing the family

FAMPLINE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNERS, INC.
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A truly remarkable aspect of the IEP process is its potential for providing accommodations, modifying the curriculum, and tailoring the environment for the special needs of the student. This allows teachers to create a more inclusive learning environment where students can thrive.

A teacher who is well-versed in the process of creating an IEP can effectively advocate for the needs of their students. By understanding the IEP process, teachers can work with parents, administrators, and other professionals to ensure that students receive the necessary support and accommodations. This can result in improved academic performance, increased confidence, and a more fulfilling educational experience for students with special needs.

One of the key components of an IEP is the provision of accommodations and modifications. These are designed to address specific learning needs and help students to succeed in the classroom. Examples of accommodations and modifications may include extra time for tests, use of assistive technology, and the provision of additional resources.

Understanding the IEP process is crucial for teachers and educators who are committed to providing the best possible education for all students. By working together, we can ensure that students with special needs have the support they need to reach their full potential.
Developing Individualized Education Programs for Young Handicapped Children

ALICE L. HAMLEN
EUGENE EDGAR

THE RATIONALE

The service described in the rules and regulations, Federal Register, April 27, 1975, 40: 7650-7668, and Federal Register, August 15, 1975, p. 14519. The only interpretation that can be made with regard to the Congressional mandate is that the IEP is an accountability check for the teacher, administrator, and school system to translate the federal goal of an "appropriate education for every handicapped child" into reality. The IEP is a planning process between the teacher and the child's parents to determine the child's education needs. The goal of the IEP is achieved through a systematic, planned planning process designed to systematically plan the IEP which is an individualized education program.
Most educators will agree that there are five major areas that must be included in the educational process for handicapped children. First, there is an assessment/evaluation process in which the child is evaluated to determine what the child can and cannot do. This information is then used to develop an individualized education plan (IEP). The IEP must be agreed upon by the individual and committee who will be responsible for developing the IEP. The IEP must be evaluated for its effectiveness in meeting the needs of the child.

Another major concern about the use of a committee to develop the IEP is that the IEP is handled in a way that is adequate for the child. The Committee for the IEP must be composed of people who can develop an IEP that is specific to the needs of the child.

PROCEDURES: HOW TO DEVELOP IEP

1. A summary of the program must be developed for the child.
2. The objectives for each subject should be stated.
3. Evaluation criteria for each objective should be stated.
4. Procedures for reevaluating the IEP should be stated.

In all, almost every requirement for the IEP is currently being done by some group or other. The key is that the minimum membership of the planning committee is to be the child's teacher, parent, and a representative of the local school district (or preschool program serving the child) and the child. Additional members may be included as required by the Federal Register, (22 U.S.C. December 27, 1982. p. 55963). However, Section 112 of P.L. 94-119, (November 28, 1975), states that the committee may include individuals knowledgeable about the child, the assessment results, and the individual evaluation skills of the child.

To our way of thinking, the committee is the most appropriate group to determine a child's individual program. Each member of the committee collects relevant information and generates possible ideas for the IEP. After the formal meeting, the professional staff (teachers and other education agency personnel) need to recognize that parents have a right to be involved in the child's education. There may be instances when parents have the support of other parents, and the child's education is handled in a way that is adequate for the child. The responsibility of these individuals long-term responsibilities for the child.

Committee does not necessarily have to perform each function or meet as a group in each phase, but must agree on each component of the final program.
The committee is responsible for ensuring that there is an appropriate service delivery program for each child, that the program is implemented exactly, that the results of the program are reviewed, and that the program is revised, at least yearly. Some considerations regarding parents are that:

1. Meetings must be scheduled at a convenient time for the parents.
2. If the parents' native language is other than English an interpreter must be provided.
3. The parents need to be informed of their rights and responsibilities and should be trained in the IEP process.

The first task of the committee is to collect data on the child. Data must include that relates to the child's current level of performance and the possible effects of the child's handicapping condition on learning.

Data To Be Collected and Analyzed

Medical Assessment Data
There can be no substitute for a thorough medical examination. Even though there might be very little that can be done to correct the child's medical or health problems, these conditions often influence instructional planning. Therefore, not only must these problems be noted but an interpretation must be made as to how they affect the child's instructional program.

- Such issues as seizures, medication, heart defects, allergies, susceptibility to illness, strength and stamina, and special feeding instructions are types of assessment information that must be considered in the formation of the IEP.
- Heart defects may require a curtailment of certain types of physical activity or specific amounts of rest periods.

- The possibility of surgical techniques to alleviate physical problems (club foot, cleft palate, leaking heart valve, etc.) must be explored and considered.
- In the rare case of degenerative central nervous system disease the IEP must focus on the best strategies for maintaining current functioning and retardation of current skills.
- The types of medications being used must be noted, as well as possible side effects. Procedures for conducting controlled studies of varied dosages should also be established.
- Specific physical limitations may alter educational priorities (a paralyzed arm, for example, might dictate that instruction be geared to the good arm and that physical therapy be given to the immobile arm).
- Allergies may limit the types of food that can be used as possible reinforcers.
- The need for rest will certainly be a factor in determining the daily schedule of activities (a child with a serious heart problem might need to have complete rest three or four times a day).

The basic purpose of this medical information is to permit development of a comprehensive IEP. Thus, this information must be used to provide for ongoing medical treatment (medications, diet control, seizure control) as well as to determine considerations for educational programming. All of this information needs to be gathered and summarized in the IEP.

Physical Assessment Data
Many preschool aged handicapped children have physical involvement. Programming considerations will concern the procedures that can be used. Positioning, for example, is of prime importance for severely/profoundly handicapped individuals, not only as it may relate to a therapeutic program but also how various positions may facilitate or hamper the educational programing. Techniques to relax children who are spastic and strengthen those who are atonic, procedures for lifting and moving the children, and the possible use of prosthetic devices are all critical pieces of information that must be collected during the assessment phase.

For any child who is experiencing physical problems, the initial assessment information should attend to three major points. First, a competent occupational therapist or physical therapist needs to determine the specific therapeutic needs of the student. These needs, of course, will be responded to by the IEP and special services. Second, the information gained from this evaluation should point out any of the child's specific physical limitations that will affect educational programing. Third, especially for the severely involved child, specific positioning and handling techniques need to be specified. The occupational therapist or physical therapist should be able to determine how best to position the child so that the child will be physically able to make the desired response. This position should be noted on the IEP as the desired educational position.

In the greater majority of instances, occupational therapists or physical therapists will be used as consultants to the teacher in the classroom. The initial assessment information, therefore, should include specific information on how the teacher and therapist will interact throughout the school year. Information should be included on the types of behaviors that might occur which should demand immediate therapeutic attention.
As with the medical assessment information, these physical assessment data need to be recorded on the IEP both for special program considerations and also to see how they interact with all educational programming.

Educational Assessment Data
Although assessment for instructional programming is a complex issue, several pertinent areas need to be discussed. First, the process of assessment involves teachers looking directly and frequently at specific child behaviors. Second, the materials the teachers use contain procedures for measuring objective behaviors that are sequenced developmentally in various content areas, but always including gross motor, fine motor (or cognitive), communication (language), social, and self-help behaviors. Third, the formats in which the materials are presented should be program specific; that is, they are derived from the specific goals of the educational program.

Determining Priorities
Analysis of Data
When all the assessment data are collected the committee must meet and determine the child's current level of functioning and special needs. The analysis of the assessment data in order to establish service priorities is the major task of the committee and they must establish a process for making these decisions. In most cases the professionals on the committee must carry the brunt of the decision making process. Parental input is crucial, especially as to desired goals, but the professionals, who should understand the assessment data and program capabilities, will have the basic responsibility for determining priorities.

Probably the most important activity of the committee is to analyze the assessment data and establish priority areas of instruction. This activity determines the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the IEP, because the most technically correct IEP, if focused on inappropriate instructional goals, will result in low quality instruction.

Current Functioning Level
Before any meaningful program can be developed, an accurate statement of the child's current functioning level in each content area must be made. This is interpreted as the highest level of the skills the student has in each area. The priority area for instruction should be at the next level. When programming is planned at a lower level, valuable instructional time will be lost. If programming occurs at too high a level there will be little, if any, success as well as a high degree of frustration on the part of both student and teacher. A caution should be noted at this point: regardless of the appropriateness of the initial assessment data, mistakes will be made. With the careful use of ongoing assessment procedures teachers are able to detect quickly any pinpoints that are too high or too low for a given child. Thus, daily instructional data should probably take precedence over initial assessment data in determining level of instruction. If the daily data indicate a lower level of functioning than did the initial assessment, a careful explanation of the initial assessment data is called for. In this case the teacher will have to consult with the individuals who collected the initial assessment information and try to determine the cause of the discrepancy.

Physical Limitations
There are very obvious physical limitations that will necessitate alterations in priorities. For example, completely deaf children should not be expected to acquire basic auditory skills. Obviously, cases of physical limitations will certainly alter the instructional priorities. However, specific functions (i.e., motor manipulation, receptive language) must remain as instructional priorities; only the specific skill descriptions will change. A very special caution is needed here because many times these obvious physical limitations are poorly documented. Many cerebral palsied children and partially sighted children have been poorly programed because teachers assumed they could never use their fingers or see. Any case of physical limitations must be precisely documented before priorities are changed.

Functionality of Skills
The ultimate criterion for programing must be: "Will this skill provide the individual with a functional behavior that will directly enhance his ability to live independently?" This priority should direct all goal setting activities. Unfortunately, many educational objectives are established simply because these objectives are "always used." Each skill that is taught should either be a functional behavior in and of itself or should be a building block skill (a skill that is part of a functional behavior).

Re-evaluation of IEP's
As priorities are determined, objectives must be developed for each skill area. Each objective should contain a specific procedure for determining when the child evidences the desired skill. With this procedure, re-evaluation of the IEP focuses on three questions: (1) Are the goals appropriate for the child? (2) Are the listed services being delivered to the child? and (3) Is the child evidencing skill gains? In reality these three questions are related to child performance data. Hence, the committee's task is to monitor the child's progress and to make sure that the child is receiving the services that are listed in the IEP. If the child is evidencing satisfactory gains the IEP is probably appropriate. If the child is not experiencing success the committee must determine if the goals need to be altered or if different educational procedures are called for. In any instance, the committee has the responsibility to act as a team to insure that each child is receiving the most appropriate education.
Individualized Education Programming
At The Secondary Level

PATRICIA T. CEGELKA
MISHA W. PHILLIPS

During the past several years, increased attention has been focused on the vocational preparation of handicapped children and youth. In 1971, the US Office of Education predicted that the future of 77% of the handicapped children leaving school programs over the next few years would be unemployment, underemployment, or total dependency. As one step toward rectifying this situation, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) declared career education as a priority program area for exceptional children. BEH emphasized that every exceptional child leaving school should have, at minimum, entry level skills. At the same time, increased concern and support has been expressed regarding the issue of training the handicapped for qualitative levels of employment. The mere fact of employment, regardless of job attributes or their match to the individual, is no longer acceptable for the handicapped any more than it is for the nonhandicapped. The following summarizes current thinking:

We have, for far too long, seemed to act as though a handicapped person should be both pleased with and grateful for any kind of work society provides. Unlike other persons, we seem to assume that, if a person is handicapped, boredom on a job is impossible. Worse, much of society has seemed to assume that, while most persons should seek work compatible with their interests and aptitudes, such considerations are not necessary when seeking to find employment for handicapped persons. If any job in the world of paid employment can be found for the handicapped person, we seem far too often to be personally relieved and surprised when the handicapped person does anything less than effectively grateful (Hergt, 1975, pp. 6-7).
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VOCAATIONAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

An increased emphasis on vocational education programming for the handicapped has been one approach to preparing this population for more suitable employment opportunities. The passage of various federal legislation has underscored the increasingly important role that vocational education must play in the education of handicapped children. The 1965 Vocational Education Act specifically extended vocational education services to both handicapped and disadvantaged populations. When expansion in program effort did not follow, the 1968 Amendments to that law required each state to spend a set proportion of the federal vocational education funds toward vocational education to handicapped students not otherwise being served. Even then, the required federal monies were infrequently spent. When they were, they were usually allocated to the development and support of special segregated vocational education programs. A scathing Government Accounting Office report (1976) criticized this approach as both educationally unsound and economically inefficient. The report suggested that larger numbers of handicapped youth could receive more meaningful and appropriate training through integration into existing programs.

That the educational neglect and mismanagement of the past will no longer be tolerated is clearly indicated by the provisions of the 1978 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act and by Public Law 94-142. The 1976 Amendments specifically mandated that handicapped children be included in regular vocational education programs wherever possible. In addition, Public Law 94-142 requires that appropriate programs be provided for handicapped children in the least restrictive environments possible. It specifically alludes to vocational education and, in fact, its provisions supersede those of the Vocational Education Act and its amendments. Consequently, it can be expected that the individualized education programs developed for most high incidence mildly or moderately handicapped children will specify vocational education training as appropriate and regular vocational education classes will be determined to be the least restrictive environment in which the requisite training can be provided. Cooperation between vocational education and special education is no longer a matter of choice; it is fast becoming a matter of complience. By virtue of the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, vocational rehabilitation counselors will also become increasingly involved in the delivery of services to school-aged handicapped youth.

SPECIAL EDUCATOR/VOCATIONAL EDUCATOR COOPERATION

Despite federal mandates to the contrary, cooperative efforts toward providing improved career preparation opportunities to the handicapped are not yet a widely prevalent practice. Several factors appear to account for this. First, the historical orientation and training of both special educators and vocational educators has not been toward programming for the adolescent handicapped person. Vocational educators have developed programs for non-impaired youth while special educators have concentrated most of their efforts on programming for young children. Consequently, few professionals in either discipline have been trained to meet the unique needs of the adolescent handicapped individual. Neither the skills nor the attitudes required for such an orientation have been developed. Finally, neither group has been particularly motivated to venture into this new arena. We have found it easier, as well as more comfortable and secure, to do those things with which we have previously experienced some success (Gover, 1977).

Attempts to remedy these situations have been made at national conferences for teacher educators from both the special and vocational education disciplines, as well as through the development of inservice and preservice programs for public school personnel.

THE IEP PROCESS

All professional personnel concerned must be prepared to demonstrate the needed competencies in assessing the student's skills, planning an individualized program, determining the program placement, specifying the instructional components, and evaluating the total program. This article focuses on the development of the individualized education plan as the structure for the delivery of services. Vocational educators in cooperation with special educators, other teachers, parents, administrators, and when appropriate, other individuals, must share in the process of developing, implementing, and monitoring the educational programs for handicapped adolescents. The following discussion deals with some basic considerations inherent in this process.

Assessment

Assessment should be viewed as a two-stage process: assessment occurring prior to the initial development of the IEP, and the program placement; and ongoing assessment of abilities and interests that occurs as the student participates in a developmental sequence of academic and career preparation experiences. Brodlin's (1976) text provides an excellent review of a wide variety of interests and
that some students may be placed in vocational education programs for the entire vocational training sequence while others will receive only that training necessary for them to attain the minimum entry level skills for the jobs of a particular occupational cluster.

Curriculum
Each program alternative available to meet the needs of any handicapped student must be considered in light of the curriculum design. An excellent framework for the development of the curriculum of the secondary program is found in Bratton's (in press) competency-based approach which specifies 22 competencies and 102 subcompetencies that mildly handicapped individuals should attain. The initial placement in a special education program may not be compatible with the needs of the individual; some may not have the skills necessary for the environment of the secondary program until age 21. It should be evident that ample time is available for this competency attainment. This system, academic skills play a supportive role, being viewed primarily as a means to obtaining occupational, daily living, and personal-social competencies. This approach has significant implications for the curriculum experiences specified in the IEP.

The career education model also has important implications for the achievement of skill levels of students entering secondary programs. During the career awareness stage in the elementary years and the career orientation and exploration phase of junior high school, students can be expected to develop the essential attitudes and skills prerequisite to the more specific occupational competencies. The special education program components at the secondary level should continue to emphasize the acquisition of those personal characteristics and attitudes necessary for successful employment.

Research has indicated that it is frequently deficiencies in those areas that account for performance failures among the handicapped. The vocational education teacher may find it necessary to alter instructional methods (such as substituting oral directions for written ones), to adapt machines and tools, and to differentiate instructional goals for the handicapped student. The IEP may specify that the student complete the entire vocational training sequence or only a portion of it. Even though an initial IEP may call for only a limited level of vocational skill training, the ongoing assessment of student progress and abilities may indicate that these objectives should be revised to include more sophisticated skill training.

Two sets of curriculum materials that should be of particular value to vocational educators wishing to provide competency based
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programing are the Learning Activity Packets (LAPs),
developed by the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium, and the Competency-Based Vocational Education modules developed at the University of Kentucky. Both of these programs afford individualized, competency-based instruction across a wide range of occupational skills. One of them, a combination, or neither might be determined to be the most appropriate approach to the curriculum design. The critical consideration is that the program be developed or modified to follow a logical skills sequence leading to the student's achievement of the long term goals and objectives of his or her IEP.

Program Management

The development of the IEP is the initial step in appropriate programing for the handicapped student. However, equally important is the task of monitoring the implementation of this plan. If it is determined that the student’s instructional needs can best be met through placement in special education classes for a portion of the day, the special education teacher would be responsible for the implementation of that portion of the plan. However, if the student can perform successfully for the remainder of the specified academic subjects in regular classrooms, it would be the responsibility of those teachers to manage those portions of the educational program. A third alternative is the placement of the student in a vocational education program under the guidance of either a regular or a special needs vocational teacher. This teacher is then responsible for programing for these goals and objectives.

All of these teachers share collectively in the responsibility for monitoring the student’s progress toward the goals and objectives of the total program. Public Law 94-142 requires that the placement committee, which now includes those persons who originally developed the IEP as well as those individuals designated as responsible for portions of the prescribed program, meet at least annually to review the student's progress and determine what program extensions or expansions should be written into the IEP. A key person in the success of this endeavor is the committee manager or chairperson. The manner in which this role is fulfilled can be critical both to compliance with the law and to the achievement level ultimately attained by the handicapped student. The following conceptualization outlines some of the major responsibilities of the program manager.

1. Monitoring timelines. The program manager, through consultation with the responsible teachers, must determine that the goals and objectives targeted in the IEP are being met by the specified dates.

2. Coordinating committee members. Committee members must have time prior to the committee meetings to summarize the required data on student progress toward goals and objectives and to prepare statements of alternative suggestions as necessary.

3. Scheduling placement committee meetings. This must be accomplished in advance of the dates targeted for the attainment of the short term instructional objectives.

4. Maintaining records. Records must be maintained on current data provided by the teachers and from any additional assessments. Relevant information relating to the committee meetings must be disseminated to appropriate persons (e.g., the parents, should they fail to attend a review meeting).

5. Chair the meeting. A task orientation must be maintained and the unique professional competencies of the staff utilized in an effective and efficient manner.

Evaluation

The evaluation component is the key to issuing the student's successful progression through his or her individualized education program. Evaluation is initially structured by the writing of short term instructional objectives. The objectives include statements of each terminal behavior, expected conditions under which the behavior is to occur, and the criteria for evaluation of the student’s performance level. Monitoring and evaluating the student’s progress is further indicated by the projection of dates for the initiation of a task and the anticipated duration of that task. A review, to be held at least annually, is required by Public Law 94-142. However, in order to monitor the IEP effectively for the student's maximum benefit, the review should occur as often as necessary to coincide with the objectives. In this way, an appropriate decision can be made as to whether the student should remain in the same program for an extended but specified period of time, whether the program should be redirected, or whether additional components should be added to the initially planned and completed program.

SUMMARY

This article has reviewed the implications for secondary level students of legislative mandates requiring individualized education programing for handicapped children. It is clear that these youngsters must be included, if appropriate, in vocational education programs as well as other mainstream programs. The development and implementation of the IEP was discussed as the structure for the delivery of these educational services. Five basic considerations for the development, implementation, and monitoring of the IEP were discussed: assessment, placement, curriculum, program management, and evaluation. It was emphasized that the role of the program manager is one that is essential to comply with both the letter and intent of the law.
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IV. Instructional Practices
During the past decade, the educational rights of handicapped children and their parents have been recognized and affirmed. Perhaps the most important affirmation of these rights was the passage of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. This law attempts to ensure that all handicapped children are identified and receive a free, appropriate public education. To insure the appropriateness of a child’s program an individualized education plan (IEP) must be written for each student. At first glance the requirements for the development of each IEP may appear to be inordinately extensive and/or cumbersome. However, we believe these requirements are not extraordinary, but represent steps typically performed in the course of “good teaching.”

In our view, good teaching is comprised of a series of interrelated steps that appear to apply equally to handicapped and nonhandicapped students, all teaching environments, and instruction on any skill. Many of these steps are similar to those required in the development of an IEP. Not surprisingly, these teaching steps have been identified by other authors and might be termed a common sense approach to teaching (Christie, Williams, Edelman, Hill, Fox, Fox, Sosul, & York, 1977; McKenzie, Egner, Knight, Perelman, Schneider, & Garvin, 1979). These 11 steps are listed below and described more fully in the following narrative.

Preparation of this paper was supported in part by Special Projects Grant #51 A110 00351 and Program Assistance Grant #EDO1750655 from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, USED, HEW.

Meet and Learn About the Students

It is essential that every student be viewed as an individual with unique strengths, weaknesses, and learning experiences. Sensitivity to individual differences and knowledge about each student are important to the development of quality instructional programs. Familiarity with students allows a teacher to accurately assess skills and facilitate optimal performance. A teacher’s knowledge of his or her student is the best single information source for developing and revising instructional programs.

Determine What the Students Want to Learn and/or What Their Parents Want Them to Learn

The guidance and cooperation of students and parents is necessary in the development and implementation of instructional programs. Since parents have had the greatest opportunity to observe their child’s behavior, they can provide valuable information regarding current skills, as well as particular preferences and dislikes the child may have. Further, parents are in the most appropriate position to predict future needs and lifelong goals for their child.

Determine the Students’ Current Skills

We believe the best currently available way to determine a student’s skills is to compare his or her current repertoire against comprehensive sequences of skills. Such skill sequences consist of hierarchies of behaviors that progress from the most rudimentary level to competent functioning in major developmental and academic areas. Similar to the mathematical concept of a number line, skills can be ordered along a continuum of increasing complexity. However, instead of being comprised of a chain of numbers, skill sequences are comprised of behaviors. These behaviors can be converted into objectives for assessment and later for instruction and evaluation. Placing each student within such a sequence of skills allows the formulation of a basic map of where the student is and what skills might be appropriate for instruction (York & Williams, 1977).

Such assessment procedures are based on the notion that evaluation of a student’s performance should relate to the environment in which he or she will be functioning. Further, it suggests that assessment should be closely linked to instruction; thus encouraging the process of on-going, continuous evaluation.

Determine the Skills Needed by the Student

Following a comprehensive assessment of a student’s skills, a careful evaluation of the current and future environment must be made. This process will assist the teacher in determining “what” skills are or will be needed for adequate functioning. Teachers should provide a rationale concerning the value of a skill to a student once it is acquired (Brown, Nietupski, & IlarnreNietupski, 1976; Williams, Brown, & Gotta, 1975). Questioning the rationale behind the teaching of a specific skill will also assist the teacher in prioritizing objectives.

Specify the Goals of Instruction

Following completion of steps 1 through 4, the teacher is ready to select the goals most appropriate for the individual student (Issazi, 1976). These goals should be selected using: (1) input gained from interactions with the student and/or the parents, (2) assessment of the student’s current skills, and (3) the teacher’s assessment of what skills the student needs to acquire in order to function successfully within current and probable future environments.

Break the Goals Down into Smaller, Teachable, and Measurable Objectives That, When Acquired, Lead to the Realization of the Goals

Specifying goals is much easier than developing the carefully sequenced set of objectives or steps that will lead to the realization of those goals. Breaking the goals down requires a careful analysis of the component skills comprising those goals. For example, walking across a classroom within 30 seconds may be an easily agreed on goal. However, generating the sequence of objectives from head control to walking is considerably more demanding and might include steps like: (1) creep (hand/knee locomotion), (2) pulls to knees, (3) lowers from knees, (4) kneels with support, (5) pulls to standing, (6) lowers from standing, (7) stands supported, (8) stands alone, (9) walks sideward while holding onto a table, (10) walks forward while holding onto a table, (11) walks forward along a wall, and (12) walks forward with support (Williams & Fox, 1977).

The process of breaking goals down into teachable objectives is often referred to as task analysis. The seven basic steps of the task analysis process are listed here.

Seven Steps of Task Analysis

1. Delineate the instructional objective.
2. Review relevant literature and resources (normal development, mental sequences, curricular guides).
3. Derive and sequence the component skills of the objective.
4. Eliminate unnecessary skills.
5. Eliminate redundant skills.
6. Determine prerequisite skills.
7. Monitor student performance and revise the task analysis as required (Williams & Gotta, 1976).
Select Instructional Procedures to Teach Those Objectives

While considerable debate exists concerning the "best" instructional procedures, the fact that some procedures are necessary is generally accepted. Even advocates of "discovery" or "self instructional" approaches typically attempt to arrange the educational environment so that "discoveries" may more readily occur. We consider any attempts to arrange or create an environment that produces specified changes in the student's behavior to be instructional procedures (Brown & York, 1974). Primarily, these instructional procedures may be broken down into three components.

First, the educational environment preceding the task the teacher wants the student to perform should be arranged to maximize the likelihood that the student will perform that task. This could include such antecedent events as giving clear directions, providing specially designed curriculum materials, or changing the physical environment to encourage social interactions.

Second, the actual behavior to which the instructional procedure is directed must also be considered. The specific skills, knowledge, and attitudes a teacher hopes to develop must be specified and provisions must be made for the unique physical and behavioral characteristics of each student. Consequently, alternate paths to the same goal must be determined in order to accommodate these characteristics.

Third, the consequences for correct and incorrect performance must be specified so that the student will receive appropriate feedback and continue to work at the task of learning. Feedback and reinforcement must be provided to guide, encourage, and nurture the child's love of learning. What the student learns should be of functional value and assist the child in effecting his social and physical world. Ideally, the learning environment is one that promotes further learning by stimulating curiosity and motivation.

Select Materials, Tasks, Physical Arrangements, and Schedules that Fit the Objectives and Instructional Procedures

The physical environment should be arranged to facilitate active involvement and cooperation among students. Further, the environment should be flexible enough to allow for large or small group instruction, self-directed learning activities, and one-on-one teaching. Emphasis should be placed on designing and choosing learning materials that are functional, enjoyable, and have generalized value to the student. This requires that a teacher be able to manage an educational environment designed to encourage diverse learning experiences that are receptive to the unique needs of each student.

Aspects of this step are both conceptual and mechanical. The teacher must both decide that an objective, such as matching numerals, can be taught through a game, and then assemble the necessary materials. If the objective is to develop social interactions, the student needs someone to interact with and a place in which to interact. These opportunities for interaction must be regularly scheduled within the time available for instruction. This step requires many decisions, ranging from how the furniture will be arranged, to how this skill can be taught and tested in a natural setting.

TEACH—Implement the Instructional Program

This is, of course, the most obvious thing a teacher must do and perhaps the most important step. Time engaged in direct instruction of a skill has been shown to be the most significant determinant of whether that skill was subsequently acquired (Freedicks, Anderson, Baldwin, Beard, Moore, & Grove, undated). However, we have seen teachers become so involved in the other steps of teaching that they apparently forgot to teach.

Measure Student Progress on the Objectives

The two major reasons for measurement of student progress are to determine the success or failure of current teaching efforts and to document student progress over time so that the students, parents, and others are informed and can assist in updating goals. Thus, measurement or data collection is done to aid and improve decision making. Collection of data that are not used for these purposes is usually of little or no value.

Evaluate Instruction in Light of Student Progress and Make Appropriate Revisions

The importance of writing observable and measurable goals is underscored during the process of evaluation. If the goals have been written in such a way that it's clear whether or not the desired behaviors have been learned, evaluation becomes linked to
instruction. The question teachers should ask is, "Has the student learned what I had hoped to teach?" If no progress has been made, teaching has not occurred.

If progress is not apparent or is less than expected, the teacher needs to carefully reconsider all 10 teaching steps leading up to this point. Examination of these steps usually suggests several possible program changes, e.g., "Is progress on objectives slow because some pre-requisite skills are missing?" Are the teaching procedures ineffective because of unclear instructions or uninteresting content? Are we measuring the wrong things and missing progress? Thus, solving problems usually means re-examining the first 10 steps of "good teaching." Often a teacher's own analysis will identify a potential problem and suggest appropriate revisions of that step.

If skills are being learned, a teacher must still ask the questions "Is learning fast enough?" and "What is the quality of learning?" Teachers must be concerned with the quality of their instruction and its effectiveness in preparing students to adequately function in their living and working environments. Thus, effort needs to be expended to measure the durability and generalization of instruction. Are the skills that were taught functional to the student as he or she performs the tasks required in his or her daily life? Are the skills durable so that the student is able to use them after instruction is over? Do the skills generalize to new settings, people, and materials? If skill performance controlled by events in the natural environment?

SUMMARY

The 11 teaching steps that have been presented certainly are not revolutionary. However, we feel they define the basis of "good teaching." Further, the development of an individualized education program requires that many of these steps be followed, and, in fact, specified in writing, for each handicapped student. As simple as they seem, their successful implementation usually requires substantial amounts of hard work. However, their successful implementation appears to lead to that most desirable goal of any teacher: students who learn and grow.

REFERENCES


Brown, L., & York, R. Developing programs for severely handicapped students: Teacher training and classroom instruction. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1974. 6(3).


Meeting Children's Needs Through Materials Modification

LIBBY GOODMAN

Today, more than ever before, special education teachers have an enormous array of instructional materials from which to choose the specific curricular materials for use with their handicapped students. The software of special education includes materials for basic skill instruction in the fundamental subjects (e.g., reading, mathematics, spelling, handwriting, etc.) as well as materials in many content subjects specifically designed for the special or remedial student. Materials for specialized skill areas such as perceptual motor language, readiness, and the more basic training in the areas of self help and awareness abound. An extensive and constantly growing library of high interest, low readability materials on a wide range of topics for the heterogeneous group of problem readers is available to the teacher and student.

The hardware of special education, which often accompanies the curricular packages, includes a phenomenal array of electronic and manual gadgetry from desk calculators for drill in arithmetic operations to programmed readers and language machines. In the midst of such an abundance of materials and technology, teachers are faced with the formidable task of selecting materials to match their children's needs.
SELECTION OF MATERIALS

The special teacher very likely will become concerned with the selection and use of specific curricular materials in the later phase— the teaching phase—of the diagnostic-prescriptive teaching process. The initial diagnosis of the child typically will yield information as to the child's current levels of educational performance (this much at least is required for compliance with Public Law 94-142) and should reveal specific patterns of strengths and weaknesses in the child’s performance that are relevant to school success. Armed with this information, the teacher will have to identify the instructional materials that fit the child both in terms of specific academic or training needs (e.g., comprehension skills, word attack skills, spelling errors, etc.) and individualistic learner characteristics (e.g., preferred learning styles, special interests, etc.).

The major objective for the teacher in materials selection is to place the child on a level and to choose a task at which he or she can maximally benefit from instruction. This is the teacher's task, in the selection of a specific curriculum and the placement of student in curricula, to find the right balance between what the child already knows and what needs to be learned—between challenge and frustration. While various procedures and criteria standards are used to judge when a child has been properly placed into a curriculum sequence, in the end the teacher's judgment must prevail.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS ARE NOT ENOUGH

After conducting a thorough diagnosis of the child's learning needs and carefully selecting the curricular materials, it may be disconcerting to the teacher to find that the student still is not experiencing success. This situation—which is not at all uncommon—highlights the fact that knowing a child's instructional level may not be enough to insure the child's success. Certain features (or lack of features) of the material itself, which may otherwise be appropriate, may present an obstacle that the child cannot overcome.

Further adaptations or modifications of the learning materials are often necessary to bring mastery of the content within the child's grasp. No one questions the need for adapted materials for children with physical or sensory deficits. Teachers need to be as flexible and creative for children without obvious physical limitations who may nevertheless require something special in the way of learning materials. Teachers of exceptional children should make the best use of both special materials and regular materials at their disposal, but they should also be prepared to make further adaptations and modifications as needed. Teachers should anticipate the need to individualize, indeed customize, learning materials—even those that are expressly designed for the handicapped—in order to meet individual needs. The truly amazing accomplishments of many handicapped children that are made possible through the adaptation of materials and/or curriculum emphasize that all special teachers need to become as some time instructional engineers.

RESOURCES FOR THE TEACHER

There are several references to which the teacher can refer for guidance in the identification of appropriate instructional materials (Goodman, in press), selection of materials (Boland, 1976; Grosspelt, 1975), and evaluation of materials (Wiederhold & McNutt, 1977) but few sources that offer guidance specifically on curriculum/materials adaptation. One very helpful reference is entitled Mainstreaming the LD Adolescent: A Staff Development Guide, developed by South Carolina Region V Educational Services Center. This guidebook offers specific and systematic procedures for adapting materials; and, despite the focus on children with learning disabilities, the procedures are applicable across various handicaps. A few suggestions will illustrate the variety of ways in which the teacher can begin to modify materials. Some of the variables under the teacher's control and examples of their adaptations include:
1. The specific material to be used: type of material, topic, interest level, etc.

2. The amount of material presented to the student: if a full book or a whole page overwhelms a child, the daily portion can be reduced to a lesser amount; if 10 arithmetic problems are more than the student can accomplish without wandering off the task, fewer problems can be given at one time, etc.

3. The difficulty level of the material: difficulty of material may hinge upon language complexity, conceptual complexity, readability, amount of material on a page, etc., and these factors can be altered.

4. The sequence of presentation: while skill hierarchies offer a general guideline, the specific sequence need not hold for all children, for some learning-disabled youngsters cursive writing should proceed or totally replace manuscript writing even though the traditional progression is appropriate for most children.

5. The mode of presentation: if a student is unable to read the material presented, but is capable of dealing with the concepts it contains, a tape recording of the text may effectively overcome the obstacle to success.

6. The mode of response: frequently handicapped students have the understanding we wish to teach them, but are unable to demonstrate the mastery of the content through the traditional means, e.g., written, timed examinations; alternate modes, oral tests, untimed examinations can be employed.

7. The use of supplementary learning aids: reading or study guides can be used to provide the added structure and assistance needed by some students.

In addition to the materials themselves, the teacher has control over the learning environment and can manipulate environmental factors to further enhance the learning situation. Some situational factors under the teacher's direct control include:

1. Time - when the learning activity will take place.
2. Space - where the learning will take place.
3. Student grouping - from individual instruction to peer tutoring.
4. External motivation - behavior modification techniques, student contracting, student self-monitoring, etc.
5. Homework and parent involvement in the instructional process.

While we encourage innovation and creativity, as teachers begin to modify materials and/or the learning environment they should bear a few general principles in mind.

First, the best curricular package is not going to suit every child; alterations and modifications to individual learning materials ought to be the rule not the exception in special education.

Second, initiate as few alterations as possible to achieve the desired results. Experiment with one variable (task dimension) at a time, and assess its effectiveness before undertaking multiple changes. For some children curricular modifications (e.g., braille) are permanent. But for many of our children, at some later date or time, it will be necessary to retrace our steps to prepare them to function adequately and appropriately with regular materials in regular classroom settings. The less we have to undo the better; try the simplest and most obvious solution first; forgive the token economy if a smile or an encouraging word will do the job.

Third, give any alteration a reasonable trial period. One lesson is hardly a fair test situation, and three months is far too long especially if the student has not responded positively to the curricular changes.

Finally, maintain records of the child's behavior and performance for objective decision making.

Every teacher must be concerned with utilization of materials so that the learning of students is enhanced. Every teacher recognizes that instructional materials are one of the special teacher's most potent tools; the selection and use of instructional materials are two of the special teacher's major responsibilities.
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Practical Task Analysis for Special Educators

John R. Moyer
Jill E. Harling

The task analysis is designed as a practical guide for practitioners of special education, focusing on the methodology of task analysis. A functional tool is provided for task analysis within a behavioral approach. It involves the identification of specific goals and the use of a series of steps to achieve these goals. The methodology is explained through the use of a logical approach to task analysis and instruction. The guide includes a step-by-step process for conducting task analyses and includes examples. The goal is to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding and implementing task analysis in special education settings.
The Assessment Tool
that Meets Your Needs: The One You Construct

JAMES F. McCORMACK, JR.

1. Special education teachers frequently
   conduct a comprehensive assessment
   and report their findings. The student's
   progress should be monitored by the
   teacher, the principal, and parents,
   with frequent evaluations. The student's
   progress should be based on the
   individual's strengths and weaknesses.

2. The student's performance should
   be evaluated in relation to the
   objectives set for the group.
   This evaluation should be
   conducted by the teacher, the
   principal, and parents.

3. The student's progress should be
   monitored by the teacher, the
   principal, and parents, with
   frequent evaluations. The teacher's
   progress should be based on the
   individual's strengths and weaknesses.

4. The student's performance should
   be evaluated in relation to the
   objectives set for the group.
   This evaluation should be
   conducted by the teacher, the
   principal, and parents.

5. The student's progress should be
   monitored by the teacher, the
   principal, and parents, with
   frequent evaluations. The teacher's
   progress should be based on the
   individual's strengths and weaknesses.
CIRCLES and TAPE:

An Easy, Teacher Implemented Way To Teach Fundamental Writing Skills

MARGARET A. MENDEZ
WIDMEN'S CHILDREN
DONALD J. JACOBS

MARGARET A. MENDEZ is a professor in the Department of Early Childhood Education from the University of Kansas. She is currently a member of the National Council of Teachers of English in Kansas.

The problem that is often raised in children's development and learning is that of teaching the ability to read and write. This paper describes a method that has been found to be successful in teaching reading and writing to young children. The method involves the use of circles and tape to help children learn how to read and write.

The method involves the use of circles and tape to help children learn how to read and write. The circles are used to help children learn to recognize letters and words, while the tape is used to help children learn to write. The method has been found to be effective in helping children learn to read and write, and it is recommended for use in schools.
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THE CLASSROOM

ENVIRONMENT

Mary and George were two children in the kindergarten class. The classroom was a lively and stimulating environment, with colorful paintings and educational materials scattered around. The children, who were about four years old, engaged in a variety of activities, including arts, crafts, and play. The teacher, Mrs. Smith, was known for her patience and enthusiasm, which helped create a positive and engaging learning atmosphere.

The children were given instruction in a variety of subjects, including reading, writing, and mathematics. They were encouraged to ask questions and participate in discussions, which helped develop their critical thinking skills. Mrs. Smith also emphasized the importance of teamwork and collaboration, which were key components of the classroom environment.

RECORDING

The children's progress was recorded using a combination of formal and informal assessments. Formal assessments included tests and quizzes, which were conducted on a regular basis. Informal assessments, such as observations and discussions, were also used to evaluate the children's learning.

The class was divided into small groups to ensure individualized attention. The teacher, Mrs. Smith, was a skilled educator who used a variety of teaching methods to cater to the diverse needs of her students. She was particularly effective in teaching reading, which was a challenge for some of the children.

PENCIL HOLDING DEFINED

The children were taught how to hold a pencil properly to improve their handwriting. The teacher demonstrated how to position the pencil correctly, ensuring that the thumb, index, and middle fingers were in the correct places. The children were then given the opportunity to practice holding the pencil while Mrs. Smith observed their technique.

The children were instructed to sit quietly and listen attentively during their writing lessons. They were encouraged to use the correct pencil grip and to focus on their handwriting. Mrs. Smith provided feedback and encouragement to help them improve their skills.

CIRCLES AND TAPE

The children were taught how to draw circles using tape. They were given a roll of tape and a piece of paper to practice drawing circles of different sizes. Mrs. Smith encouraged them to experiment with the tape and to use it as a guide to help them draw more accurately.

The children were then asked to draw a simple picture using the circles and tape. They were given the freedom to be creative and to express their ideas through art. Mrs. Smith observed their progress and provided guidance as needed.

The children were proud of their work and expressed their confidence in their ability to draw using the tape. Mrs. Smith was pleased with their progress and praised them for their creativity and hard work.

ADVANTAGES OF CIRCLES AND TAPE

Using circles and tape in the classroom can have several benefits. It can help children develop their fine motor skills and hand-eye coordination. It can also be used as a tool for teaching basic math concepts, such as addition and subtraction. Additionally, it can be a fun and engaging way to incorporate art into the curriculum, which can help children express their creativity and develop their artistic skills.
It was 1:30 p.m. on Thursday and time to add up the reward points earned during the day. The conversation went something like this:

"Well, Jack, it looks as though you really had a good day. You earned 35 points. How did you do it?"

Jack shrugged his shoulders and replied with a grin, "I don't know. I just worked hard, I guess."

"You've earned enough points to go outside. Jack, is that where you want to go?"

"Yes," said Jack as he zipped up his jacket.

"Let's see how Laura. How many points do you have here?"

"Yesterday, let's see, you did well in math and science games, but today I earned 24 points. I want to go to blocks with Roberta because she earned 24 points too.

"Very good! Let's see where it is that you didn't earn your two points."

"Oh, I missed my behavior point in my group and my coming in quietly point in prayers."

"Will you meet tomorrow, won't you?"

Laura answered with a grin, "Now, see, don't. Oh, yes, I mean it.

"And you, Michael?"

"Well, I got 22 and I'd like to go out, but I guess I'll go to coloring."

"O.K., Mike, maybe you'll earn enough tomorrow."

What kept you from earning your points?"

Michael responded with a sigh, "Well, sometimes it's difficult to do what we're supposed to do."

"It's not doing it perfectly every day. But doing it as well as we can."

Another good day at school."

Just then Honda came into the room. "Well, how was your day so far?"

"It was good. I earned 25 points so far, but I need to get some in reading and math."

Honda proceeded to the computer area and sat down to watch the kids continue with their tasks.

"It's a good day for all of us."

FRANCES CROW
OLOBE JOHNSON
MARGERY MECKS
PHILLIP WILSON
and emotional behavior. Various methods were
applied but not consistently or successfully.
Finally, the author, Mr. E. A. Despo, suggested the use of a punch card to reward good
behavior. Since that time, and with several
modifications, the punch card method remains
used for record points for rewards and interest.
Achievements have varied. It has proved quite
successful in some schools, and has had the added benefit of good
supervision and consistency.

USING THE PUNCH-CARD

The staff and children at Mr. Shoey's Center were
suggested that each child may earn three points at each
session work period. The first point on each
card is punched for among the area where
the second point is punched if the assigned task is
completed, and the third point if the assigned task
is completed.

Every morning the teacher sits on a large piece
of paper to write the child's name and the site she also
writing at the child's name and the site. The child has a punch card form where she takes the card
and has a paper puncher which she uses to punch
the earned points. A paper puncher with a metal
stapler attached to the paper is included in the
material. The type of puncher usually punches at
the left side of the paper, and is used around the
school. The teacher separates the punch cards at the
end of the day in the language department.

At this child is expected to walk all the
days. The children are often given a choice
of the tasks on the card. If the child
completes these steps, the teacher puts the first
point in the box. When the task is
completed, the child takes the box to
the teacher. If the teacher
grants the child a punch, he
punches the first point in the box. He
then places the punch card on the
teacher's desk. If the teacher
punches the second point, he
punches the second point
in the box. He then places
the punch card on the
teacher's desk. If the
teacher punches the third
point, he punches the third
point in the box. He then
places the punch card on the
teacher's desk. The teacher
then tells the child to go to
the punch card station, where
he punches the fourth point.

The child must have a card for each
point. If the child
completes the tasks, he
punches the first point
in the box. He
then places the punch card on the
teacher's desk. If the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the second point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. If
the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the third point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. If
the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the fourth point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. The
child may be rewarded with
a punch card for each
point.

The child must have a card for each
point. If the child
completes the tasks, he
punches the first point
in the box. He
then places the punch card on the
teacher's desk. If the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the second point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. If
the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the third point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. If
the teacher
accepts the punch card,
he punches the fourth point
in the box. He then
places the punch card on
the teacher's desk. The
child may be rewarded with
a punch card for each
point.
The reward card is the child's ticket into the reward zone. It must be presented to show the correct number of points earned. If the child earns 30 points or more, he may choose one of the three rewards: a toy, a book, or a special treat. If the child earns 20 points or fewer, he may choose one of the two rewards: a small toy, or a special treat. If the child earns 10 points or fewer, he may choose a special treat only. The rewards are designed to be age-appropriate and appealing to the child. The rewards are rotated every week to keep the child interested and engaged.

Above is the child's reward card. Each week, the child may choose a reward from the card. The child may also choose a special treat from the teacher. The special treat is a small toy or a special treat that the teacher may choose. The special treat is designed to be age-appropriate and appealing to the child. The special treat is rotated every week to keep the child interested and engaged.

The reward system is designed to encourage the child to participate in the classroom activities. The rewards are designed to be age-appropriate and appealing to the child. The rewards are rotated every week to keep the child interested and engaged.
TABLE 1

Reward Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Advantages of the Punch Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The McVey punch card system proved advantageous in many respects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The punch card system operates quickly, just as adults earn money with which they can buy what they want, students can earn points for desired rewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The system relies on natural consequences. If the student earns his card or fails to earn points, the natural consequences of these actions are immediately known. The child is made responsible for his own behavior. The teacher desires to maintain the system of natural consequences, not to administer reward and punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The method of accounting is simple; the teacher only has to count the number of points at the end of the day. Through this system, the teacher can conserve time because the teacher and the student know the daily total for each child in a short period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The system encourages flexible goals. The student may work on a variety of goals, both long- and short-term. The punch card can thus be tailored to the individual. Also, certain points on the card may be more specifically defined, e.g., a particular child might earn his behavior point by raising his hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is little need for individualization. When a child falls short of a behavior or work standard, all that need be said is &quot;I am sorry that you did not earn your point.&quot; In this case, verbal and negative comments are kept to a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The card is not easily lost, torn, or stolen. The punch card is one single piece of paper. Earned points are only indicated by punched holes. There is nothing to be traded or stolen. It is the child's responsibility to hold onto the card, which he guards like money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The system provides feedback to the teacher. The punch card immediately reflects progress. Systematic patterns on the card provide potential positions in the teacher's example. Surveys fairly measured work points could indicate that the assigned tasks are not on the child's level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The system can be applied to an unstructured situation. Points are also earned in unstructured settings, such as in the hall, lunch, and in assemblies. These unmeasured points are integrated into the system of natural consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important, the punch card system is a positive system. The child is praised only for positive behavior which is rewarded. Negative behavior is inconsistent with the behavior of the situation. Either than by being arbitrarily punished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punch Card: A Herman H.
GROUP PROCESSES FOR BEHAVIOR

Robert Harth
Stanton M. Morris

Robert Harth is Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Missouri, Columbia.
Stanton M. Morris is Assistant Professor of Special Education, University of Denver, Colorado.

The pow-wow is an important part of classroom activity.
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Goal Setting

- Teachers of emotionally disturbed children have always set goals for the children with whom they work. These goals help the teacher focus on specific strategies to be used in moving the child from a special setting to a regular setting. Without some sort of goal setting on the teacher's part, programs lack direction and tend to become vague.

- The purpose here is not to talk about goal setting by the teacher, however, but to develop procedures for helping children set goals for themselves. This is seen as the first step in their achieving cognitive control—the ability to identify their own problem behaviors and alternatives to these problem behaviors.

The notion of children setting goals for themselves carries with it two important implications: (a) that children need to become aware of their problem behaviors and be able to verbalize them; (b) that the process of goal setting the child makes a commitment to change as well as a commitment to be an ally of the teacher in the change process. It is possible to change a child's behavior without a commitment, but the changes are easier when a commitment exists.

THE PROCESS OF GOAL SETTING

Goal setting is the first activity of each week. It is carried out on Monday morning. The setting is a circle of chairs with the teacher included as part of the circle. Rules for behavior are set up to ensure the understanding of the meeting. The rules have nothing to do with the quality of goals suggested or with whether or not a child gets a goal. They refer only to the orderliness with which the meeting is carried out.

The purpose of the meeting is to help children set one goal for themselves relative to some aspect of their problem behavior. The child will work on the goal for a minimum of one week. To accomplish this, the teacher goes around the circle asking each child to identify his goal. Occasionally, particularly when a child is new in the program, he may be unable to identify a goal. In this case, the teacher poses the child with some leading questions, e.g., What kinds of things do you have problems with in school? What things do you get in trouble for in school? If this fails, the teacher could ask other group members what they think a good goal might be. If someone suggests a goal, the teacher should determine whether the original child will accept it. If the child does, then the goal is set. If there is still resistance on the child's part, the teacher should stress the issue and go on to another child. Later, when the group breaks up, the teacher should talk to the child individually and attempt to set the goal there.

As each child presents his goal in the meeting, the teacher records it on chart paper. When completed, the chart is posted in the classroom to serve as a visual reminder to the children during the week.

Children may be allowed to carry a goal from one week to the next. However, this should occur only if the child demonstrated that the goal was not fully achieved. Some children want to carry a goal over even though they have achieved it. Under these conditions the teacher encourages the child to set a new goal, explaining that the old one has already been accomplished.

The goals selected should always represent a challenge for the child. If the goal is too easy the child will not be truly involved in the program. If the goal is too hard it will be impossible for the child to achieve and frustration will occur. Figure 1 presents examples of goals set by children in an intermediate class for the emotionally disturbed.

---

The Pow-Wow: Rationale and Objectives

- Classroom teachers often have problems in managing behaviors on an individual basis due to the number of children in the class. The size of the class may limit the amount of time a teacher can spend with individual pupils. It has been stated that a teacher with problem children spends most time with these children anyway, so time spent in individual management programs may be well spent. This is true of course, but if teachers could use groups for a complete or nearly complete reorganization of their classes, it could be more effective. Figure 1 presents examples of goals set by children in an intermediate class for the emotionally disturbed.

---

The Pow-Wow: Rationale and Objectives
SETTING UP THE POW-WOW
1. Seat the children in a circle.
2. Explain that this is a pow-wow and that they will each make a behavioral goal which they should attain by the next pow-wow.
3. At the first pow-wow, begin with the child on your left and state something like the following to each child in turn: "If we had done this before you would now tell us whether or not you achieved your goal, and then we would ask the others if they thought it you did. Since this is the first time we are doing this, you should make a goal for next time. Explain to the children what a goal is, giving examples if necessary. Goals must be stated in observable behavioral terms and must be observable in the classroom. At the first pow-wow, proceed to step 4 if the child has stated his goal.
4. At the second and all following pow-wows, have the child on your left state his goal. Read it for him if he does not remember it.
5. Ask the child if he achieved the goal. The child may only answer "yes" or "no" and may offer no excuses if the answer is "no."
6. Ask the child to make a new goal. Go around the circle and ask the other children in turn if they think the goal was achieved. If the answer is "no," select another child. If none can be given then it is assumed that the child has achieved his goal.
7. Ask all the other children in turn whether or not they achieved the goal.
8. Go around the circle and ask the other children if they think the goal is a good one. If someone says, "yes," ask the reason.
9. Ask the child if he wants to keep the goal as stated or if he wants to change it in light of the other children's comments. If the child wants to change, he may.
10. Write the goal on a large piece of paper next to the child's name.
11. Go around the circle asking for suggestions on helping the child achieve the goal.
12. Go around the circle and have each child make one positive comment about the child who just finished making a goal.
13. Go to the next child and proceed with steps 3 through 12.
14. After the last child has finished, post the goals on the bulletin board or some other place where they can be seen by the class.

SOME SUGGESTIONS
Keep the pow-wow comfortable and flexible, but keep the following suggestions in mind:

- Keep all students involved with the pow-wow. If a student leaves, the pow-wow stops and everyone waits until he returns. If someone cannot think of a goal, everyone waits until a goal is decided on. After a period of time, the teacher may ask for suggestions from the other children.
- The teacher should be fully committed to the pow-wow. Unless there is a fire drill, pow-wows should be held as scheduled. If this is not possible, it should be held at least once a week.
- The teacher should participate in every pow-wow. Although there is much repetition and the children can eventually proceed without the teacher, the teacher must be there in order for the children to have a model to copy. If only unacceptable models are available, the children may not be able to form acceptable goals. The teacher participates fully except that he does not make a goal. It has been found that when teachers make goals, the students tend to spend too much time writing the teacher and too little time writing themselves and each other. If you think the pow-wow method might work for you, try it, but use a little time to organize and to plan.

The teacher should be fully committed to the pow-wow. Unless there is a fire drill, pow-wows should be held as scheduled. If this is not possible, it should be held at least once a week.

The teacher should participate in every pow-wow. Although there is much repetition and the children can eventually proceed without the teacher, the teacher must be there in order for the children to have a model to copy. If only unacceptable models are available, the children may not be able to form acceptable goals. The teacher participates fully except that he does not make a goal. It has been found that when teachers make goals, the students tend to spend too much time writing the teacher and too little time writing themselves and each other. If you think the pow-wow method might work for you, try it, but use a little time to organize and to plan.

Stages of Development
1. The teacher should be fully committed to the pow-wow. Unless there is a fire drill, pow-wows should be held as scheduled. If this is not possible, it should be held at least once a week.
2. The teacher should participate in every pow-wow. Although there is much repetition and the children can eventually proceed without the teacher, the teacher must be there in order for the children to have a model to copy. If only unacceptable models are available, the children may not be able to form acceptable goals. The teacher participates fully except that he does not make a goal. It has been found that when teachers make goals, the students tend to spend too much time writing the teacher and too little time writing themselves and each other. If you think the pow-wow method might work for you, try it, but use a little time to organize and to plan.
As an example, consider the case of a child who, in goal setting, decides that his goal for the week is to fight less. In pow-wow the child decides that he will count to 10 and walk away from situations that previously led to fighting. The teacher may point out models to the child of other children walking away from fights and make sure that the child's behavior is reinforced when he walks away from a fight.

These things are most important. Without the teaching procedures and the reinforcement as supports, cognitive control techniques will be relatively ineffective.

Cognitive control techniques are enhanced by a classroom which operates on a point or token system. The child's goal can be listed as one of the behaviors for which points or tokens may be earned. For each time period in which a child is given points or tokens, extra points or tokens are earned if he meets his goal. An alternative is to give bonus points or tokens for achievement of the goal. Figure 2 presents an example of a point sheet with space provided for the goal.

In order for these meetings to achieve their purpose they must be orderly. As a result ground rules must be set up to include such things as not interrupting, staying on topic, and so forth. Rule-setting techniques are illustrated with a point or token system. A list of rules can be identified, with point or token values assigned for each behavior on the list. An example of such a list appears in Table 1.

It should be noted that points are not taken away or given for interactions around the content of the meeting. Points relate only to surface behavior that facilitates the orderliness of the meeting.

Hobbs (1966) indicated that disturbed children can and should be taught cognitive control. According to Hobbs:

The emotionally disturbed child has fewer degrees of freedom in behavior than the normal child, yet he is not without the ability to shape his own behavior by self-administered verbal instruction. He can signal to himself if he can feign what the useful signals are. The teacher counselor works constantly to help the child learn the right signals.

Hobbs is saying that children can be taught to instruct themselves about appropriate behavior, and that children should be able to administer self instructions whenever they get into situations where problem behaviors occur. The management techniques of goal setting and the pow-wow can aid the teacher in developing successful group processes for behavior change.

### References


### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Reinforced during Pow-Wow and Goal Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking away from fights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not talking when another is talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not thoughts about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not whispering while others are talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping to the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Identified in the pow-wow, and we need to provide the child with reinforcement for the new behavior when it occurs.

As an example, consider the case of a child who, in goal setting, decides that his goal for the week is to fight less. In pow-wow the child decides that he will count to 10 and walk away from situations that previously led to fighting. The teacher may point out models to the child of other children walking away from fights and make sure that the child's behavior is reinforced when he walks away from a fight.

These things are most important. Without the teaching procedures and the reinforcement as supports, cognitive control techniques will be relatively ineffective.

Cognitive control techniques are enhanced by a classroom which operates on a point or token system. The child's goal can be listed as one of the behaviors for which points or tokens may be earned. For each time period in which a child is given points or tokens, extra points or tokens are earned if he meets his goal. An alternative is to give bonus points or tokens for achievement of the goal. Figure 2 presents an example of a point sheet with space provided for the goal.

In order for these meetings to achieve their purpose they must be orderly. As a result ground rules must be set up to include such things as not interrupting, staying on topic, and so forth. Rule-setting techniques are illustrated with a point or token system. A list of rules can be identified, with point or token values assigned for each behavior on the list. An example of such a list appears in Table 1.

It should be noted that points are not taken away or given for interactions around the content of the meetings. Points relate only to surface behavior that facilitates the orderliness of the meeting.

Hobbs (1966) indicated that disturbed children can and should be taught cognitive control. According to Hobbs:

The emotionally disturbed child has fewer degrees of freedom in behavior than the normal child, yet he is not without the ability to shape his own behavior by self-administered verbal instruction. He can signal to himself if he can feign what the useful signals are. The teacher counselor works constantly to help the child learn the right signals.

Hobbs is saying that children can be taught to instruct themselves about appropriate behavior, and that children should be able to administer self instructions whenever they get into situations where problem behaviors occur. The management techniques of goal setting and the pow-wow can aid the teacher in developing successful group processes for behavior change.

### References


### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Reinforced during Pow-Wow and Goal Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking away from fights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not talking when another is talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not thoughts about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not whispering while others are talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping to the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A SEVERELY HEARING IMPAIRED CHILD IN THE MAINSTREAM
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Cooperation and support are necessary in any educational system. They are especially important when the system includes mainstreaming children with special needs into the regular classroom. Birch (1974) referred to mainstreaming as the practice of placing handicapped pupils in regular classrooms and providing special educational services for them in that setting. Additionally, mainstreaming to us means insuring that all learners acquire the basic skills necessary to perform successfully in our society.

In order to facilitate the implementation of mainstreaming programs and increase the likelihood of their success, educators must first be willing to accept handicapped children into their schools and second, make adequate provision for their education (Turke, 1974, p. 211). The idea of accepting children into our schools who have not previously been educated in the mainstream involves changing the attitudes of the school community. Importantly, it also means providing financial support to insure that teachers and school personnel receive the training and resources necessary to provide quality special educational services within the regular classroom.

A MAINSTREAMING SYSTEM BASED ON INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

During the past 4 years, the staff of the Hinesburg Elementary School in Hinesburg, Vermont, has attempted to develop and implement a mainstreaming system which uses a data-based model of instruction (McKenzie, Maher, Knight, Perelman, Schneider, & Garvis, 1970). Educational decisions for children are made according to performance-based measures, and teaching plans are formulated according to the specific needs of each child. The classrooms are large open space environments containing from 40 to 60 children. Teachers work in teams with the assistance of one paraprofessional. The rooms are arranged into learning centers so that varied instructional activities may be occurring simultaneously.

Each child has an individually prescribed mathematics and reading assignment to complete daily. Instruction is provided in large groups, in small groups, and on an individual basis. All of the teachers at the Hinesburg School have received training in assessing instructional entry levels, developing and sequencing objectives, developing and implementing teaching-learning procedures, and evaluating the effectiveness of each procedure they design. Full time special services personnel include a consulting teacher and a reading specialist who is also a speech and language clinician.

A SPECIALIZED PROGRAM FOR LAURIE

This year when a parent from the community requested that we consider enrolling her 9-year-old, hearing impaired daughter in our mainstreaming program, we were all somewhat apprehensive. In spite of the fact that we had been providing quality special education services within the regular classroom to children who might be considered educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and/or emotionally disturbed, we were unsure if we could provide Laurie with the appropriate instructional program. The special school for hearing impaired children which Laurie had attended for her first 3 years of school was anxious to insure that the skills she had learned would be maintained and that her rate of learning would continue to improve. Since Laurie had a pure tone average of 75 decibels in her right ear and 70 decibels in her left ear, making normal conversation impossible to process without the assistance of hearing aids and special training, we knew that a highly specialized program was needed.

From TEACHING Exceptional Children, Fall 1975, pp. 6-9. Copyright © 1975 The Council for Exceptional Children
Following a number of meetings between Hinesburg staff members and the special school staff, we decided that Laurie could function in our school in the fourth grade if we could arrange for an individual tutor to assist Laurie in the transition from a small special school program to our large open space environment. Fortunately, the Special Education Division of the Vermont State Department of Education agreed with our plan and provided Laurie with a full-time tutor during the school day. We were lucky to find a tutor who was experienced in teaching hearing-impaired children.

A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Based on standardized and informal entry level measures, we formulated a comprehensive plan to teach oral and written communication that would provide instruction in three basic areas:

1. Auditory training to facilitate discrimination between sounds and patterns used in spoken language and to reduce dependency on visual cues.
2. Speech training to consist of articulation, intonation, and phrasing practice.
3. Receptive and expressive language training to develop syntax and a more sophisticated oral vocabulary.

Based on these three major areas, we developed a set of 70 specific enabling objectives to be completed by the end of the school year. Accompanying the objectives were estimates of the amount of time it would take Laurie to learn the skills necessary for mastery. Charts indicating the number of objectives achieved were prepared as a method of communicating Laurie's progress to her parents and school personnel.

During a daily 1½ hour tutoring session conducted in a quiet alcove adjacent to the classroom, Laurie's tutor taught her the skills specified in the objectives. The instructional materials used in the implementation of these objectives included the Wilson Initial Syntax Program, the Daxstar Language Program, and numerous teacher-made materials.

STAFF AND PEER INTERACTION

Frequent meetings were scheduled between the tutor and classroom teachers to ensure that the skills taught during the tutoring sessions would be maintained in the regular classroom. Monthly meetings were scheduled so that all of the involved staff might review Laurie's progress and suggest alternative teaching-learning procedures if necessary.

In order to maximize Laurie's learning, her teachers attempted to arrange their classroom schedules around the tutoring sessions.
would have many opportunities to interact verbally with both staff and peers.

Laurie's school day was spent much like that of the other students. With the assistance of her tutor, Laurie participated in both large and small group activities. Except for the 90 minutes of instruction with her tutor, Laurie spent the rest of the day with her peers. Along with her classmates, she had an individualized packet of materials in arithmetic and reading which was monitored daily by the teachers. She played on the playground, ate lunch in the cafeteria, and rode home on the school bus with the children from the community.

SUCCESS THROUGH COOPERATION AND SUPPORT

Thus far, Laurie has demonstrated social and academic gains significant enough to warrant continuation of the program. By June, Laurie had mastered all 70 of the objectives specified for oral communication this year. Her reading had increased from 3.0 in September to 5.0 in June. Next year, based on Laurie's rate of progress, we hope to gradually withdraw the tutorial program.

Most importantly, as a result of the cooperation between the State Department of Education, the special school, and our staff, we have provided Laurie with the kind of education that her parents requested. The additional financial and professional support provided to the Hinesburg School has made possible the development and implementation of this successful educational plan.
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Mainstreaming: A Model for Including Elementary Students in the Severely Handicapped Classroom
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The Autistic Education Program, Portland Public Schools, Oregon, like many programs for the severely handicapped, was not housed within a public school building during its initial development. Because of legislation (Public Law 94-142) assuring handicapped students of access to an education in the least restrictive environment and based on the continued belief that community living is more normalizing (Wolfenbarger, 1972), specialized programs are now being placed into regular elementary and secondary schools. In its third year of operation the Autistic Education Program moved into a local elementary school in order to better meet the goals of the new legislation.

Several issues inherent in the special education process come forward in such a move. Normalization, one of the originating concepts behind Public Law 94-142, recognizes the right of each individual within a society to "patterns and conditions of everyday life which are close to the mainstream of society" (Nispe, 1969). For handicapped children, part of this routine includes the right to attend a public school. When, during the education process, a handicapped student progresses to that part of his or her day can be spent alongside nonhandicapped students and engaged in non-specialized activities, then the true benefit of mainstreaming becomes possible. Peers already functioning within the mainstream become available as models and the advantage of social relationships with these peers becomes possible. Finally, providing instruction that best fits the needs of severely handicapped students often requires an individualized instructional program that frequently includes one-to-one student-teacher ratio.

Using the three concepts of normalization, mainstreaming, and individualized one-to-one instruction, a big brother/big sister program was developed. With present teaching technologies, it did not appear feasible to expect the severely handicapped autistic students to perform "normally," so the nonhandicapped students were brought into the classroom and trained to work and live with the autistic students.

The Autistic Education Program curriculum is based on the work of Ivar Lovaas (1977) whose success with autistic children involved one-to-one instruction. Each classroom within the program is regularly staffed with one full time teacher and one full time aide. Child trainer positions are filled by graduate students from nearby colleges and universities, so that the program is able to give each child one to one instruction for approximately 70% of his or her school day. The children entering the Autistic Education Program exhibit extensive delays in language development and engage in behaviors which make group instruction extremely difficult to conduct. By initiating individualized educational programs on a one to one basis, these children learn to participate in the instructional process and make optimal educational growth. When language growth has progressed sufficiently to teach group participation behaviors, the children begin to participate in small group activities.

IMPLEMENTATION

Students
The supervisors were drawn from the 133 member nonhandicapped student body of an elementary (K through 6) school and the 12 students from an intermediate level educable mentally retarded class. Three classrooms with a total of 16 autistic students ranging in language age from 2 months to 3 years and in chronological age from 4 years to 15 years made up the severely handicapped, nonlanguage, autistic students.

Karen and Kim, two sixth grade student supervisors, walk their charges to the taxis.
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Promotion

Upon completion of planning, the Volunteer Supervisor Program was presented to the elementary school principal and the regular classroom teachers. The rationale and procedures involved were discussed and input from all staff members was encouraged.

Following the staff orientation, the program was advertised to the students at the school. Posters about the program were displayed around the school. Presentations were made to each classroom to inform the students about the Volunteer Supervisor Program and what their roles would be if they participated in the program.

Positions

To determine what jobs would be available, the teachers within the Autism Education Program assessed their needs and determined when and what help they could use. For each job available the teacher completed a job slip (Figure 1) providing a detailed description of the work to be performed. All the job slips were then tacked on a job board and categorized by classroom assignment and time period. Job positions covered a wide range of responsibilities such as Music Supervisor, Playground Supervisor, Task Supervisor, Data Collector, and Child Trainer.

Elementary students were given the opportunity to view the job board. At that time they selected jobs in which they were interested (one job per student). Students removed the selected job slip from the job board, filled in the required information, obtained the required signatures of approval, and returned the job slip to the contact person.

A final schedule (Figure 2) was developed when jobs were filled. This schedule collectively listed all volunteer supervisors and pertinent information about them and their work assignments.

Developing Interaction Skills: Training

Each volunteer supervisor completed a training period that familiarized him or her, with interaction guidelines. Objectives were limited to general interaction situations in which a volunteer supervisor might be involved, as well as how to teach a task. The procedure developed was based on the tests frequently used in training parents and future teachers in the basic of behavior modification (Becker, 1971; Becker, Engelmann, & Thomas, 1975; Patterson & Guillon, 1968).

Over a period of three days the supervisors were involved in training activities. The first of the two phases of the training period involved 15 to 20 minutes of observation by the volunteer supervisor. The supervisors viewed the classrooms in which they would work and observed students, programs, and interactions taking place.

The second phase was covered in two 15 minute training sessions and involved explanation and implementation of selected objectives. Emphasis was limited to three concepts in the classroom training program: praise, clear directions, and helping. Table 1 summarizes this training.

During the first training session the idea of praising students who were doing the right thing was the main lesson. The trainer demonstrated descriptive praise statements such as "good clapping" and "nice walking." The students supervisors then paired off and took turns role playing both the student and the supervisor.

The second training session involved a brief review of descriptive praise. Following praise a demonstration of helping or using prompts and a demonstration of clear directions or simple one concept commands was given. Each supervisor again paired off to practice the concepts presented.

Once this training was completed each student reported to his or her assigned job. The teacher in charge of that job specifically trained the student in the details of his or her particular job. These instructions included such features as the location of materials, hand washing procedures, an introduction to the student they would work with, and a demonstration of the activities to be conducted.

Figure 1. Job Slip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Grade Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who to Contact

APPLICANT’S NAME

Have You Been A Supervisor Before?

Where?

When?

APPROVAL

(Teacher) (Parent) (Principal)

Figure 2. Needs Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Summary of Classroom Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Each supervisor will reinforce appropriate behavior with descriptive praise.</td>
<td>Teacher explanation. Teacher model and role play. Supervisor role play in varied situations.</td>
<td>&quot;You (clap, talk, etc.) nice.&quot; &quot;Well!&quot; &quot;Nice (sitting, walking, etc.).&quot; &quot;That's a good (throw, picture, etc.).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear directions</td>
<td>Each supervisor will give clear, single command directions.</td>
<td>Teacher explanation. Teacher model and role play. Supervisor role play in varied situations.</td>
<td>&quot;Put the puzzle together.&quot; &quot;Stand up.&quot; &quot;Come here.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping (prompting)</td>
<td>If assistance is needed to elicit a correct response, the supervisor will guide the child as much as necessary through the correct action. Guidance will be mainly in the form of physical manipulation.</td>
<td>Teacher explanation. Teacher model and role play. Supervisor role play in varied situations.</td>
<td>&quot;Clap.&quot; &quot;(Child does not clap.) Student supervisor guides child's hands through correct action. &quot;Put on your coat.&quot; &quot;(Child does not put on coat.) Student supervisor guides child through correct action.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracts
Supervisors met with the teacher to whom they were assigned and signed contracts when training sessions were completed (Figure 3). The contracts covered the responsibilities of the supervisor and specified that work could be continued only as long as the assigned responsibilities were met. Guidelines were negotiated prior to the signing of the contracts. For example, two excused incidents of tardiness were allowed before dismissal, and no unexcused absences were allowed.

Daily Sequence
The majority of the supervisor jobs followed the same basic sequence. The supervisors went to their work location, signed in or checked in with the work assignment teacher, washed their hands, obtained necessary materials, located the assigned child, performed job duties, replaced the materials, and returned to their regular classroom.

Observation and Assessment
In order to promote efficiency and a better learning environment for the supervisor and the autistic student, frequent observation and feedback from the assigned teacher was required. The feedback slip (Figure 4) proved to be a quick and effective way to provide student supervisors with information about the quality of their work. A 3 to 5 minute assessment procedure was implemented with each supervisor weekly or biweekly depending on the responsibilities involved in the job assignment. Written guidelines for use of the slip were provided on the reverse side.

A final assessment (Figure 5) was used to summarize each volunteer supervisor's performance and provide feedback to the classroom teacher at the end of the term. This evaluation form also allowed for comments from volunteer supervisors. Notes regarding behavior changes seen in supervisors, and questions concerning the evaluation. The final assessment was placed in the supervisor's school file.

EVALUATION
During the 9 months of the academic year 1977-78, three groups, each working 10 weeks, participated in autistic classrooms. By the end of the year, 78 normally-developed students from all grades, Kindergarten through 8th, were involved in the program for at least 6 weeks. This represented 50% of the student body.

The program increased in popularity throughout the year, with 21% involvement during the fall term and ending with 52% involvement at the end of the spring quarter. All 16 autistic students had at least one personal contact daily with a volunteer supervisor.

Figure 3. Contract.

1. WILL:
1. Complete daily work and jobs in my own classroom.

   (Teacher)
   will decide what work is satisfactory.

2. Come to work on time: I will report to
   (Place),
   (Time)

   (Teacher)

3. Wash my hands when I arrive at work

4. Follow directions. My duties are:

   As long as I meet these responsibilities, I can continue to work as a student supervisor?

   My job begins on
   (Date)
   and ends on
   (Date)

   Here, I am training
   Student
   Classroom
   Work Assignment Teacher

 Maintaining Momentum
The most visible result of the Volunteer Supervisor Program was demonstrated by the understanding and support of the school's students and teachers. The nonhandicapped students demonstrated understanding and acceptance of the autistic students' behavior. "They can't control themselves very well," said one fifth grade boy, "but we don't laugh at them for it." And a sixth grade teacher who had 14 of his 24 sixth graders involved in the program remarked that "kids can be very cruel to handicapped children." But he went on to note that "the Volunteer Supervisor Program side tracks that whole thing," and further commented that some of the slower students who were involved in the program "have gained a sense of self worth from their volunteer work." These same supervisors were frequently the most dependable.

Following training, six of the volunteer supervisors were randomly selected and measured using the same observation tool that was used to train teachers. These students were evaluated for appropriate use of clear directions, helping, and praise. Table 2 shows the teacher effectiveness of each supervisor.

Further evidence of the effectiveness of the supervisors as teachers was shown by the fact that a select group of six supervisors, three each term during winter and spring, were the sole teachers of the "following simple directions" program in the high level class.

Figure 6 shows preacademic skills taught by volunteer supervisors. In this task a supervisor would enter the classroom, set up the materials, locate the assigned autistic student, and both would sit down at the learning station. The supervisor showed the child objects on a table and said "Give me x." The child was to select the appropriate item and hand it to the supervisor. Each supervisor collected 20 trials per day per student. The supervisors used pegboards with 10 or 20 holes each in which to place the tokens (pegs), one token for each correct response. The supervisors were able to complete 10 preacademic programs with five different students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Percent of Appropriate Supervisor Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors, % Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Feedback Slip and Guidelines.

Table 2. Percent of Appropriate Supervisor Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors, % Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Evaluation of Student Supervisors

Name: __________________________

I. Date: __________________________

II. Review Students Own Evaluation Form:

III. Summary of Feedback Slips:

IV. Student Comments:

V. Behavior Changes:

VI. Questions Relating to Evaluation:

Make a carbon copy for the student to show his or her teacher and parents.
that would not have been completed without their assistance. These programs included identification of six colors, nine numerals, five shapes, six adjectives, plus the letters of the alphabet. Only one classroom had students ready to work in these preacademic areas.

During playground recess many volunteers requested additional supervisory responsibility, and many first and second graders especially wanted to be included. Six autistic students were each observed on the playground for 20 observation intervals during every lunch recess using a time sampling procedure. During the baseline period of observation the average number of observations in which an autistic student was engaged with another individual was 2.6. After the nonhandicapped students were provided with training and structured activities, the mean number of contacts increased to 10.7 times. As predicted, the increase in contact was significant t(5) = 5.54, p < .01. The total daily contacts of the autistic students is shown in Figure 7.

CONCLUSION
The program appeared to be beneficial to both the autistic students and the nonhandicapped students involved and seemed to positively affect the daily attitudes of the elementary school community.

The autistic students achieved preacademic skills that may not have been developed without the assistance of one to one instruction from the supervisors. In addition, contact with nonhandicapped students on the playground increased significantly, making more appropriate social models available to the autistic students. A significant point to be made is that the goals of normalization were greatly accelerated by training the educational community.

The nonhandicapped elementary students were able to participate in a career education experience in which they applied for jobs selected from available job listings and signed contracts committing themselves to regular attendance. The training these students received on the job provided them with the interpersonal skills to relate competently with severely handicapped nonlanguage autistic students within the school environment.

The nonhandicapped students developed a sense of responsibility as they left their classrooms each day to go to "work." The teachers and students alike expressed positive attitudes about the experiences they had, as well as an understanding of the autistic students' abilities.

In the future this model could be adapted for use in high schools, community colleges, and on the job work experience programs. The ultimate success of maintaining severely handicapped individuals within the community rests with the community members and their ability to live and work with these individuals.
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V. Perceptions and Attitudes
Teacher Attitudes and the Labeling Process

ELEAN SMITH
SANDRA GREENBERG

The term we have recently coined has been examined in the context of the "labeling" of schools as a phenomenon. The phenomenon of labeling behavior in the classroom is not new, but it is surprisingly widespread and often results from the pressures of school personnel to meet the needs of students. In this paper, we examine three main themes that appear to underlie the decision-making process in labeling behavior. These themes are:

1. **Stigmatization of Students**: The labeling of students as "deviant" or "at-risk" can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy, where the label affects the behavior of the student.

2. **Institutional Pressures**: Schools and teachers may feel pressure to label students in order to meet certain educational standards or to secure funding.

3. **Teacher Attitudes**: Teachers' attitudes towards students can influence the labeling process. A teacher who is negatively biased against a student is more likely to label that student.

The goal of this study is to examine the relationship between teacher attitudes and the labeling process. The study is conducted in a large urban school district, with a focus on understanding the impact of teacher attitudes on the labeling process. The results of this study are expected to provide insights into the complexities of the labeling process and to inform policy decisions aimed at reducing the negative effects of labeling.
the Curriculum Research and Development Center at Mental Retardation were em-
ployed in conducting the questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered to the teachers of the public schools.

While the family interview data were used to interpret the findings, the teachers were also evaluated on the basis of their responses to the teachers' questionnaires about the child. (Ma 1972). Teachers who had longer experience of teaching and had more information about the child were more likely to be asked to respond to the questions. The teachers were asked to respond to questions about the child's behavior, the child's school performance, and the child's personal characteristics. The teachers were also asked to respond to questions about the child's social behavior, the child's personality, and the child's peer relationships. The teachers were also asked to respond to questions about the child's family background, the child's home environment, and the child's health. The teachers were also asked to respond to questions about the child's school environment, the child's educational program, and the child's school performance.
Thus, it would appear that the six-hour retarded child exists only in the degree that the decisions of teachers, as representatives of the schools, are in line with the three assumptions given earlier. The teacher attitudes inherent in these assumptions, then, lead to the creation of the six-hour retarded child and are the means through which the school produces a set of discontinuous experiences for this type of child. This idea implies that under a different set of assumptions it is likely that such a child would not be labeled as retarded.

Under the present assumptions one wonders whether the labeling of these types of children serves merely to release the future of the child to respond to the school in the future of the school to adapt to the child. In this situation, the introduction of the label—six-hour retarded child—may be unfortunate because it appears to emphasize that which is creation was intended to prevent. That is, it emphasizes the 18 hours of retarded behavior as opposed to the 18 hours of presumptuous nonretarded behavior. In this manner then the label appears to license the weaknesses in behavior rather than suggest to the strengths in behavior. Indeed, it seems to justify the inappropriate labeling of children which has as its first effect the increase of behavioral heterogeneity of children in special classes.
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"I Wouldn't Have Seen It If I Hadn't Believed It"

GLEN G. FOSTER
JAMES E. YSSULTYRE

JAMES H. REESE

Special education in the public schools has developed around an existing series of five
different categories. As a result, a child must be identified as being eligible for special
educational services if he or she demonstrates, through appropriate testing, that the
teachers feel that he or she is in need of special education. The present
criteria for labeling a child as "special" in some way is that special educational services can be
provided. An example might be a child with a learning disability. The present
criteria for labeling a child as "special" in some way is that special educational services can be
provided. An example might be a child with a learning disability. The present
criteria for labeling a child as "special" in some way is that special educational services can be
provided. An example might be a child with a learning disability.
The subjects were divided into four groups, as follows: Group A, which was the control group; Group B, which received a brief introduction on the subject; Group C, which received a detailed introduction on the subject; and Group D, which received both a brief and a detailed introduction. The subjects were then asked to complete the test, and their performance was compared to the performance of subjects who received different levels of introduction. The results showed that the performance of subjects who received both a brief and a detailed introduction was significantly better than that of subjects who received only a brief introduction. The results also showed that the performance of subjects who received a detailed introduction was significantly better than that of subjects who received only a brief introduction. The results were consistent with the hypothesis that a detailed introduction is more effective in improving performance than a brief introduction.
Table 3

Results of Two-Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (or Behavior Rating Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

Means and standard deviations for each of the four treatment groups during the two phases of the study are presented in Table 1. The two analyses of variance were computed separately for the results of the pre-experimental questionnaire and the behavior rating scale. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

**Discussion and Implications**

The data obtained in this study strongly suggest that teacher ratings have genuine corrective and preventive significance at not the
Integrated Settings at the Early Childhood Level: The Role of Nonretarded Peers

LEA SILLEN

MAY APOLLONI

UMAS P. COOKE

numbers of non-mental, non-handicapped, and severely retarded children into the

Formal education systems and into residential facilities for the severely retarded is a major concern. This issue is addressed in a comprehensive manner by the authors in this chapter.

The role of nonretarded peers in providing a supportive environment for retarred children is emphasized. The authors discuss the benefits of integrated settings and the importance of developing appropriate programs for these children. 

The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research and practice in this area.
learn much more than they typically do from their impaired peers (p. 11).

Furthermore, it has been suggested that non-retarded children function as reinforcing agents to their retarded classmates within the context of child-child interaction (Wynne et al., 1975). This article reviews literature regarding these assumed benefits and suggests teaching procedures that are designed to maximize the desirable outcomes purported to accrue from integrated programming.

**Efficacy of Integrated Programming**

The contemporary trend toward integrating retarded and nonretarded preschool children has been projected to lead to improved social and intellectual performance (Wynne et al., 1975). However, some relevant research has been reported by O'Connor, Goodnight, and Kolter (1974) which examined the extent to which handicapped preschool children interacted with nonhandicapped preschoolers. These investigators found that handicapped children did not attain comparable aphasia and their teachers systematically structured play activities around their needs. Unilateral by the handicapped group from such structured activities, teachers were only mildly effective for the majority handicapped children in their study.

O'Connor analyzed data from 30 preschool children, involving retarded and nonretarded children at ratios of four to one. She found that nonretarded children interacted significantly more with both retarded and nonretarded children than the nonretarded group. More importantly, perhaps, she found that nonretarded children improved social skills and minimally with their retarded classmates.

Additionally, a study conducted in settings with retarded, normal, and normal children showed that children in a 1:2 ratio and 1:4 ratios were more involved in group activities and were more likely to engage in social interactions. The study was aimed at investigating the effectiveness of integrated settings on social development.

**Programming Suggestions for Integrated Settings**

Research indicates that early interaction may be based on the assumptions that nonretarded classmates, educationally effective beyond hand training for retarded children (Allan & Tinkham, 1973; Brooker & Rickers, 1972) and that interaction with nonretarded children reinforces retarded children's prosocial behaviors, as well as their skills in other areas of development. Consequently, this suggestion the child development literature reveals that young nonretarded children interact and support with one another in a friendly, relationships, in adaptive, functional development (Judd & Cook, 1974).
peer imitation of non retarded nursery school children (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1960). Gesthur (1975) although conducting results have also been reported (Eliot & Vegaro, 1920).

**Generalized Imitation Approach**

Another approach for increasing the rate at which retarded children expose their non-retarded peers might be to systematically program for generalized imitation (Barrett et al., 1970). Trenary and Frade (1975) trained these retarded children in structured training sessions to imitate the peer responses of a non retarded child. The results indicated that the retarded children tended to imitate the non retarded child's behavior and that these behaviors generalized across stimulus conditions. The peer responses were not directly trained.

Other studies currently under way by the same investigators are focused on discriminating the abilities of peer imitation training as an aid in unstructured, free play situations and with verbal target behaviors.

**Reinforcing Agent Approach**

A second major underlying premise suggests that the value of integrated preschool programs is that non retarded children learn to act in a manner similar to their retarded classmates. However, in this case retardation is not the end result but rather the means to an end. The end result is to develop the social and emotional competence of retarded children so that they can interact with non retarded children in an acceptable manner. This might be accomplished through structured training programs that focus on the development of social skills (Barrett et al., 1970) and social reinforcement patterns (Trenary & Frade, 1975) and establish a conflict-free social interaction (Krug, 1975). Another technique would be to directly train the children in social skills that would allow them to function in mainstream classroom settings (Bandura & Ross, 1961).

Experiments in training non retardates (Bandura & Ross, 1961) to model the behavior of normal peers would involve teaching the former to engage in behavior that the latter would act on. To determine those aspects of normal peer behavior that is most readily modeled, two retarded children would be selected.


directly model an adult teacher's technique of social interaction (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1960). This implies that the reinforcement patterns of non retarded children would be systematically programmed and designed to provide a basis for accommodating the learning needs of retarded children. Bandura and Hamilton (1967) have proposed a method involving the presentation of a series of positive reinforcers to retarded children in order to facilitate their social interaction with non retarded peers.

**Implications for Research**

---

*--- unless otherwise stated ---*
school children. Seemingly, the most significant questions currently demanding empirical response relate to the identification of (a) an optimal set of environmental conditions which would promote interaction between retarded and nonretarded children and (b) the appropriate educational procedures for establishing nonretarded children as behavior models and as reinforcing agents for their retarded classmates. Among the variables which could be experimentally manipulated to effect such outcomes are (a) the ratio of retarded to nonretarded children; (b) the ages, language skills, and other competencies of the retarded and nonretarded participants; (c) the nature of the teacher's behavior in the training setting or in a variety of training settings until the learned responses are emitted in novel situations. A related technique might involve gradually changing the stimuli in the training setting in one closely resemble the natural environment or, similarly, introducing trainable responses at the natural setting. Finally, specialization might be achieved through the use of multiple peer models in order to enhance the likelihood that the retarded child would imitate an unfamiliar peer.

Another issue of great practical and ethical importance concerns the potential effects of early integration on nonretarded participants in planning integrated preschool settings. Special educators should incorporate systematic procedures for assessing any behavioral changes which may occur in the normal children. There is some tentative evidence that the experience of serving as a reinforcing agent may function to increase peers' skill levels [Siegel & Stelnman, 1975]. This issue, however, needs further clarification and thus remains a fertile area for future research.

**Attitudinal and Affective Development.**

Finally, the developers of integrated programs should consider the influence of such programming on the attitudinal and affective development of both retarded and nonretarded participants. Early integration, given appropriate structure and instruction, may result in the development of an early attitude of acceptance and understanding by nonretarded children for those different from themselves or helping retarded children an environment that maximally facilitates their behavioral development. The development of successful procedures to realize these outcomes at the preschool level may have far reaching effects on the later lives of retarded individuals due to at least three potential results of such early programming.

- First, as nonretarded children grow up with the experience of direct personal interactions with their retarded peers, the general level of societal understanding and acceptance of the retarded may be expected to increase, while the old attitudes of fear and mistrust should be diminished through early firsthand experience with this population. Second, as a result of such structured interactions with their nonretarded peers, retarded individuals may be expected to grow up with greater receptivity to socially acceptable interactive behaviors, fewer of the stigmatized retared behaviors which conform to ostracism and ridicule of the retarded. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, such early training should equip the retarded individual with the processes (e.g., selective imitation of context-appropriate behavior) that will enable him to adapt to novel situations in which the specific normal behavior is not already within his repertoire.

If such long-range effects are possible, then the success of such research and program development activities as those suggested in this article may ultimately have far-reaching implications for the future position of retarded individuals in our society.
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VI. Parents as Partners
Parent Groups: Their Role in a Better Life for the Handicapped

LEO F. CAIN

Volunteer groups for self-help purposes have been a part of our nation's history since the time of the American Revolution. They have, of course, had varying purposes, structures, and memberships. In the 1930's, the focus was on housing, recreation, and the organizational motivation came from professionals in the field of medicine. Following the Second World War, groups were organized for the welfare of the handicapped and mentally retarded, not only in the United States but also in a number of other countries. These groups were distinguished by the fact that they were organized by parents and their memberships, although not totally restricted to parents, were primarily comprised of parents of children with handicaps.

More than Volunteers

In the personal involvement of the parents with the particular problems for which the association was organized, a special form of dedication not found in many other volunteer groups. Parents participated in the organization and volunteered time in the projects served by these groups, not for some altruistic basis but because of a deep felt concern and commitment. This dedication had mixed blessings, but it was the reason for their persistence and success in working relationships beyond their calling.

The existence of some local parents groups can be traced back before the early 1930's—the National Society for Crippled Children, thus. However, the main thrust of the movement came in the 1930's and 1940's, with the organization of national groups such as the National Association for Retarded Children and United Cerebral Palsy Association. The rapidity of the growth of these organizations and the effectiveness of their demands for social and educational...
change is testimony to the legitimacy of their need, the intensity of their involvement, and the dynamic quality of their leadership.

Handicaps are not necessarily related to the social status of the family, educational attainment, intelligence, economic influence, or environmental setting. They respect no one and, because of this, handicapped children came from homes representing the complete panorama of American life. The result was a pool of concerned parents possessing the qualities needed for the effective mobilization of effort on the behalf of their children.

Local groups first developed informally, as gatherings of individuals sharing a common problem. Their reason for coming together was to help their children and to help themselves by providing mutual psychological support to cope with internal family needs as well as external social pressures. Their concerns first centered about their immediate needs. There were too few institutions for the care of the handicapped, and all types of handicapped individuals were placed together with little or no diagnosis or training provided. In addition, many of these facilities were greatly in need of improvement. Public education did not accept as its responsibility the provision of programs for children with limited capabilities, either mental or physical. The public in general, and legislators in particular, were greatly uninformed about the possibilities for helping this population and were totally unaware of the advances being made in knowledge and techniques on their behalf. Interest in developing methods to help children achieve according to the level of their capabilities was minimal. The concepts of social responsibility and, concomitantly, the appropriateness of allocating public funds for this purpose were just beginning to develop.

These concerns led the parent groups to organize formally for the purpose of sponsoring a wide diversity of activities. Foremost, of course, was their action in the field of education. Initially, parent groups conducted educational programs through private schools. The assumption was that these educational programs were projects to demonstrate the educational potential for the public segment. Their next step was to sponsor legislation to make programs in special education a function of public school systems, this led to the establishment of teacher training programs and certificated specialists. Sheltered workshops, vocational training centers, diagnostic facilities, parent education services, preschool and post-scholastic facilities, guardianship plans, short-stay facilities (respite homes), community centers, recreation, research, speech therapy, professional training, and medical services were all types of projects undertaken.

As parent groups organized formally, they specialized according to specific types of handicaps. The need of the parents for support from others who understood and had discrete problems of each handicap prompted this. There were, for example, individual organizations for the mentally retarded, the cerebral palsied, the deaf, and the blind. And as a result, when each organization developed a project, it was directed toward the specific need of that particular handicap. At
times, categorization, which has been intensified by parental involvement, resulted in duplication of effort and fragmentation of programs and services. Even when more than one handicap needed a service, each organization developed its own. For example, vocational rehabilitation was originally developed for the physically handicapped only; individual legislation was sponsored to establish a credential for each specialty. On the other hand, the multiply handicapped were often left out, having no service available to them. Because of the benefits to the individual organization in the areas of fund raising, legislation, and public information campaigns, they have been reluctant to cooperate and broaden their scope of activities.

The Parent/Professional Relationship

In the early history of parent associations, conflict existed between the parents and the professionals. Having had some negative experiences with professionals, particularly in the field of education but also in other support services, parents lacked confidence in them and were hesitant to utilize this resource. At times, a relationship which was almost adversary in nature was observable. However, as the membership grew and the volume of activities and services rendered by parent groups increased, the need for professional assistance overcame their objections. Skills in fund raising, public relations, medicine, social work, psychology, and teaching were all needed and could be provided by professionals. In addition, the professional contributed permanency and continuity to the activities of the group. Parents, however, jealously guarded their prerogatives within the organization and maintained control of the decision making process, while recognizing the contributions of the professionals in policy development. The professional was thus primarily an advisor or consultant. Attitudes are now more positive and many parent groups sponsor scholarships to train professionals and fund professional research projects.

The structures adopted by most parent associations were designed to unite and mobilize resources on a national level for appropriate purposes, such as fund raising, federal legislation, and public information. Yet, flexibility to develop state programs and provide projects which reflected local needs was demanded. This conflict between local autonomy and the strength of the national organization does not seem to have been a hindrance. Parents were effective at both levels. They succeeded in obtaining resources through federal legislation and in implementing programs through state legislation.

They Get Action

Parent groups can be credited with significant advances. Openly using their power as voters and as pressure groups, they have been able to get action and change within the education system. Key factors in this achievement have been public information campaigns using the press, the media, special programs, seminars, and conferences, as well as personal contacts between influential parents and key legislators. State and federal offices were established to monitor bills in progress and to assist in drafting legislation. Parent groups brought the needs of the handicapped to the attention of those at the highest level of government. Parent groups were instrumental in the establishment of presidential advocacy committees, such as the President's Committee on Mental Retardation.
dent's Committee on Mental Retardation and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, with parents themselves being named as members.

Recent history reflects an emphasis on advocacy, or the demand for equal rights, and parents and parent groups have actively promoted the rights of the handicapped. Discriminatory practices are being challenged in the courts. Judicial redress is being sought for statutes depriving the handicapped of the right to vote, to own property, to bear children, to speak for themselves, to obtain occupational licenses, or to be eligible for insurance, or excluding them from services. The nature of the permanent impact of court decisions, although at first thought to be landmarks for the benefit of the handicapped, will be determined in the future. Many of these cases are under further litigation, but at this time it can be stated with assurance that constitutional issues are being addressed at a new level of seriousness. The number of lawsuits relating to education has significantly increased. Suits are being filed which seek to eliminate the exclusion of the handicapped from equal access to educational opportunity and the stigma created by labeling children. As appropriate legislation is enacted at the state level, these suits will undoubtedly diminish. All this has been done with parent group support.

And, parent groups are also actively involved in legislation which reflects a new concern for the rights of the handicapped. Here again the right for education, the right to due process protection, and the right to adequate funding are the focal points of concern. Legislation being introduced covers such topics as the trend toward normalization in educational placement and training regular classroom personnel in the needs of the handicapped. Federal legislation is now speaking to nondiscrimination in employment in any program receiving federal financial assistance and the removal of architectural barriers. A significant amount of funding is being provided by the federal government.

As parent groups move into the future, certain issues although not new must be dealt with. One is the issue of coordination versus isolation. Should parent groups work together or alone? The case for broadening objectives seems most persuasive. Individual associations need not be dissolved, but where needs are in common, cooperation could contribute greatly to the level of services provided and the number of individually receiving benefits. In the beginning, programs were established to handle human aspects of the specific handicap. As experience is gained, however, another approach would be to look toward states that have established an strengthen cooperation not only among the several parent groups themselves, but among parent groups and public and private agencies concerned with education, social work, employment, and rehabilitation. Fragmentation of services reduces responsibility and accountability.

A trend can be seen among parent groups to extend their perspectives beyond the immediate needs of children and to be concerned...
about services for the entire life span of the individual. This is reflected in their support of programs providing living arrangements, employment opportunities either in the community or in workshops, and leisure and recreational opportunities. At least one organization has recognized this and changed its name—the National Association for Retarded Children has changed its name to the National Association for Retarded Citizens.

And, as parent groups broaden their perspectives, they must also re-evaluate the advisability of providing services in contrast to obtaining them. It seems to be readily accepted that parent groups, as private bodies, can more easily assume the role of experimenter than can bureaucratic, public agencies. Therefore, it follows that new approaches, new techniques, and new services might continue to be developed on a pilot basis by parent groups. Once effective, worthwhile projects are demonstrated, however, it is the public agency which can better finance and deliver the service on the long-term basis. The parent groups are thus free to move on to a new experiment, to monitor the effectiveness of programs operated by public agencies to insure that they continue to meet the needs of the clientele, to be involved in the setting of standards or criteria against which programs can be evaluated, or to sponsor preventative research. It is inefficient and costly to duplicate services and programs offered by public agencies.

Mainstreaming

Parent groups have also supported the general concept now being advocated by special educators of moving as many handicapped children as possible back into the regular classroom. This is variously termed normalization, or mainstreaming. Undoubtedly, the segregation of all handicapped children had stigmatizing effect on some, and both the "normal" child and the handicapped child benefit from educational settings which are nearly as possible reflect the social environment. Many parents have realized that mainstreaming places new demands on teachers; in that respect, special education teachers must be prepared to meet the special needs of the handicapped. Appropriate resource materials must be located in convenient, adjacent locations in order to supplement regular classroom materials; educational objectives must be set which are realistic for the child and against which he can be evaluated. Teachers must be concerned that not every child can benefit educationally from the regular classroom and that special programs and services must be maintained if every handicapped child is to be served.

As Significant Force

The purpose here has been to show that parent groups have been a significant force in improving the life of the handicapped. This must not be minimized. The example given here is a small one, but similar movements are occurring all over the country. Through dedication and effort, it has evolved into a significant force at national, state, and local levels. As they began, they spoke out and provided services, particularly to children, which were ignored by health, education, and welfare agencies. They established special schools, encouraged better health services, and actively worked for upgrading of state institutions housing the handicapped.
• They recognized the need for legislation at the state level to
insure improved services and were influential in the enactment
of statutes which required schools to provide special
education programs and other services such as diagnostic
classes, speech pathology, physical and occupational therapy.
• On the national level, they successfully obtained legislation
providing funds for research grants, training grants, grants for
demonstration programs, and federal aid to the states.
• They have been advocates of the rights of handicapped
through sponsoring legislation and in the judicial process.
• They have been concerned about the entire life of the
handicapped person and broadened their perspective.
• Their goal is to make available the needed services to every
handicapped individual.
• They are becoming aware of the benefits to be accrued from co-
ordination of efforts among parent groups.

Has the success of parent groups negated their need in the future? It
is true that much headway has been made. Many of the needs found
thirty years ago have at least been partially fulfilled, but these steps
have not been equally achieved in all states across the nation. Many
handicapped children and adults still go unserved and the present
services need to be expanded to reach more people. Goals need con-
tinual reevaluation in order to reflect the changes in society and this
requires some flexibility within the associations. Their existence is
still needed and parent groups can continue to be highly effective.
A Lost Generation of Parents

KATHRYN A. GORHAM

Beckie, the fifth of my five children, is profoundly retarded. The 13 years since she was born have been enlightening ones for me. I have learned enough about other parents and their experiences with professionals, about parent organizations, and about the service system for "exceptional" children to be able to pass as a professional myself and get paid for doing what I used to do as a volunteer. Although I have learned much, I am clearly one of the "lost generation" of parents of handicapped children. We are parents who are either intimidated by professionals or angry with them, or both. Parents who are unreasonably afraid of them; parents who intuitively know that we know our children better than the experts of any discipline and yet we persistently assume that the professionals know best; parents who carry so much attitudinal and emotional baggage around with us that we are unable to engage in any real dialogue with professionals, teachers, principals, physicians, or psychologists about our children.

Between birth and the age of 13, Beckie has seen 11 physicians, representing 5 specialties. She has also been referred to an audiologist, an occupational therapist, an optometrist, a physical therapist, psychologists, and speech pathologists. In answer to the common accusation that parents "shop" for professionals who will give them a less painful diagnosis, I would suggest that must like myself, see large numbers of professionals because the complexity or severity of the child's condition requires periodic re-evaluation from a variety of viewpoints. One-stop diagnostic centers did not exist when our children were growing up; few exist now, so we have been "referred" from one diagnostician to another.

The Closed Files

Seeing so many diagnosticians and evaluators presents a problem. Not many parents are fortunate enough to have a pediatrician or family physician who will coordinate all the information about them. People move and change doctors. Some doctors are unwilling to be coordinators in the first place. What happens to the reports? They are collected in manila folders that follow the child from clinic to clinic and school to school. This would be fine if one master folder containing copies of all the information were in the hands of the parents. However, few parents are given copies of these reports. Strangers are permitted to read the contents of the child's records; the parents generally are not.

When we parents fill out the application forms for school, we sign a release form which says that the school may collect information about our child from past diagnosticians and schools. We usually do not ask to see the information which is being collected or sent. But we sign our names and give access to people whom neither we nor our children have met, who may read the records, make decisions about the education or treatment of our children on the basis of what they read.

Beckie has accumulated a thick folder in her 13 year pilgrimage from profession to profession. I have deleted countless "interpretations" of its contents by social workers, but I have only read the accumulation since last year. I did so then with feelings of guilt because my access to them came as a professional on the staff of the organization which runs her training program, not as her parent. I found nothing in them that I could not understand or ask someone about if I did.
not, and nothing that could not have been discussed freely and openly with the person who wrote it. And I suspect that my case is typical rather than atypical. Sometimes the record collection process meant delays of 2 or 3 months before interviews for application to a school were granted. How much simpler it would have been if I had been able to carry her records with me.

The Ironies

Anyone who has lived with a handicapped child during the last decade or two will be able to construct a list of ironies that he has learned to live with. The following ones are derived from my Bédelie notebook, as well as from talks with other parents.

1. The responsibility for monitoring our children's progress through the fragmented service system has been ours, but the array of physicians and other professionals we have seen have assumed that we could not possibly understand the complexities of their trade or that it would take too much of their time to explain them to us. We have had the responsibility, but educating and equipping us to do the job better was generally not considered part of the diagnostic obligation.

2. A parent who thinks something is developmentally wrong with his child usually turns to a physician who has probably only had minimal exposure to the total needs of the handicapped child and his family. Physicians are notoriously unschooled about nonmedical services and often cannot tell the parent what schools are available for handicapped children, or even if schools are available.

3. The more specialized the diagnostician is, the less concerned he is to give information to the parents and the less willing he is to deal with the parents' situation and feelings. Referral of the mother for counseling has been a common and comfortable solution for the physician or other diagnostician, but when parents are repeatedly forced to ignore many of their concerns they are not helped.

4. Some of us are told repeatedly by professionals that we should institutionalize our children, but we find institutions to be places that are the least equipped to help children.

5. We could release information about our children to professionals, but we have not been allowed to read it ourselves.

6. Now, we are often told that the best place for our children is in the community, in a neighborhood, with his family or a substitute family. Yet there are not enough group homes to begin to meet this demand, and foster homes are equally hard to come by. That leaves, as before, our own homes with respite care and home support services, still only a possibility in most communities.

7. It is now commonly accepted that our children have a constitutional right to a free education, but extra appropriations to make the classrooms materialize have not yet followed the legislation and litigation. We are told again to inform our legislators of the need. Why must we tell them again?

8. In the past we were made to feel guilty when we did not institutionalize our children, and now, under the new normalization principle, we are made to feel guilty if we do.

The Effects

So much for the ironies of our past experiences and our current dilemmas. We have learned to live with them, but not without accumulating some scars which clearly mark us as members of the "lost generation":

- We are angry. We have gone to the helping professions and have received too little help.
- We are still in awe of specialists and intimidated by their expertise.
- We are unduly grateful to principals or school directors for merely accepting our children in their programs. The specter of 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week care at home, with the state institution as an alternative, has made us too blindly thankful.
- We demonstrate a certain indifference to the latest bandwagon on which the mental retardation experts are riding. Mixed messages have been so much a part of our history that, rather than join the parade, we tend to listen politely, then do what we think best for our child. We are often, therefore, more self-skeptical.
- Many of us have concluded that it is best to worry about next year or tomorrow because things might be better then we worse. Certainly it seems impossible to plan for the future as most of us are to frequently admonished to do. Generally I have found that those who planned for Rockefeller's future were urg-
gesting that I place her on the roster for permanent residence in the state institution. That is, in fact, the only option available at present. In Maryland I cannot even provide for her future by putting money aside and setting up an inheritance. If I die, and she must enter an institution, the state's general fund becomes heir to her belongings, and the money saved could go for something as remote as her well-being as highway construction. So we worry about the future, but planning for it is not yet really a fruitful activity.

- We are tired. We have kept our children at home and raised them ourselves, with all the extra demands on time and energy which that implies—often without much help from the community, neighborhood, professionals, friends, or relatives, and in fact, commonly, against their well-intentioned advice. We have founded parent groups and schools, run them ourselves, held fund raising events to pay teachers and keep up little schools, formed, organized baby-sitting groups, and summer play groups. We have built and repaired special playground equipment for our children's use at home and at school. We have painted classrooms and buildings; we have written legislators and educated them about our children's needs and rights. We have collated and stapled hundreds of newsletters, attended school board meetings, lobbied at the state legislature for better legislation for handicapped children, informed newspaper reporters about inhumane conditions in institutions, and written letters to editors. All this we have done for 20 years or more.

Small wonder that so many professionals would often prefer not to deal with parents. Few of these qualities encourage the kind of open, frank, informative dialogue that the professional wants. Possibly as much as the parent should want it.

Changing habits of communication cannot happen without efforts from both parents and professionals. There are some suggestions for achieving the dialogue that could be so helpful to the parent, the professional, and most importantly, the child.

**Suggestions for Professionals**

- Let the parent be involved every step of the way. The dialogue established may be the most important thing you accomplish. If the parent's presence is an obstacle to testing because the child will not "cooperate" in his presence, the setup should include a complete review of the testing procedure with the parent. (Remote video viewing or one-way windows are great if you are richly endowed.)

Make a realistic management plan part of the assessment outcome. Give the parents suggestions for how to live with the problem on a day to day basis, considering the needs of the child, the capacities of the family, and the resources of the community. Let the parents know that you will suggest modifications if any aspect of the management plan does not work.

Inform yourself about community resources. Give the parents advice on how to go about getting what they need. Steer them to the local parent organization. Wherever possible, make the parent a team member in the actual diagnostic, treatment, or educational procedures. It will give you a chance to observe how the parent and child interact.

Write your reports in clear and understandable language. Professional terminology is a useful shortcut for your own notes, and you can always use it to communicate with other professionals. But in situations involving the parent, it becomes an obstacle to understanding. Keep in mind that it is the parent who must live with the child, help him along, shop for services to meet his needs, support his ego, and give him guidance. You could be there to do it for him, so the parent must be as well informed as you can make him. Information that he does not understand is not useful to him. The goal is to make him understand his child well enough to help him handle his problems.

Give copies of the reports to parents. They will need them to digest and understand the information in them, to share the information with other people close to the child, and to sign the papers or monthly reports which usually appear in a new document in the future will otherwise entail.

Be sure the parent understands that there is no such thing as a one-shot final and unchanging diagnosis. Make sure he understands that whenever fules you give his child or a label must be given is merely a facade for communicating and one which may have all kinds of repercussions, many of them unpleasant. Make sure he understands that a
speak very little about the child at present and even less about the child of the future. Caution them against using that label to "explain" his child's conditions to other people.

Help the parent to think of life with this child in the same terms as life with his other children. It is an ongoing, problem-solving process. Assure him that he is capable of that problem-solving, and that you will be there to help him with it.

Be sure that the parent understands his child's abilities and assesses them as well as his disabilities and deficiencies. What the child can do is far more important than what he cannot do, and the parent's goal thereafter is to look for, anticipate, expect, and welcome new abilities and to welcome them with joy when they appear. Urge him to be honest with his child. Tell him that the most important job he has is to respect his child, as well as love him, and to help him "feel good about himself". Tell him that blame, either self-blame or the parent's, child must be avoided.

Warn the parent about "service" insufficiencies. Equip him with advice on how to make his way through the system of "help" services. Warn him that they are not always helpful. Tell him that the child has a right to services. Tell him to insist on being a part of all decisions about his child.

Explain to him that some people with whom he talks (teachers, doctors, professionals of any kind, or other parents) may emphasize the negative. Help the parent not only to think positively but to teach the other people about his child's life to do the same.

Suggestions for Parents

You are the pioneer helper, the coordinator, the consultant, the decision-maker for your child. Invest that you be treated as such. It is your right to understand your child's diagnosis and the reasons for the treatment recommendations and the transitional placement. So changes in his treatment and transitional placement should be made only with your consent, without consultation with you.

Your success as a parent is as important as your child's. Not to have your child's needs understood can be very disturbing, but you can do your child's job. Speak up for your child. A parent who speaks up is a parent who is respected. It is your right to be respected.

The way you handle that resistance is important. Your best tool is not anger. Some of your job will include the gentler art of persuasion. Stay confident and cool about your own abilities and intuitions. You know your child better than anyone else; you are a vital member of the team of experts.

Try to find a person who can help you coordinate the various diagnostic and treatment services. Pick the person with whom you have the best relationship, someone who understands your role as the principal monitor of your child's progress throughout life and who will help you become a good one.

Learn to keep records. As soon as you know that your child has a problem, start a notebook. Make entries of your child's condition and its course, dates of visits, names, addresses, phone numbers, dates of visits, the person present during the visit, and as much of what was said as you can remember. Keep these records separate. You can turn to them in the evening, or look them over at your leisure.

Record the questions you asked and the answers you received. Record any recommendations made. Make records of phone calls that make the diagnosis, the purpose, and the result. It is best to keep the notebook at home. Keep a copy for your personal use. Such documentation for every step of your efforts to get your child the treatment he needs can be evidence which can persuade a program director to give him what he needs. Without concise records of whom you spoke to, when you spoke to him, what you promised, and how long you waited between the request and the response, you will be handicapped. Someone can be held accountable for conversations or meetings with persons whose names and titles you do not remember, or dates you cannot recall, or about topics which you cannot clearly discuss.

Communicate the terminology used by the professionals. Ask him to translate the terms and the language. Ask him to start examples of what he means. Do not leave his office until you are sure you understand what he has said. Ask him what you can do in your child's treatment. Ask him what he expects of you, and if the child's progress is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.


Maintaining Momentum
Talk freely and openly with as many professionals as you can find. Talk with other parents. Join a parent organization. By talking with people who have been through it already, you can gain a perspective on your particular problems. You will also receive moral support and will not feel quite so alone. Get information from parent organizations about available services and about their quality. Remember that a particular program might not help your child even though it has proved helpful for another child. Visit programs if you have the time and energy to do so. There is no substitute for firsthand views.

Stay in close touch with your child's teacher. Make sure you know what is being done in the classroom so that you can follow through at home. Share what you discussed with the teacher. Ask for advice and suggestions. The more you are a team working for the same goals, the more likely that you are to make progress.

Listen to your child. Only he can give you his point of view. Let him know that being different is all right. Your child will learn most from your example. Help him to think of problems as things that can be solved if people work on them together.

Changes and the Future

The new parent today faces a world which is fortunately improved in many ways. The fact that his child has a legal right to education and training does not surprise this parent, and he expects programs to be provided. Consequently, his attitude toward his school system and the people in it is different. He expects the vital services to be provided.

He is not asking for services as if they were charity, nor is he left with no option other than the institution if the few existing public or private special classes refuse his children. Some things have not changed, however, and will not unless we make them. The diagnostic experience is often still traumatic to many parents who receive little counsel, encouragement, or on-the-spot information about where to go for extra support and help. Obviously, such experiences and the damage they do will simply repeat themselves with another generation of parents unless the individuals involved take deliberate steps such as the ones outlined here to avoid that possibility.
Communicating with Parents:
It Begins with Listening

PAUL LICHTER
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It has been observed in both
research studies and autobiographical
accounts by parents that one
effect of raising a handicapped child
is isolation. Parents may feel iso-
lated from members of the
extended family, neighbors, and old
friends who fear, resent, or feel
uncomfortable and embarrassed by
the handicapping condition. Many
parents either anticipate or actually
experience social rejection, pity, ridic-
ule, and the related loss of self
esteem and social prestige.

It is not uncommon to find
parents of handicapped children
withdrawing from social participa-
tion and altering plans which might
expose them or their child to social
rejection. This withdrawal or rejection
may further frustrate the parents
and thereby increase their hostility,
resentment, or anger toward those
around them. This, in turn, makes it
more likely that their family,
friends, and neighbors will want to
have even fewer associations with
them. Parents may find themselves
in the grip of a vicious cycle of rejec-
tion and isolation.

This becomes an even more
significant problem for parents of
young handicapped children who
have only just begun the painful and
lengthy "coming out" process in
which they publicly acknowledge
their child's handicapping condi-
tion. Part of this process involves
the replacement of unhelpful or
negative family members and
friends with a new constellation
which might include other parents
of handicapped children, commu-
nity agencies or associations, and
special educators as their primary
source of emotional support and
understanding. But, prior to the de-
velopment of these new relation-
ships, it may be the special teacher
who best comes to know and care
for the child. The special teacher
can be a powerful therapeutic helper
as the family struggles with problems
of isolation.

NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING
The thrust of recent legislation and
judicial decrees has been to bring an
increasing number of children with
a variety of handicapping conditions
into the schools, at earlier ages than
ever before. This situation implies
an increasing number of contacts
with parents who are new to the
task of raising a handicapped child
and who will need considerable
understanding and support as they
learn to accommodate and adapt to
their child's special needs. This need
for understanding, made even more
crucial by the possible isolation
from traditional sources of family
or neighborhood support, places an
additional obligation upon the spe-
cial educator to form a helping rela-
tionship, not only with the children
in the classroom, but with their
parents as well. In addition, these
relationships provide the teacher
with an opportunity to be a source
of positive growth for the entire
family, as well as the opportunity
for personal growth.

LISTENING TO OTHERS
The process of helping another
person begins by accepting the total
person in a nonjudgmental manner,
and communicating an attitude of
acceptance as clearly as possible. One very direct way to communicate acceptance of others, particularly to those in stress, is to listen to their feelings and to the ways in which those feelings are "coded" in language.

Listening may be either passive—where one simply listens in relative silence and where silence is an expression of openness and acceptance—or it may take a more active form in which the listener verbalizes his understanding of what was said, finds the feeling behind the verbal statement, and puts it back to the speaker for verification and clarification.

This technique, described as "active listening," is a profound way to communicate a willingness to hear, to understand, and to have empathy with someone who is isolated and struggling to be heard. Active listening has its roots in the client centered therapy of Carl Rogers (1951). The continuing success of Thomas Gordon's Parent Effectiveness Training book (1970) and courses attest to its real value for parents, teachers, and others in the helping professions.

ROADBLOCKS TO COMMUNICATION

Typically, it is assumed that being an effective helper means giving advice. When friends or family members come to us with a problem, they will often ask, "What shall I do?" or "What would you do if you were I?" Rather than actively listening to the content and feelings implied by these kinds of questions, we all too willingly respond with advice, i.e., "If I were you, I would..."

Let's face it, being asked for advice and giving it quickly is a powerful reinforcer and can be interpreted as a validation of our wisdom, vision, and mental well-being. Relinquishing this power is difficult and threatening, particularly if the advice giver has occasional second thoughts about his own wisdom, vision, or mental well-being.

Teachers often have the mistaken notion that it is their duty to help parents accept or adjust to their handicapped child by giving advice or direction. This attitude may reflect the possibility that the teacher has already made a judgment of the parents and has evaluated them as maladjusted, unrealistic, or disturbed. Given this predisposition, it is possible that the teacher may turn to any number or combination of generally unhelpful strategies such as ordering, admonishing, exhorting, moralizing, preaching; advising, blaming, psychoanalyzing, ridiculing, lecturing, questioning, humoring, or criticizing the parents.

Take, for example, a hypothetical situation in which a mother has enrolled her young handicapped child in a preschool or infant stimulation program, but fails to bring the child to school on a regular basis. The teacher decides to discuss these repeated absences and reverts to one of the above mentioned strategies. (See box below.)

LISTENING TO PARENTS

Listening is a skill which involves decoding the speaker's message to more fully understand the emotion or feeling behind the message. The listener is active in the process in that he reflects or provides verbal feedback to the speaker to test his own understanding of what has been said (see Figure 1). Another reason for listening actively is to communicate to the speaker that you are trying to understand the basic message and, if successful, that you have shared his verbal exploration. Bratman (1973) stated that a reflection accurately executed to the speaker's satisfaction is an objective definition of understanding.

The active listener translates his raw perceptions of what the parent is saying into more simple, precise, and culturally relevant language. The listener feeds back only what was said and carefully avoids adding his own ideas. To help in this process, the listener should constantly be asking internally, "What is this..."
parent saying to me?" At the time of a natural break in the flow of ideas and feelings, the listener gives a concise summary of what he has heard. The feedback may include both cognitive content and feelings, if these are an important part of the speaker's message. The novice active listener would do well to focus initially on the content side and approach the reflection of emotion with some caution until more comfortable and practiced with the technique. Of course, an emotionally loaded message cannot and should not be "diverted" or left unrecognized.

The teacher should look for some cue that his reflection has been helpful and adequately reflected. The box below shows two examples of active listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent:</strong></td>
<td>I'm really pleased with the progress Loretta has been making with the new speech therapist; he's so thoughtful and kind to always keep us informed about her progress.</td>
<td><strong>Teacher:</strong> You like him very much, then. <strong>Parent:</strong> I do, very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent:</strong></td>
<td>I just don't understand. One day I feel that Gregory really likes his school, and the next day he says he hates it.</td>
<td><strong>Teacher:</strong> He really confuses you. <strong>Parent:</strong> Yes, he sure does, and besides...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some cautions in the use of active listening. If the listener is not careful, he may develop a highly stylized way of responding which may become annoying to the speaker. Worse, the speaker may interpret the stylized response as artificial, phony, or indicative of the listener's lack of genuine concern. Phrases such as "I hear you saying..." or "What I think you're saying is..." should not be repeated too often. Using a reflection may seem a bit unnatural at first until the active listener begins to experience some rewards in the form of encouraging responses from the speaker.

After a while it will feel more like a natural form of communication than the gagle of questions, opinions, veiled threats, or bland conciliatory quips that we too often employ in our everyday communication. Ultimately, parents should experience a feeling of being understood as a consequence of active listening; for many parents of a handicapped child, this may be the first step out of isolation. Parents may also experience more specific outcomes in the form of developing a sense of connection and direction to a string of otherwise seemingly rambling statements.

Active listening fosters a kind of catharsis and helps parents initially to identify and subsequently to accept their own feelings. In addition, people tend to feel comfortable with the listener who reflects skillfully. In the school setting this may influence the parent to be more open to a cooperative home-school relationship. Active listening is a technique which encourages parents to think independently and to discover their own solutions; it communicates the teacher's belief and respect in the parents' potential for self-discovery.

Active listening is a skill which requires considerable practice in a laboratory or clinical setting. Many colleges and universities offer basic counseling or guidance courses which introduce and allow for the guided practice of active listening skills. Inservice programs or some of the commercially available courses such as Parent Effectiveness Training (PET), "help" training opportunities for those who desire more experience with this technique.

A summary of guidelines for active listening includes:

1. Listen for the basic message of the speaker.
2. Restate to the speaker a simple and concise summary of the basic content and/or feeling of the message.
3. Observe a cue or ask for a response from the speaker to confirm the accuracy and helpfulness of the reflection.
4. Allow the speaker to correct your perception if it was inaccurate.

**ATTITUDES REQUIRED AND RISKS INVOLVED**

Gordon (1960) stressed that active listening is not simply an external technique "pulled out of the top hat" whenever someone has a problem. Rather, it is a method for putting to work a basic set of attitudes about human relationships. Without these attitudes, the teacher who attempts to listen to a parent will appear to be false, empty, mechanical, or insincere. Whenever these attitudes are absent, a teacher cannot be an effective active listener. Gordon listed basic attitudes which must be present during conversation:

1. You must want to hear, and have the time to hear, what the parent has to say. If you don't, say so.
2. You must want to be helpful with the parent's problem at that time. Otherwise, wait until you do.
3. You must be able to accept the parent's feelings, whatever they may be or however different they are from yours. To accept his feelings does not mean that you must accept them as your own, but simply that you allow...
him the right to feel as he does. It is a way of saying, "I can be me, and you can be you."

4. You must believe in the parent's ability to find solutions to his own problems. This requires the teacher to give up decision making power over the parent's life. The risks involved in active listening stem from the process itself, which requires the listener to suspend his own thoughts and feelings. Active listening is not easy; it is physically and mentally demanding. It requires that we attend fully to another person, that we cease to focus on our own concerns or problems, that we suspend our moralistic and ethnocentric biases and judgments. In short, it compels the listener to see the world as another sees it.

The teacher who willingly listens to parents risks having his opinions and attitudes changed and invites the possibility of having to reinterpret his own experiences. For some teachers this will be seen as an intensely threatening experience, and for this reason they should refrain from its use. Others will choose to actively listen to parents as part of their personal and professional commitment to families of handicapped children, as well as in the interest of expanding their own human potential.
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Public Law 94-142 will be regarded by some educators as a threat and a challenge from parents and by others as an opportunity for parents and teachers to work together. Perhaps the major difference between the two groups of educators is one of attitude, because to a certain extent the behaviors will be similar. Those who are fearful of the law will take steps to insure that confidentiality of information is assured that children are tested in a nondiscriminatory manner, that individualized education programs (IEPs) are written with long and short term goals, that due process procedures are guaranteed, and that parents are notified of any changes in program.

Those who look forward to the opportunity for parents and teachers to plan cooperatively for the welfare of children will take the same steps. While one group will carefully collect and document defensive data (i.e., a log of the number of phone calls made and registered letters sent to parents informing them of placement decisions), the other group will be equally concerned with attempts to get parents actively involved in educational decisions regarding their own children. In many ways it is unfortunate that laws must be passed to insure dialogue between parents and teachers when many teachers have experienced the benefits of this type of interaction for years.

Hardly any educator would deny the strong influence that the home has on a child's growth and development. In fact, when a child does not learn or misbehaves in the classroom, parental attitudes and behavior are usually highlighted as the major reason. If parental influence is accepted as a potent force in child behavior, problems teachers do not use daily report cards tests, that is, co-operative for the welfare of children. Thereafter behavior modification techniques for parents or teachers who do not "believe" in rewards for correct behavior. Or, try to convince a number of parents who believe in going back to the basics that it is important to teach their children socialization skills. Therefore, it becomes necessary for teachers to be aware of their own values and to be cognizant of the values that parents bring to conferences or parent group meetings.

VALUES AND ATTITUDES

As a behavioralist, there is a tendency to ignore values and attitudes because of the difficulty in measurement. However, one should recognize that people often act on the values they hold, rather than on "hard" data. Millions of people smoke cigarettes even though data indicate that this can be harmful to their health; large numbers of adults and children are overweight even though data indicate that this can lead to early death or severe health problems; teachers do not use daily report card systems even though data indicate that this technique helps accelerate the growth of many children.

Just how important values are can be tested by trying to teach behavior modification techniques to parents or teachers who do not "believe" in rewards for correct behavior. Or, try to convince a number of parents who believe in going back to the basics that it is important to teach their children socialization skills. Therefore, it becomes necessary for teachers to be aware of their own values and to be cognizant of the values that parents bring to conferences or parent group meetings.

There are a number of sources that teachers may turn to as aids in value clarification of assessment:

1. "Engage in values classification activities." Simon, Howes, and Karchenbellin (1972) have prepared a number of value classification exercises for students and teachers. Some may be carried out alone and others involve other people.

2. "Engage in values assessment techniques." Kroth and Simpson (1977) have included a number of techniques for assessing one's own values as they relate to parents. Such exercises as "Who Am I," "The Balance Scale," and "Are You a Teacher Who...?" for teachers, or "Are You a Parent Who...?" and "Whom Would You Tell?" for parents, may be helpful in reviewing values.

3. "Develop your own values assessment techniques." It would probably be helpful for each teacher to spend some time with paper and pencil to do some introspection or to meet with some other teachers in "rap sessions" on what each individual believes about teaching and working with parents.

The same positive attitude and feeling of confidence that teachers have toward working with exceptional children will produce fruitful results in working with their parents.

CONFERENCE SKILLS

Most special educators are knowledgeable, skillful, and well trained in working with exceptional children. Many of the same skills are effective in working with parents. Following are some of the factors that may influence the interaction between parents and teachers:

1. Environment. Arrange that a comfortable and free from interruptions seems to be conducive to good conferences. Placing a table between parent and teacher seems to act as a barrier to discussion (Kroth & Simpson, 1977).

2. Listening. A teacher who is a good active listener can gain a great deal of information and can help parents in problem solving conferences. The responsive posture and attending skills that a teacher uses with children are very effective with parents (Kroth, 1977).

3. Recording. Learn to write down any important information that parents may share. When you go to a doctor or lawyer, you expect the professional to make notes. This is a technique to help you remember, but it also stresses to the parent that you care about what he says. The information then can be feedback to the parent to insure its accuracy.

4. Timing. Just as children like to know when assignments are due or how much time they have to work on a project, parents appreciate knowing how long the conference will be or how often they will be expected to come. Adhering to time limits in both the length of time and number of conferences seems to enhance the effectiveness of parent/teacher problem solving conferences (Batten & Batten, 1975).

There are a number of books that may be helpful to teachers.

Following is a list of some that are in paperback:


The conference is an opportunity for the significant adults in a child's life to get together for joint planning. As the child becomes older, he/she should be included also.

PARENT EDUCATION

Professionals recognize that parents need to be involved in the education of their own children. There are not enough professionals to provide all of the services needed, but probably more important is the need for consistency between school and home. Many of the methods and materials used by teachers in the classroom can be replicated in the home by parents. Parents have been taught filial therapy (Guerney, 1969), behavior management (Adamson, 1970), to teach their own children (Kroth & Simpson, 1977), plus how to teach their children to read, to be assertive, to use effective parenting and bonding, etc. (Scholl & Kroth, in press). Classroom teachers have involved parents as aides and have taught them to grade papers, record data, listen to children read, and to run such programs as the Monterey Reading and Mathematics programs. With the success of a variety of parent education programs, it is reasonable to expect that progressively more educators will become increasingly involved in parent education.

In designing and planning parent programs, the educators will want to consider the following factors:

1. Heterogeneity. Parents are not a homogeneous body. The only thing they may have in common is a handicapped child. Some will be well read, some will be skilled modifiers, and some will be good listeners. The educators will need to analyze the parents' needs just as the children's needs are taken into consideration in the classroom. Differential diagnoses should lead to differential programming.

2. Size. In general, parent education groups should be kept small. Most programs reported in the literature seem to run from 6 to 10 individuals plus the group leader(s). It is extremely difficult to have meaningful interaction in groups of more than 10. Large groups usually end up being lectures with a one-way flow of information.

3. Time. A parent education program should have clear objectives and usually a specified number of sessions. For example, if a teacher can say to parents that they will be involved in a program where they can learn to help their children read and that it will involve four 1 hour sessions, parents seem to respond better than if the goals are vague and the length of commitment is not clear.

Special educators have a number of skills and techniques to share with parents. Strategies for designing programs are described in greater detail in Getting Schools Involved with Parents (Scholl & Kroth, in press). Basically, the same process that a teacher goes through in developing a lesson plan for a teaching unit applies to developing an individualized parent education program.

COMMERCIAL PROGRAMS

There are a number of commercial materials that have been developed in the last few years. Most of these programs require a minimum amount of background to implement. They include teachers' manuals and other necessary materials.

The advantages of using commercial material are that it insures that basic points will not be overlooked by the presenter and the audiovisual materials provide variety to the workshop. The disadvantage is that "canned" presentations never seem completely right for a particular group. Usually the presenter ends up modifying the program by leaving something out or adding to it.

The following kits address various phases of parenting, parent education, or techniques for working with parents. Some are relatively "user free" but most of them should be used by skilled leaders.


As interest in parent/teacher interaction increases, one can expect that large numbers of kits will appear on the market. Just as with any commercial teaching materials, teachers will need to be judicious in selecting kits that are appropriate for their parent population.

CONCLUSION

Working with parents may be one of the most important and significant activities that educators can engage in. Not only is the activity mandated by law but the development of consistency between school and home may make it possible for children to grow enough to function in society.

With the advent of Public Law 94-142, parents as well as teachers need to learn how to confer. Some special educators have already started programs to teach parents how to prepare for conferences and how to be active participants in appraisal and review committee meetings. The assumption is that the more parents know about educational techniques and procedures, the more active they can be in the educational process.
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Conclusion
The Yet To Be Served—A Perspective

HERBERT J. PREHM, JAMES E. MCDONALD

In Futures of Children, Hobbs (1975) articulated a set of principles that could serve as a basis for providing the children of our nation with the best care and education of which we are capable. Later that year the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142, established, through law, a number of the principles presented in Futures of Children. Both documents reflected the advocacy of individual rights, court decisions, and intense study of issues and procedures revolving around the identification, classification, and education of children who proved difficult for societal institutions to accommodate within their traditional patterns of service.

A central principle of both documents was the tenet that each child has a right to an individualized education. Priority for the delivery of educational services under Public Law 94-142 has been assigned to severely handicapped and unserved children. A second, but equally important, priority is the provision of services to mildly handicapped and underserved children. While these priorities appear to be clear and to advocate the right to education for all handicapped children, implementation of programs designed to meet these priorities is variable. As a result, there remain handicapped children yet to be served.

This issue of Exceptional Children is focused on the Yet To Be Served. The purpose of the issue is threefold. First, this issue of the journal is designed to explore the issues and opportunities involved in meeting the educational needs of the yet to be served. Second, the issue is intended to provoke discussion and debate that will clarify our opportunities for service. Third, the issue will, hopefully, stimulate increased efforts in behalf of those handicapped children yet to be served.

This article is intended to serve as an introduction to the overall topic of the yet to be served. It is our purpose to (a) present an alternative perspective of the exceptional child; (b) provide a brief overview of the state of the art with respect to the yet to be served; and (c) briefly discuss three issues not discussed by the other articles included in this issue of Exceptional Children.

Exceptional Children and Youth—A Perspective

Many definitions of exceptional children have been advanced over the years. Most definitions emphasize that the exceptional child is one who cannot obtain maximum benefit from the usual school program afforded the typical child. Exceptionality is usually attributed to intellectual, physical, sensory, or socioemotional causes. Because the exceptional child cannot obtain maximum benefit from the usual school program, supplemental, specialized educational services are required. It is important to note that it is the behaviors of the child that lead to referral and classification as exceptional. These same behaviors can be described as skills and the child’s performance described as skill levels.

Based on this analysis, we prefer to define exceptional children and youth as children and youth who have motor, self help, cognitive, or personal-social skills that deviate significantly from the skill levels of their same age cultural or ethnic group peers. This definition of exceptional children and youth focuses on the behavioral skills of the child. The child’s skill deviation can be in one or more of the skill domains. The definition does not state that exceptionality is due to deafness, blindness, retardation or any other internal trait. Rather, the definition stresses that a child is exceptional because the skill levels demonstrated by the child are significantly different from the skill levels exhibited by the child’s age and cultural group peers.

Using this definition as a base, handicapped children can be defined as children whose...
Skill levels are significantly below those of their peers. Gifted children would be those who exhibit skill levels significantly above the skill levels of their peers.

Implicit within the definition is an interaction between biological attributes of the child and the degree to which the child has been taught. While biological damage may produce sensory, intellectual, or physical impairment, the skill levels demonstrated by the child are a result of both the damage and the degree to which the child has been taught. Instruction is, therefore, also a significant determinant of exceptionality.

Consideration of cultural, ethnic, and group age peers have been included in the definition because of an accumulation of data (e.g., Mercer, 1973) that has demonstrated that failure to take cultural/ethnic variables into account has resulted in excessive numbers of minority group children being misclassified as handicapped. Data adjusted for cultural context demonstrates the need to relate skill levels of exceptional children to the skill levels exhibited by both their cultural and age group peers.

The definition avoids defining exceptional children in terms of the public school. Thus, the definition opens the age range within which persons can be considered exceptional. By avoiding reference to the school, the definition also recognizes the reality that the education of exceptional children occurs in a wide range of settings. A further advantage of the definition is its stress on skill levels. This emphasis places the focus of instruction in its proper perspective: the improvement of skill levels. Efforts to meet the educational needs of the yet to be served will have to focus on the delivery of special education in a wide variety of settings and on age groups outside those usually served by the school. Educational efforts in behalf of the yet to be served must also focus on the enhancement of each child's motor, self-help, cognitive, and personal-social skills.

The State of the Art

Identification and Evaluation

One reason for the existence of the yet to be served as a group is the fact that they are sometimes difficult to identify and evaluate using traditional means. Our procedures and evaluation tools are not readily adapted to multiply handicapped, infant, or multicultural exceptional children. Comparing children to a norm that does not represent them or interpreting test results based on extrapolated norms presents serious problems when determining the eligibility of children for special services. Evaluation of exceptional children (i.e., specific testing and measurement practices) needs to be reviewed critically and presented in a later issue of this journal.

Progress is being made in the development of standardized testing procedures for some subgroups of the yet to be served. The contributors to this issue note, however, that most current, effective assessment efforts are designed to analyze functional behaviors (i.e., skills) as a basis for instructional planning.

While progress in developing procedures for assessing the functional skill levels of exceptional children is being made, development of procedures and tools for identifying the yet to be served is hampered by a variety of problems. Children with mild or subtle skill deviations are being passed over in favor of children with more extreme deviations. Many teachers are unprepared to recognize mild deviations in skill development. Systematic referral programs for children with mild deviations are underdeveloped. Teachers may also be reluctant, as noted in Meyen's article, to refer handicapped children for evaluation. Because of the pressure for timeliness, local education agencies may be directing evaluation resources to the more obvious exceptionalities. If the allocation of evaluation resources is inequitable, it is likely that some mildly handicapped children are not being identified and are, therefore, at risk for being underserved. In the rush to identify and evaluate handicapped children, the gifted, including minority gifted and handicapped gifted, are often overlooked or assigned low priority. Each of these problems contributes uncounted numbers of children to the population of the yet to be served.

Intervention Strategies

The articles that follow document the diversity of the population of the yet to be served. Each of these subgroups presents unique educational problems and opportunities. As a result, diversity of instructional effort is the norm. Documentation of the effectiveness of the developing instructional efforts is frequently lacking. The development of instructional programs based on behavioral skill analyses will...
lead, however, to the acquisition of data demonstrating program effectiveness for each group.

A number of instructional problems are common to each of the subgroups discussed. What should these children be taught? How does what they need to be taught relate to the regular curriculum? How does the curriculum relate to the skills needed to function as independently as possible as adults? Under what conditions is the curriculum most effectively delivered? How does the curriculum accommodate unusual educational settings (e.g., correctional facilities, group homes)? What curriculum and setting is appropriate for infants or young adults? How do we involve the regular educator in the instructional program for the yet-to-be-served? While each of these problems is common to each group of the yet-to-be-served, each solution is as varied as the subgroups themselves.

**Resource Allocation**

While allocating funds for resources and support services based on numbers of children with categorical handicaps might be administratively expedient, such an allocation system implies a state of the art that simply does not exist. Tying financial resources to categorical disabilities promulgates beliefs that (a) categorical disabilities are operationally defined and functional; (b) children of one disability are homogeneous and exclusive of children of another disability; (c) knowledge of a child's disability predicates the selection of one instructional program over another; (d) there is a significant interaction between diagnosis, teaching program, and change in skill level; and (e) all exceptional children, that is, those in need of special services, will be identified and served adequately via a categorical model. These beliefs have been shown to be unsubstantiated (Forness, 1974; Lilly, 1974; McDonald, 1968; Reger, 1972; Weiderholt, 1974).

Adhering to this regimen will have profound effects. In addition to perpetuating a system founded in supposition and nonfact, it will overshadow the significance of determining exceptionality by observation and evaluation of skill domains. Consequently, the practice of designing instructional programs based on continuous assessment and identification of learner needs will be delayed. More importantly, perhaps, adherence to a categorical system of resource allocation may preclude service to the yet-to-be-served because the nature of their instructional needs may prohibit a "categorical diagnosis."

It is time for progressive change. One level of change is to modify the present method of allocating financial resources for program support. If the instructional needs of the yet to be served are to be met, modification of our resource allocation patterns must be made. Reports (Bernstein, Kirst, Hartman & Marshall, 1976; McLure, Burnham, & Henderson, 1975; Hobbs, 1975; Levin, 1978; Lilly, 1972; Reynolds & Birch, 1977; Rossmiller, Hecker, & Frohreich, 1970) of various funding plans show that resource allocation systems designed to meet the needs of the yet-to-be-served should accomplish the following:

1. Modify eligibility criteria for special services so that they (a) assess areas of learner need and identify specific skill deficits; (b) are relative to cultural or ethnic group age peers; and (c) do not assume that all instructional needs are based on the child's disability.

2. Compensate cross categorical or noncategorical teaching to (a) enable comprehensive assessment and identification of learner needs; (b) provide systematic teaching practices designed to remediate identified learner needs; and (c) enable instruction to be designed to the shared needs of many children.

3. Shift the financial reimbursement system from a child count to the support of the teacher and support personnel.

4. Reimburse local education agencies for developing special instructional and compensatory programs (or program components) designed to accommodate varied exceptionalities and needs.

5. Allow an equitable dollar distribution to severely, mildly, and mainstreamed handicapped children as well as gifted children.

Acquiring the funds needed to fulfill the promise of an appropriate, individualized education program for the unserved and underserved remains a problem for both legislative and educational leaders. Failure to solve the problem will lead to continued failure to actualize our promise to the yet to be served.
Three Issues

There are three issues that are not discussed in subsequent articles. These issues bear on the education of the underserved and unserved and must be mentioned. The issues include (a) fragmentation of effort; (b) the insular focus of traditional special education; and (c) substantive compliance with the promises that are implicit in Public Law 94-142 and much of our current special education literature.

Fragmentation

As a profession, special education is very fragmented. The fragmentation is the result of professional practices and personal preferences. Historically, we have divided exceptional children into discrete subgroups and developed discrete, separate programs for the preparation of personnel to teach a particular categorical subgroup. In some local education agencies, service delivery for different groups of exceptional children was sometimes assigned to unrelated administrative units.

By focusing on the differences between exceptional children, we produced multiple subprofessions within special education. We have created a situation wherein special educators interested in one category of exceptionality fail to see themselves as having anything in common with special educators interested in a different group of exceptional children. We have also created a situation wherein persons interested in a given category of child sometimes compete against other categories of exceptionality in order to secure a more advantageous share of scarce resources.

By competing with one another, we are weakening our overall effort in behalf of the served, underserved, and unserved exceptional children. This fragmentation of effort, interest, and rhetoric serves to confuse the public and their legislators, retard the improvement of services for all exceptional children, and create false schisms within the profession.

By these comments, we are not condemning an interest in a particular group of exceptional children. We are, however, urging that when we serve as an advocate for a specific group of exceptional children, we also advocate for the other groups as well. Coalitions have been effective for parents of exceptional children. Coalitions should be equally effective for special educators. Only through common, coordinated efforts in behalf of all exceptional children can we develop the comprehensive programs needed to meet the needs of the yet to be served.

Insular Focus

Since the early 1900s, the education of exceptional children has been a phenomenon increasingly identified with the public school. Public Law 94-142 makes the provision of educational services to handicapped children the responsibility of the local and state education agency. While the focus of responsibility is appropriate, the historical focus on the public school has made many special educators myopic about where special education occurs.

Instructional programs for institutionalized mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children were frequently outside the purview of the public school. This was also true of educational services for handicapped children in juvenile detention facilities.

As a result of these practices, the public school classroom became the focus of special education efforts. As is evident from this issue of Exceptional Children, many of the yet to be served are found in settings outside the traditional focal point of special education. As a result of our insular focus, the development of special education services for children in unusual settings has been retarded.

If we are to accelerate the rate at which the state of our art develops, we must become less insular in focus. We must become more outgoing. As noted by Reynolds and Birch (1977), special education is being provided in settings that are increasingly diverse and decentralized. Maintenance of this trend is important if we are going to provide an appropriate education for the yet to be served.

Substantive Compliance

Substantive compliance with the promises inherent in Public Law 94-142 and Futures of Children is necessary if we are to meet the educational needs of the yet to be served. Substantive compliance means developing the best service plan possible for all exceptional children. This plan is committed to the ideology represented by human rights, legislation, and the right to education principle.

State and local education agencies are hurriedly developing procedural compliance guidelines and monitoring systems. Proce-
dural compliance plans are being developed without the benefit of adequate opportunity to analyze all the implications of meeting the varied and comprehensive requirements of the law. The result seems to be a trend toward meeting minimum standards only. Meeting minimum standards is procedural compliance with the law.

Forces that work against the development of plans to achieve substantive compliance are varied and complex. Some of these forces include the following facts (Clifford, 1978; Hobbs, 1975; McDermott & Aron, 1978; Reynolds & Birch, 1977; Sarason & Doris, 1978):
1. Not everyone supports the right to education principle.
2. Attitudinal problems toward the handicapped are ever present.
3. Teacher associations are not always enthusiastic about mainstreaming and its implications.
4. Teachers are becoming vocal about the lack of adequate funding and resources needed to teach exceptional children and/or maintain mainstreaming programs.
5. Preservice and inservice training programs have not prepared regular or special educators for their emerging roles.
6. Support for many "special" programs is decreasing because of the accompanying problems and bureaucratic paper chase.

These problems will not be alleviated by focusing on procedural compliance. They can only be overcome through concerted efforts focused on the development of long-range plans designed to achieve the best possible education for all children of a community. Reynolds and Birch (1977) document a number of locales where such plans are being developed and implemented.

Substantive compliance will improve educational opportunities for all children. Only through substantive compliance will we be able to keep our promise to the yet to be served.

Concluding Comments

All handicapped children have been promised a free appropriate education. The promise recognizes that some handicapped children are not yet receiving services and that some handicapped children are underserved. This issue of the journal identifies a number of different groups of yet to be served exceptional children. Common to each of these groups is the fact that they exhibit motor, self-help, cognitive, or personal-social skills which deviate significantly from the skill levels of their same age cultural or ethnic group peers. The articles that follow describe issues, problems, and programs related to the identification, evaluation, and education of the yet to be served. While a number of problems in meeting the educational needs of these groups are identified, the articles also document that the educational needs of unserved and underserved exceptional children can be met through coordinated efforts and instructional programs that are in substantive compliance with our promise.
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