

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 012

EC 001 216

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF. (VIRGINIA BEACH, MARCH 15-19, 1964).

BY- QUIGLEY, STEPHEN P.

REPORT NUMBER OE-35085

PUB DATE

66

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$2.76 69P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER EDUCATION, *DEAF, *TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, *STUDENT TEACHING, *ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS), SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, TEACHER CERTIFICATION, CHILDREN, ADOLESCENTS, TEACHERS, PUBLIC LAW 87 276, PUBLIC LAW 88 164, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF,

PARTICIPANTS IN THE FOUR-DAY NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF COMPILED RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT TEACHER PREPARATION AFTER DISCUSSING FOUR MAJOR TOPIC AREAS. RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF STUDENTS INCLUDED RECRUITMENT OF TEACHERS, TIME OF ENTRY OF STUDENT INTO PROGRAM, PREVIOUS PREPARATION OF STUDENT, AND HIS PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS. GENERAL AND SPECIALIZED CURRICULUM PROGRAMS WERE CONSIDERED ALONG WITH THE DISTRIBUTION, QUALITY, AND MANAGEMENT ASPECTS OF THE PRACTICUM PART OF THE CURRICULUM. CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS AND ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS WERE REVIEWED AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE. APPENDIXES INCLUDE A DISCUSSION OF THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON TEACHER TRAINING FOR THE DEAF AND A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE CURRENT TRENDS IN CURRICULUM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. SURVEY INFORMATION ON INSTITUTIONS AND STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR TEACHER TRAINING IS PRESENTED. CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS ARE LISTED. A REFERENCE LIST CITES NINE ITEMS. THIS DOCUMENT WAS PUBLISHED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20402. \$0.25. (MY)

ED013012

SEP 11 1967

EC 001 216



PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

OE-35085
Bulletin 1966, No. 8

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

*A Report of a
National Conference
Virginia Beach, Virginia
March 15-19, 1964*

Stephen P. Quigley, Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
JOHN W. GARDNER, *Secretary*
Office of Education
HAROLD HOWE II, *Commissioner*

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.235: 35085

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968**

**For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20540 - Price 25 cents**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	Page IV
<i>Chapter I. Conference Background and Procedures</i>	1
<i>Chapter II. Recruitment and Selection of Students</i>	7
<i>Chapter III. Curriculum</i>	11
<i>Chapter IV. Practicum</i>	21
<i>Chapter V. Evaluation, Accreditation, and Administration of Teacher Preparation Programs</i>	29
<i>Chapter VI. Conclusions and Major Recommendations</i>	38
<i>Appendices:</i>	
<i>A. The Federal Program for Training Teachers of the Deaf, Samuel A. Kirk</i>	45
<i>B. Current Trends in Curriculum for Teacher Education, Herbert W. Schooling</i>	47
<i>C. Preliminary Survey Information Program for Training Teachers of the Deaf</i>	52
<i>D. References</i>	56
<i>E. List of Conference Participants and Observers</i>	57

FOREWORD

There is a temptation to describe almost any national conferences these days as being some sort of landmark; however, in the present case, such a description is justified. In a field that has been characterized by many differences of philosophy and opinion, the fact that the conference was even held is noteworthy. More important is the proof, now established by this conference, that those who hold a major responsibility for the preparation of teachers of the deaf can indeed meet and work together, share experiences and ideas, and arrive at some general consensus. This alone is an eloquent testimony to the dynamic forces at work in the education of the deaf today.

Chief among these forces is a growing awareness that the education of the deaf in general leaves a good deal to be desired, and that one way of improving it is to improve the preparation of teachers. Undoubtedly, another force at work is the impact of Federal support for teacher preparation programs. This has resulted not only in a number of new programs and the attraction of a great many students, but also in increased public attention and interest in our work.

The results of this conference cannot be judged solely in terms of the report that follows. While we believe that its conclusions and recommendations will serve as guidelines for the establishment and evaluation of teacher preparation programs, we must also recognize that its most valuable ultimate contribution may arise out of the discussions, the sharing of ideas and an increased understanding of the problems facing us all.

After this auspicious start, it is to be hoped that the future conferences recommended in this report be arranged and conducted in a similar spirit of cooperation. If so, we are sure of success.

EDGAR L. LOWELL.

CHAPTER I CONFERENCE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURES

The stimulation of Federal aid under Public Law 87-276 has undoubtedly been an important factor in developing a renewed interest in preparing teachers of the deaf. The teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in our field, through their professional organizations, were responsible for focusing attention on the lack of trained teachers and the serious need for the expansion of opportunities for the preparation of new teachers. These people, many of whom attended this National Conference on the Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf, along with numerous professional groups, parent organizations, congressional leaders and others, were responsible for the encouragement and final enactment of this legislation.

The results have been highly dramatic. From an average annual output of little more than 125 new teachers during the 10-year period before 1960, more than 500 students are now graduated annually from our training centers. A majority of these students received direct support from the Federal program. All persons interested in the education of deaf children hope that this kind of Federal support will continue as long as the need exists.

During the first 2 years of operation, academic years 1962-63 and 1963-64, a total of 942 scholarships were made available to 48 colleges and universities in 30 States and the District of Columbia. Under a 1-year extension of Public Law 87-276, the Office of Education awarded a total of 432 scholarships to 47 colleges and universities in 29 States and the District of Columbia for academic year 1964-65.

History of Program Development

The preparation of teachers prior to 1940 was managed almost entirely by schools for the deaf on an in-service basis. The principal training feature of this kind of program involved the assignment of a beginning teacher to a master teacher in the school. The preparation of new teachers was often accomplished in this fashion. Eventually, this type of training was formalized and some schools for the deaf conducted training programs of a more structured nature consisting

of didactic course work augmented by observation and practice teaching experience. An even more formal arrangement and set of requirements resulted as these schools worked with institutions of higher education to prepare more and better teachers.

Although the standards of the profession have for many years required the affiliation of practice teaching facilities in schools for the deaf with colleges and universities, the passage of Public Law 87-276 provided the resources to cement the relationship into a stronger, more unified professional endeavor. The law stimulated colleges and universities with existing teacher training programs to adapt them to the requirements of the profession and it motivated other schools to establish new programs where none had previously existed.

The Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf has always been interested and in more recent years has been directly involved in activities designed to improve the profession. By 1961 there were 25 programs that had received approval as teacher preparation centers by this organization. During academic year 1960-61, these 25 centers trained 177 teachers. Since the number of teachers needed at the time was at least 500, the demand exceeded the supply. As in previous years most of the teachers employed were inexperienced and had to be provided with in-service training.¹ In anticipation of the passage of the law in 1961 the number of centers preparing teachers of the deaf increased to 31 with a total of 231 teachers receiving training that year.²

The various centers capable of developing such a program began to prepare themselves for this legislation by marshalling staff and resources for an all-out effort to launch their training activities before final enactment of Federal legislation. The immediate impact of the law after its passage was amply demonstrated by the fact that in the first year of operation, academic year 1962-63, there were 370 scholarship students enrolled in programs of teacher preparation at 43 centers with an additional 100 students being trained without scholarship help.³ During the second year of operation, 1963-64, there were 427 students enrolled in 46 centers receiving grants-in-aid under Public Law 87-276 with an additional 132 students in training at these and other centers.⁴

¹ Council on Education of the Deaf study of the need for teachers of the deaf conducted in 1961 by the organization's legislative chairman Dr. George Pratt, which has been included in the Committee Reports of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House of Representatives Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

² *American Annals of the Deaf*, vol. 106, No. 1, January 1961, p. 113.

³ *American Annals of the Deaf*, vol. 108, No. 1, January 1963, p. 111.

⁴ *American Annals of the Deaf*, vol. 109, No. 1, January 1964, p. 123.

Table I illustrates comparatively the annual increase in the number of training centers and the number of teachers who completed training as reported in the *American Annals of the Deaf* from 1959 through 1964.

Identification of Needs

The question frequently raised in the midst of rapid program expansion such as this one is whether or not quality in training has kept pace with the corresponding quantitative growth. Three factors were evident. They were: (1) a general concern for quality in teacher preparation programs, (2) an increased demand for leadership personnel at the college or university level, and (3) an influx of requests from many training centers for assistance in upgrading course work and for new functional guidelines in the field. As a result, the Office of Education and the Advisory Committee of Public Law 87-276 became aware of an immediate need for a conference on the Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf.

The Advisory Committee of Public Law 87-276 at its January 1963 meeting recommended that a major conference be held and that it be addressed to issues pertinent to the professional preparation of

Table I
Training for Teachers of the Deaf

	School year ending—					
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Number of training centers.....	22	25	31	32	47	51
Number of training centers participating under Public Law 87-276.....					43	46
Number of teachers completed training.....	129	177	231	202	470	559
Number of scholarship students under Public Law 87-276.....					370	427

teachers in this area. Its recommendation to the Commissioner of Education was as follows:

In view of the variety and kinds of problems which have grown out of the various programs for training teachers of the deaf and the need for additional guidelines for the development of curriculum and other considerations, it is recommended that a major conference on the training of teachers of the deaf be called. Such a conference should involve leaders in the field from various colleges and universities, schools and classes for the deaf, instructors of teachers in training centers, and representatives from related disciplines rendering services to deaf children.

The approval for planning this meeting from Commissioner Keppel carried with it the suggestion that the proposed major conference include, in addition to professional educators of the deaf, appropriate representation from higher education, teacher preparation, special education and persons from related disciplines who could contribute much to a broad approach to training of deaf children. The formation of the planning committee and the selection of participants for the major conference were conducted in accordance with this plan.

Planning of the Conference

In June of 1963 the planning committee consisting of seven members was formed. Those asked to serve were Dr. Edgar L. Lowell, Dr. Stephen P. Quigley, Dr. S. Richard Silverman, Dr. Henry Kronenberg, Dr. Tony Vaughan, Dr. Clarence D. O'Connor, and Mrs. Harriet Gough. The Office of Education representatives on the committee were Dr. Eric R. Baber and Dr. Ralph L. Hoag. This planning group held its first meeting in the Office of Education on July 25-26, 1963, at which time the purposes and objectives of the proposed major conference were carefully reviewed and discussed. Specific conference responsibilities were assigned. Dr. Edgar Lowell was asked to serve as conference chairman, Dr. Stephen Quigley as editor, and Dr. Ralph L. Hoag as coordinator. The other members of the committee were assigned liaison and advisory responsibilities for conference topic committee meetings and group work sessions.

At this meeting several alternative conference procedures were reviewed. The format selected contained adaptations of the plan used by the American Speech and Hearing Association for its 1963 National Conference on Graduate Education in Speech Pathology and Audiology, and those used by the American Psychological Association

in its series of national meetings on the training of professional personnel.

The participants and alternates were selected on the basis of educational, organizational, and philosophical representativeness, experience as teachers and educators of the deaf, or for recognized leadership in their particular discipline, and their potential as contributors to such a meeting. Unfortunately, some people who could have made excellent contributions were unable to accept invitations to attend the conference.

Operating Procedures

In attempting to define more specifically the areas of concern, the committee decided that most conference issues could be classified into one of four major topic areas. These were as follows:

- I. Curriculum.
- II. Selection, level, organization and administration.
- III. Practicum.
- IV. Accreditation, certification and evaluation.

Participants who had accepted invitations to attend the conference were assigned to one of the four areas.

Following the first plenary session of the conference, each of the four major topic committees met to identify and record the issues in their respective topic areas. One-half of a working conference day was devoted to this task. Subsequently, the composition of the major topic committees was changed as each new topic was being discussed. All four work groups addressed themselves to the same topic at the same time. This procedure was followed throughout the conference until the final session when the original topic committees were reorganized. For each of the four half-day work sessions the structure of each work group was altered randomly so that every conferee had an opportunity to work on all topics and work with all participants by the end of the conference.

Short plenary meetings preceded each group work session to provide the particular topic chairman with an opportunity to review the suggested agenda of subissues resulting from the initial topic committee meeting. The recorder of each group work session was given the responsibility of writing a summary report of the discussion in the group to which he was assigned and then submitting it to the major topic editor concerned. Since all four groups on each half-day of the conference addressed themselves to a single topic area, the editor of each topic under consideration received reports from four recorders assigned to the study groups of each session.

The final morning of the 4-day conference was devoted to the formulation of topic area consensus reports. All participants returned to their original topic committees to review the discussion summaries of the previous group work sessions dealing with each topic area. The topic editor assigned to each committee prepared the topic committee consensus report. These reports in turn were submitted to the conference editor who was responsible for preparing the conference publication. The last plenary session of the conference was devoted to oral summary reports by the topic committee editors as a review of the results of the 4-day meeting.

CHAPTER II RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF STUDENTS

In the past, administrators of programs for the deaf were able to draw teachers from persons who had had direct and personal experiences with them. Because these teachers had been exposed to the deaf at an early age, either through their own deaf relatives or through contact with schools for the deaf in their communities, they did not have to be "taught" empathy.

In recent years, however, two forces have emerged to influence recruitment of teachers: the growth of programs in speech and hearing, particularly those identified under the title of audiology, and the support provided by the Federal Government under Public Laws 87-276 and 88-164 for preparing teachers of the deaf. Both of these forces have exposed students at the college level to programs for the deaf.

The major contributions of audiology have, so far, been in the development of techniques of differential diagnosis, preschool programs for deaf children, and participation in programs for preparing teachers of the deaf. Because of increased exposure during training, however, speech and hearing specialists have more knowledge of, and interest in, the behavioral effects of deafness, and are contributing more and more to problems on the periphery of both fields, for example, that of developing communication skills. In a like manner, but to a lesser extent, psychology, linguistics, and speech pathology are also increasing their contributions in the area of deafness.

Probably the most important influence on recruitment, however, is the financial support supplied by the Federal Government through the Office of Education; support for teacher preparation programs has been supplied in the form of scholarships for students and teaching grants for colleges and universities. These grants have not only enabled the established programs of teacher preparation to increase their enrollments, but have also resulted in the establishment of new programs. Since Public Law 87-276 was enacted in 1961, the number of centers preparing teachers of the deaf has increased from 80 to 50, and the number of teachers being trained has increased from 200 to 500.

A more subtle effect of Federal support is related to this rapid expansion; persons of a different type are being recruited. A large proportion of the trainees in the new programs have not had direct experiences with the deaf prior to seeking admission to a training program. Students, who previously would not have known of this field, are being made aware of it as the special education or speech and hearing programs in the colleges and universities they are attending establish programs for teachers of the deaf.

One of the problems that the conference participants discussed was connected with the changes that will have to be made in recruitment. In addition to attracting capable people to the field, the teacher-training programs have to avoid those persons whose interest in the education of the deaf is solely financial.

On the first day of deliberations, then, Topic Committee I offered four questions as focal points for discussion in the area of recruitment:

1. Who shares with the teacher-training institutes the responsibility for recruitment? Should there be a national recruitment program, and, if so, what part should professional organizations play in such a program?
2. From what professional and academic areas should trainees be recruited?
3. How early in their academic careers should potential trainees be recruited?
4. What new approaches to recruitment should be tried?

A wide variety of recruitment practices and media were discussed around these points and have been classified under two headings for presentation in this report: potential sources of teachers, and systematic recruitment efforts.

Potential Sources of Teachers

Although many colleges and universities are attracting trainees through their new teacher preparation programs, they are reaching only their own students. It should be possible with the help of national professional organizations to make students in colleges and universities which do not have programs aware of this occupational possibility. Recruitment might even be started at the high school level on a nationwide scale, so that students could have direct contact with the deaf before the expenditure of time in training made them committed to this field. This would increase not only the number of teachers of the deaf, but also the number of devoted teachers of the deaf.

Systematic Recruitment Efforts

Although many of the teacher preparation programs now in existence have attempted recruitment in other institutions through the distribution of brochures describing their programs, these attempts have lacked the coordination that a national professional organization could supply.

The conference members recommended that the Council on Education of the Deaf (CED) consider conducting a national campaign. The CED has served a useful function in coordinating the support of Federal Legislation in the education of the deaf, and is well suited to perform a similar function with regard to recruitment. The CED also represents an outlet for the views of the three major groups in the education of the deaf: the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, the American Instructors of the Deaf, and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. It was further recommended that the CED coordinate its recruiting with those of other professional organizations, particularly the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Education Association.

Organized parents' groups are potentially one of the most important aids in recruitment; they have been highly successful in recruiting teachers of the mentally retarded. Attempts should be made to encourage similar efforts by the parents of deaf children on a systematic and nationwide basis. Again, the conferees thought that the CED might be the best agency to initiate this effort.

The conferees repeatedly emphasized that the most basic and vital force in the recruitment of personnel is continued improvement in the education of the deaf, and the elevation of the status of the teacher of the deaf. One group stressed this point in relation to the need to attract more men to teaching deaf children. Male teachers would provide more stability of personnel through the reduction of turnover, and would benefit students psychosociologically in allowing them to identify with teachers of both sexes; but considerable improvement in salaries, advancement opportunities, and prestige are necessary before any significant number of men can be attracted to this field.

Selection

It is self-evident that a teacher preparation program can be only as good as the caliber of its students. Although the principle is axiomatic, the conference group felt the necessity of emphasizing it at a time when the pressures of teacher shortage might lead to a relaxation of admission standards. An obvious need at present, not only in the area of deafness, but in all areas of teacher preparation, is for higher admission standards in training programs.

In the early days, when training programs for teachers of the deaf were usually located within established schools for the deaf rather than in colleges and universities, trainees studied under master teachers, and these teachers often exercised considerable powers of selection. Selection standards were usually based on such subjective factors as personality and apparent aptitude for and dedication to the teaching of deaf children; academic attainments and past professional preparation were scarcely considered. As colleges and universities became interested in the field, however, they began to establish their own programs for preparing teachers of the deaf, and to require that these meet the same standards as the teacher preparation programs in other areas of special education. Today, public school systems that include day schools and classes for deaf children generally seek teachers from colleges and universities, and State certification standards and requirements reinforce this practice.

This change in the location and sponsorship of teacher-training programs will undoubtedly influence selection procedures. In any program centered in a college or university, the standards and procedures for admission to the institution are likely to prevail. These would vary from school to school, but in general would increase the emphasis on scholastic features and academic grades. Universities do not decry personal and physical characteristics, but recognize the difficulty of assessing them objectively, and, as the Federal Laws which provide financial support for training teachers of the deaf stipulate that these funds must be given to accredited institutions of higher learning, university standards predominate.

In its initial discussions, Topic Committee I offered four questions as focal points for a discussion on the selection of students:

1. At what academic level should students be admitted to teacher preparation programs?
2. How much and what kind of preparations should a student have in order to be accepted into a teacher preparation program (e.g., liberal arts, elementary education, speech and hearing)?
3. What personal qualities make an effective teacher of the deaf, should they apply to all levels of teaching, and how can they be identified?
4. Should physical disability exclude a person from entering the field of teaching the deaf?

Destable Academic Admission Level

A basic issue which emerged from all of the discussion groups concerned the time of entry of the student into the teacher preparation program. At present, programs for the preparation of teachers exist

at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and are of three basic types: the 4-year undergraduate program, usually with a major in the education of the deaf or in special education; the 1- or 2-year graduate program begun after completion of a full undergraduate course not necessarily related to education of the deaf; and the continuous 5-year program which begins with the freshman year and ends with the master's degree.

Much of the discussion on selection was actually related to curriculum, because of the different philosophies operating within the various programs. The topic of curriculum is dealt with in a later chapter. The level at which a student wanted to teach, however, would affect his time of entry into a training program because his training, and the previous preparation required of him, would differ for different levels. It would be useful, for example, for a trainee who wanted to teach at the high school level to have completed an undergraduate major in either liberal arts or science before entering a 1-, or 2-year graduate program which would concentrate on methods of teaching the deaf.

Previous Preparation

It is desirable to have teachers with diverse academic backgrounds, and therefore no standard curriculum should be made a prerequisite for entrance into teacher-training programs. In general, however, a strong background in liberal arts and sciences would be of most value to a teacher of the deaf.

At the high school level, teachers could be trained in methodology, either in graduate school, or, as the majority of conference members advocated, in 5-year programs which would blend teacher preparation with an academic major and lead to an MA.

At the preschool and elementary level, there is a definite place for 4-year undergraduate programs which provide preparation and experience in education, child development, and speech and hearing, but even here it should be remembered that deficiencies in these areas can be remedied in graduate school much more easily than deficiencies in liberal arts and sciences, and emphasis on the latter areas should be increased in many existing programs.

Psychosocial and Physical Characteristics

Although certain personal and social traits are important in prospective teachers of the deaf, particularly in those who will work with young children, it is difficult to identify and assess these and to relate them to teaching effectiveness. Among the qualities which

might be considered in the selective process, the following will always be important:

1. Academic record.
2. Intellectual ability.
3. Personal and social adjustment.
4. A commitment to teaching the deaf.
5. Physical characteristics.

Of these qualities, the personal and social factors are the only ones which cannot be readily assessed. All applicants for entrance into training programs should be personally interviewed by several of the staff members of the program. This is the only way to judge each applicant's personal fitness for teaching the deaf. In addition, the past of each applicant should be reviewed through recommendations from persons familiar with his personal and social life.

Standardized measures, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, cannot be considered until research is done to relate such instruments to teaching effectiveness with deaf children.

The conferees recognized the importance of physical characteristics of persons engaged in teaching deaf children; the most obvious of these was deafness itself, and the role of the deaf teacher of the deaf. Although many of the conferees approached this topic with considerable caution, it was obvious that this was no longer the burning issue that it had been in the past.

The liabilities of the deaf teacher are obvious, particularly in the development of oral communication in deaf children. Under the prevailing philosophies of educating deaf children, the development of oral communication skills to the highest possible degree for each child is paramount. This would include not only the development of speech and speechreading, but also the development of oral language to which reading and writing could later be added. Most, if not all, deaf teachers would have difficulty in developing oral language in young deaf children.

A deaf teacher may also have written language deficiencies, and if his language problems are reflected in his writing, he is likely to perpetuate his own difficulties in the deaf children he teaches. Schools for the deaf, however, usually take this factor into consideration in employing deaf teachers, and most deaf teachers have a good knowledge of language.

On the positive side, deaf teachers have much to contribute. Because they are apt to have a good understanding of the language problems of deaf children, and an understanding of the personal, social, and economic problems imposed on an individual by profound deaf-

ness, they can be effective in counseling their students. In addition, they are examples of successful deaf adults with whom deaf students can easily identify.

Deafness, therefore, should not arbitrarily exclude a person from consideration by teacher preparation programs, though at present it limits him to the program at Gallaudet College, which is the only one equipped to receive him. But the deaf teacher must realize that his employment possibilities are pretty much limited to the upper grades of state residential schools, where oral communication skills become corrective rather than developmental, and that even in these grades, the necessity for a sizeable proportion of hearing teachers will tend to limit his employment possibilities.

After considering other physical handicaps, the conferees agreed that no arbitrary limitations on physical disability should be written into the requirements for entrance into the training programs, but emphasized certain practical considerations. The teaching of deaf children, particularly in the preschool and elementary years, requires a considerable amount of physical activity and dexterity on the part of the teacher. The conference participants therefore cautioned against accepting applicants who for lack of mobility could not be responsible for a full range of teaching activities in the classroom.

CHAPTER III CURRICULUM

In attempting to define the role of the teacher of the deaf, the conferees considered his relationship to the teacher of nonhandicapped children and to the audiologist, psychologist, speech clinician, and other specialists who function in the education of deaf children.

The teacher of the deaf is one who is concerned with the development and conservation of language and communication in children whose hearing impairments are great enough to preclude the establishment or retention of language and communication through normal developmental means. In addition, he is also a teacher like any other, in that he must develop within the child the understanding of content normally acquired by most children in our culture. This dual role of the teacher, led to some disagreements among the conferees, which will be discussed in the section on specialization during preparation.

It was agreed, however, that any training program should stress the interdisciplinary role of the teacher and give him the knowledge and skills necessary to make him an effective consumer of the information that specialists in related areas can supply. A teacher of the deaf should know something of the techniques used in speech correction and audiology. He should, for example, be able to understand the significance of residual hearing as reflected in audiometric measures. And, although he is most familiar with clinical psychology's contributions to his field, he should know something about theories of learning and sensory deprivation, so that he can use to maximum advantage his school's information on the mental, social, and personal function of his students.

To fulfill his role, then, the teacher of the deaf should incorporate within himself a sound background in liberal arts and sciences, specialization within professional education at either the elementary or secondary levels, specialized training in developing language and communication with deaf children and in developing content areas, and a knowledge of ancillary areas such as audiology and psychology.

The Preparation of the Teacher of the Deaf

It was agreed that preparation in the liberal arts and professional education is essential if the teacher of the deaf is to have the proper frame of reference which includes an understanding of child development, learning, and the culture and environment of normal children.

No agreement, however, could be reached on the proportion of such a background that should be included in the teacher-training program. Some believed that teachers of the deaf should have the equivalent of an undergraduate major in liberal arts with varying amounts of specialized preparation in teaching the deaf superimposed on this base; the amount of specialized preparation would be determined by the age-grade level at which the person planned to teach. Others expressed the opinion that less than a major in a content area was sufficient, but that all teachers should have a common core of knowledge and skill about deaf children regardless of the age-grade level for which they were preparing. Discussion of this area inevitably involved the amount of specialization which was desirable in teachers of the deaf, and whether they should be prepared at a graduate or undergraduate level. These basic issues recurred in almost every discussion group. In this chapter, they will be considered in the discussion of specialized preparation.

General Preparation

Those participants who believed in the need for a specialized common core for all persons preparing to be teachers of the deaf emphasized that language was a major problem for the deaf and that the teacher of the deaf must, therefore, always be a teacher of the English language, no matter what his subject or area. They recommended a common core stressing knowledge of the structure of the English language, its natural development in children, deficiencies in acquiring the language, and methods for treating the deficiencies. All symbol systems by which language is acquired or communicated by the deaf were discussed, but emphasis was on those symbol systems which form the basis of oral teaching: the receptive phases of speechreading and reading, and the expressive phases of speaking and writing.

While the emphasis was on the symbol systems used in oral teaching, some conferees stressed the need for consideration of other systems, particularly the language of signs and finger spelling. Most programs which prepare teachers of the deaf offer courses in speech, speechreading, and reading, but only a very few programs offer formal courses in finger spelling and the language of signs. Some members thought such courses should be a part of all teacher preparation pro-

grams, regardless of whether the teacher might ever use this type of communication in the classroom. They suggested that such a background would help the teacher to gain a better understanding of the language problems of the deaf and might also serve, in certain situations, as a means of communication with deaf adults.

The participants went no further in discussing specific courses which should be common to all training programs; subsequent discussions were confined to philosophical issues and general outlines of desirable curriculum areas. The members recognized the need for a discussion of specifics, but were limited in time. They recommended, therefore, that another conference be conducted and confined to the construction of a curriculum for teacher preparation.

Specialized Preparation

Throughout the conference, was a growing awareness of the need for some degree of specialization in teaching the deaf. Most participants stressed the fact that it was not realistic to have a common program for training all teachers and then to expect the products of such programs to be able to teach at any level. Secondary schools for the deaf often have to choose between a person qualified in subject matter, but unprepared to teach the deaf, and a teacher of the deaf who is not qualified to teach the subject matter. As stated previously, this became a basic issue of the conference.

Solutions for this problem differed only in the degree of specialization they suggested; they ranged from seven areas of specialization to two. The most highly specialized programs emphasized that if deaf children are to receive as good an education as other children, their teachers must be at least as well prepared as other teachers. It follows that if teachers of the deaf are to have both the knowledge of subject matter and methods that other teachers have and a familiarity with the basic questions of deafness, the latter requirement should be specialized to suit the needs of deaf children at one or another of the different steps in their development. At one end of the continuum, then, the following specialities were suggested: (1) preschool education of deaf children; (2) elementary education of deaf children through grade 3; (3) elementary education, grades 4-6; (4) secondary education, grades 7-9; (5) secondary education, grades 9-12; (6) physical education, art, home economics, and various vocational subjects; and (7) education of atypical deaf children.

In addition to these, some members thought there should be a category for specialization at the college level.

Some of the conferees felt that specialization was needed, but that the specialties suggested did not represent a realistic appraisal of developmental or subject matter levels. They argued that a well-trained teacher could teach across two or more of the levels proposed.

The least specialized of the proposed programs made a simple division into elementary and secondary levels of education, and did not, as the highly specialized programs, favor an inverse ratio between training as a teacher of the deaf and increasing grade level of teaching.

In general, some type and degree of specialization was favored. The program which seemed to enjoy the highest regard involved specialization on four levels:

1. Preschool education of deaf children.
2. Elementary education of deaf children.
3. Secondary education of deaf children.
4. Physical education, art, home economics, and various vocational subjects.

The recommendation was made that teachers of the deaf who are prepared in the basic core program and in one of the specialties should be employed only within the grade levels of that specialty. Universities should be encouraged to offer only those specialties which their resources permit, and information regarding the specialties offered by each university should be centrally collected and nationally distributed, perhaps by the U.S. Office of Education.

The concern over specialization appeared to be for the secondary level, for which many conferees felt that the present preparation of teachers was inadequate. These members suggested that students who are prepared to teach in grades 7-12 should be prepared for one teaching field only (English, mathematics, social studies, chemistry and/or physics, biology, foreign languages). Preferably they should not be admitted to graduate programs unless they have completed an undergraduate major in their proposed teaching field. Deficiencies in the teaching fields should be remedied during the period of professional training, which should include adequately supervised student teaching at the grade levels and in the field for which the student is preparing. Specialization of this nature would contribute much to equalizing the secondary programs of deaf and hearing children.

Grave concern was expressed over educational programs for the multiple-handicapped child whose major handicap is deafness, e.g., deaf-blind, deaf-mentally retarded, deaf-brain injured, deaf-emotionally disturbed, deaf-cerebral palsied. Most schools for the deaf now have many of these children to educate, and no special teacher preparation programs or special curriculums have been established. Ob-

viously, exposure to and some knowledge of multiple-handicapped deaf children is a necessity in the basic core of preparation for all teachers of the deaf, but the conferees emphasized that special training for those teachers assigned to classes of multiple-handicapped deaf children should be provided after the usual preparation and not as a specialty within the preparation program. Classes of such children demand special attention, and should not be given to the beginning teacher simply because no one else in the school wishes to teach them.

Suggested Curriculum Model

Some of the conferees offered general principles to guide the development of a curriculum and also a tentative curriculum approach based on these principles. They emphasized the following points:

1. A curriculum should be devised to give the teacher the knowledge and skills that are necessary to meet the specific needs of deaf children at various age and education levels.
2. A suitable professional group or study commission should be formed to determine exactly what those needs are.

The basic core of a teacher preparation curriculum should be calculated to impart:

1. Body of knowledge (those aspects of the behavioral, medical and natural sciences which are pertinent for the teacher of the deaf).
2. Skills and practices of the teaching process (methodology).
3. Practicum.
4. Content to be taught (subject matter of preschool, elementary, or secondary levels).

The areas which make up the body of knowledge (defined in this instance as the general fields taught by specific departments or colleges of a university, e.g., communications, psychology, education, sociology, etc.) should be analyzed in a descending order of application, so that their ultimate contributions would be in a form that might be used in the classroom, e.g.:

1. Body of knowledge (general synthesis of areas of knowledge).
 - A. Area of knowledge ----- (department or college of a university).
 1. *Extraction* of aspects pertinent to the entire teaching profession.
 2. *Regrouping* for teachers of the deaf.
 3. *Application* by teachers of deaf children.

The following outline of an analysis of the field of psychology is offered as a model:

A. Psychology.**1. *Extraction:* (for any teacher).**

Learning.

Perceptual processes.

Human development.

Personality and adjustment.

Abnormal psychology.

Social psychology.

Experimental psychology.

2. *Regrouping:* (for a teacher of the deaf).

Effects of sensory deprivation.

Learning processes.

Social and personal adjustment.

3. *Application:* (by a teacher for deaf children).

Development of self-concept.

Development of socialization.

Development of motility.

The Personnel and Setting of the Teacher Preparation Program

Most of the discussion of this topic related more to practicum than to curriculum and will be found in that chapter; however, the participants did stress the relationship between curriculum and the qualifications of the persons presenting the curriculum.

In this respect, the individual on the university staff who is responsible for teaching methods courses is frequently overlooked. It is the responsibility of the colleges and universities to establish and apply requirements for the professional competence of their faculties. There should be additional requirements for trainers of teachers, and one of these, in the case of the deaf, should be experience in the teaching of deaf children.

Postgraduate Education

Training at the postgraduate level is as necessary for teachers of the deaf as for teachers of hearing children, who are already being supported in such areas as science, mathematics, and English. All teachers need to keep abreast of new knowledge within content areas and new ways of transmitting that knowledge. Teachers of the deaf could either participate in the programs already established for hearing teachers, or could have programs established especially for them.

Similarly, there is a need for workshops and institutes to keep teachers informed of new techniques and materials which might apply

to teaching the deaf. This would include new knowledge gained through research in the education of the deaf, in audiology, psychology, and other ancillary areas, as well as demonstrations of new teaching techniques, visual aids, programmed learning, and other technical devices which might be of assistance to the teacher. The emphasis should always be on reducing the obsolescence of the teacher's skills.

CHAPTER IV PRACTICUM

The term, practicum, comprises all those aspects of the teacher preparation program that bring students into contact with children and with professional situations which they may meet as teachers. Practicum should include the following categories of experiences:

1. Unstructured contacts with deaf children and particularly with deaf adults, in a variety of settings: homes, dormitories, social clubs, vocational centers, etc.
2. Structured observations of classroom activities and such clinical activities as testing, diagnosis, remedial teaching, and counseling in audiological and psychological activities.
3. Participation as assistants in classrooms, in dormitories, on the playground, or in special activities such as testing programs.
4. Experience as observers or participants in professional activities such as faculty meetings, committee meetings, and parent conferences.
5. Visits to different types of schools and classes for the deaf, and to facilities for other types of handicapped children.
6. Student teaching, the indispensable experience in any practicum, including both tutoring children on an individual basis and classroom teaching.

The intent of the practicum experience is, among other things, to give students a comprehensive exposure to the many types of problems imposed by deafness, to provide an understanding of the course work involved, particularly the methods courses, and to prepare for and provide the teaching practice upon which the acquisition of skills and techniques ultimately depends.

The first year of teaching is actually an extension of the practicum in that the beginning teacher is still a learner and should be placed in a professional situation conducive to further growth. Suggestions for providing suitable guidance and support for beginning teachers are presented in the section on quality of practicum.

Distribution of Practicum

The question of distribution of practicum experiences is related to that of specialization, which in turn is directly related to the basic function of teacher preparation programs in the education of the deaf. There are two opposing views of the function of such programs. One is that the primary objective of the programs is to prepare teachers to overcome the unique communication problems associated with deafness (particularly the language deficit) at whatever age-grade level and in whatever subject matter setting they may be found. The other view is that the chief goal should be to prepare teachers to teach a particular subject or range of subjects to a particular age-grade range. Inherent in the first view is the assumption that the communication problems of the deaf are so pervasive that a teacher cannot teach successfully at any level without intensive training in the development of communication skills as such. Inherent in the second view, is the assumption that he can.

Discussion of the distribution of practicum experiences also reflected the opinion that a teacher preparation program has two functions. One, to expose students in a relatively general way to a wide range of levels, subjects, and learning problems, and the other to prepare them to teach or deal with some of these. In general, it was agreed that practicum experiences should involve:

1. A wide range of age-grade levels from nursery school through, at least, junior high school.
2. Exposure to the full range of elementary school subjects.
3. Exposure to children with other handicaps in addition to deafness, such as mental retardation; it was suggested that only the educationally significant attributes of such children should be stressed with student teachers.
4. Exposure to both hard of hearing and deaf children.
5. Both residential and day schools wherever possible.

With regard to the second, more intensive function of teacher preparation, there was an area of agreement and a basic area of disagreement. Most conferees seemed to agree that specialization in teaching children with multiple handicaps should not be part of the basic teacher preparation program, but that provision for such specialization should be made for experienced teachers of the deaf. Many expressed the opinion that even if it was not yet possible to make such a provision on a large scale, student teachers and beginning teachers, at least, should work with deaf children of normal ability rather than with the atypical deaf child.

The participants could not agree on the desirability of specialization in particular age-grade levels and content areas. This was a recurrent issue at the conference, and is related to the issues raised on the desirable academic admission level of students, and to the issues in curriculum specialization. Many expressed the view that all students should learn to teach the basic communication skills of language over as wide an age-grade range as possible. Observation and practice teaching should center on speech and language development from the beginning stages through at least the elementary grades, and should include the development of these skills in connection with at least some of the elementary school subjects. Concentrated experience with nursery school teaching or with upper-level subject matter, however, should be given only to students who have completed the core of observations and practice teaching previously described and who bring the appropriate background to these areas of specialization.

Others expressed the view that ability to teach the communication skills at all levels is not a necessary prerequisite for teaching children of a particular age-grade range and that students should be required or encouraged to concentrate on one or two levels (variously delineated as preschool, elementary school, and high school; or preschool, primary, intermediate, and advanced). Practicum should be concentrated on observation and practice teaching at the levels of specialization. At lower levels, observations and practicum should include all subjects; at the high school level, they might be restricted to a particular subject or subjects of the student's choice.

The latter body of opinion appeared to arise from justifiable concern over the lack of teachers adequately prepared to teach subject matter to deaf students at the high school level. This concern was most evident among conferees working in schools with high school programs and in Gallaudet College, which many graduates of these programs attend. There also seemed to be a more general feeling that teachers of the deaf should concentrate on and be certified for nursery, elementary, or high school teaching as is the practice among teachers of normal hearing children. This feeling appeared chiefly among the conferees working primarily in university settings.

Serious consideration should be given to the problem of obtaining competent subject matter teachers at the high school level. A number of participants discussed financial assistance for qualified teachers of the deaf wishing to pursue graduate work in a content area. Some members suggested that information be sought concerning the academic background of students preparing to become teachers of the deaf, so that it could be used in guidance and recruitment programs.

More vigorous recruitment activities aimed at universities with strong liberal arts traditions might also increase the number of students interested in teaching content subjects to deaf high school students.

The emphasis on all students receiving a common core of training in developing the communication and language skills of deaf students does not contradict the need for specialization expressed in the section on curriculum. It would be possible for students to specialize in age-grade levels or content areas and still acquire a common, basic knowledge of the language and communication problems of deaf children. The disagreement did not refer specifically to the need for specialization, but to whether increased specialization, particularly in content areas, should be accompanied by a reduction of training in speech and language developments. Similarly, support of a core program in communication skills is not incompatible with acceptance of the trend towards graduate level training discussed in the section on selection of students. Specialization in a content area and acquisition of the basic skills for developing language and communication could take place within graduate programs. In fact, specialization in addition to the knowledge of a common core would almost demand a program extending to the graduate level. In such programs, students would probably specialize in a content area on the undergraduate level and progress at the graduate level to training for teaching deaf children.

Quality of Practicum

The conferees recommended that observations coordinated with course work should be carefully structured and that there should be proper preparation for the more informal observations that precede actual student teaching. Preparation and guidance should stress theoretical considerations underlying the work observed, the reasons as well as the methods for teaching. Student teaching should be carefully prepared for, guided and supervised through a variety of techniques, including lesson plans, teacher-student conferences, and self-evaluation devices, but the student should have freedom to prepare and implement his own plans and to learn from his mistakes. Training in self-evaluation was particularly stressed as an important skill to be developed by students.

The conference members cautioned against the employment of beginning teachers by any institution that could not make supervision by a fully qualified and experienced teacher available. Good supervision was deemed essential for teachers of all levels of experience, but it was felt to be absolutely indispensable for the beginning teacher of the deaf, and should be particularly intensive during the first year.

A variation of the team-teaching technique was suggested as a supplement to the conventional type of supervision with the beginning teacher being teamed for the first year with an experienced teacher.

It was also proposed that the first year of teaching be an internship or sponsored professional practice, an essential feature of which would be continued contact with, and supervision by, the training institution. Such contact would help the institutions to evaluate their programs and would provide additional support and guidance to beginning teachers. The training institution in such a program would have to respect the autonomy of the employing institution, and maintain its formal contact with that institution's administration, rather than with the intern himself, although an informal contact with the intern would be desirable during his first year of teaching.

It was repeatedly stressed that the supervisor of practicum should be a fully trained, experienced teacher of the deaf of appropriate professional stature, and that an adequate number of experienced, highly competent, teachers should be available at the practice facility to assist him.

The participants agreed that the universities should provide financial compensation to interest these teachers in serving in this capacity; that the continued professional growth of cooperating teachers should be encouraged by sabbatical leaves, stipends for further study, attendance at institutes, etc., and that teachers should be prepared in a more specific way for the responsibilities of working with student teachers.

Conferences with the supervisor of practicum, Saturday workshops either at the school or at the university, summer courses in techniques of working with students, and a manual on the subject might all be used to increase the competency of cooperating teachers and add prestige and dignity to the job.

The characteristics and quality of the cooperating school were considered important enough to warrant a system for approval or accreditation. The cooperating school should have the following qualifications:

1. A minimum of three age-grade levels; primary, intermediate, and junior high school. If these are not available, it is the responsibility of the university to seek out supplementary facilities.
2. A sufficient number of competent teachers qualified and willing to serve as cooperating teachers. The number was not specified by the conferees, but presumably there should be at least one for each student teacher.

3. Highly competent persons to supervise the practice teaching of the students.

The conferees expressed strong interest in the potential uses of films, tapes, and other audiovisual aids in improving and supplementing the practice teaching and classroom observations. The following suggestions were made:

1. Films should be made showing skilled teachers demonstrating various teaching situations and techniques. Such films should supplement but in no way replace live classroom demonstrations.
2. Video tape might be used in student teaching to provide opportunity for students to see themselves teaching and to evaluate their own performances.
3. Closed circuit television might be used in certain facilities to supplement live classroom demonstrations.

In view of the superior service and leadership which the Captioned Films for the Deaf program is providing to the education of the deaf through visual aids, the conference members recommended that the U.S. Office of Education be asked to support this aspect of the program through that branch.

Responsibility for Practicum

The consensus of the conferees was that the training institution is responsible for the planning, supervision, and guidance of the practicum in cooperation with the practice facilities; and that the relevant practicum experiences should be closely coordinated with courses being given by the university faculty. Again, the main responsibility of the cooperating school is to its own educational program, and its autonomy must be respected. The reconciliation of the primary responsibility of the university to its students and the cooperating school to its educational program may be a delicate task. Obviously, coordination between course work and practicum requires good cooperation between the two institutions.

Because the proper supervision of student teachers might place undue burdens on the staff of the school, it was agreed that the university should make supplementary staff available. The following suggestions were made:

1. With funds made available by the university, a senior member of the school staff could be relieved of other duties to act as supervisor of student teachers.

2. The university could appoint a clinical professor, such as is found in other branches of professional education, to plan, manage, and supervise practicum and relations with the cooperating facilities (schools and clinics). He should be a fully qualified, experienced teacher of the deaf with professional attainments appropriate to position and responsibilities.

It is particularly important that a common philosophy be shared by the staff of the university and that of the cooperating school or schools. The curriculum for a teacher of the deaf should include different philosophies and methods but should provide sufficient experience and stimulate enough enthusiasm for *one* method to make him an effective teacher. Such unity of outlook need in no way detract from the development in students of a broad outlook and open-mindedness towards other philosophies.

Many of the potential problems in coordinating the roles of the university and the cooperating school can be avoided when those responsible for the educational program of the school have university appointments and teach the methods courses. This arrangement was generally considered to be ideal where the appropriate personnel in the school have the necessary qualifications for academic rank in a university. Conversely, a qualified member of the university faculty might be given supervisory responsibility in the cooperating school.

Management of Practicum

Most members of the conference seemed to feel that both observation and practice teaching should be spaced throughout the academic year and coordinated with the methods courses; in addition a longer period of concentrated practice teaching near the end of the teacher preparation program is desirable. During this period, the student teacher, with guidance, should have experience in conducting a class by himself over a period of time extensive enough to acquire depth of understanding and experience with methods, and to apply ingenuity and creativity in managing teaching problems. A dissenting opinion suggested that practice teaching should be confined to a period following completion of course work.

The complete facilities of a cooperating school, as described previously in this chapter, should be available throughout the academic year, so that observations can be coordinated with course work. Individual children from clinics or ungraded classes do not meet this requirement. If, therefore, a university does not have ready access to an adequate cooperating school, it should seriously question the advisability of attempting the preparation of teachers of the deaf.

However, under certain conditions, obstacles presented by such geographic separation can be overcome. Where the supervisory staff of the cooperating school are of high caliber, hold university appointments, and are equipped to take full responsibility for methods courses, students might spend a full academic year at the school concentrating on methods courses and practicum. Background and related courses such as phonetics, physics of sound, and audiology could be conducted at the university prior to the year at the cooperating school or at summer sessions preceding and following it.

Consideration and study should be given to new ways of organizing and arranging practicum and course work. Some suggestions are as follows:

1. Conduct experimentation with combinations of school and work programs where the academic experiences of the student are coordinated with a variety of work experiences within the school. For example, courses in the guidance and adjustment problems of deaf children could be coordinated with supervised work experience as a dormitory counselor, not in order to make the student a skilled counselor, but to give him an opportunity to gain understanding of the problems involved.
2. Experiment with allotting blocks of time for study of specific subject and problem areas in working with deaf children rather than having the student handle a range of subjects and problems within any given day as is the common practice in student teaching.
3. Instead of separating observations and practice teaching, combine them. Practice teaching should follow a series of unstructured and structured observations in a variety of settings.
4. Study the amount of time devoted to practicum. The amounts now given to the total practicum and to specific experiences within the practicum usually are arbitrarily assigned without any rational basis.

CHAPTER V EVALUATION, ACCREDITATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

To develop uniform standards of professional preparation and competency for teachers of the deaf, it is necessary to establish standards for certification and accreditation, and mechanisms for enforcing them. These standards may be best achieved through interaction of certifying agencies, colleges and universities providing academic preparation, professional organizations, and agencies which employ teachers of the deaf.

Historical Background

Until 88 years ago, there were no accepted, uniform standards for teachers of the deaf. Much of the training, aside from those of a few established training programs, was inservice training provided by schools for the deaf whenever they needed teachers and could find willing people. It is obvious that, in the absence of systematic procedures, standards of preparation and performance varied widely.

In 1931, the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc., and the convention of American Instructors of the Deaf agreed to recognize the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (CEASD) as the agency to establish standards for certification of teachers. Since that time, the CEASD has exerted a strong and continuing influence on programs of teacher preparation and certification. At the time the Conference of Executives undertook this responsibility and established its first certification plan, there was little interest on the part of agencies not concerned directly with the education of the deaf in establishing standards for teachers of the deaf. Few colleges and universities had training programs in this area, and few states had licensing requirements for such teachers. Since 1981, the minimum standards established by the CEASD have been raised considerably. Certification has also been expanded to include specialties within the education of the deaf, particularly vocational education.

Although the professional area of the education of the deaf does not involve large numbers, teacher preparation centers and schools for

the deaf are scattered all over the country and teachers tend to be highly mobile; therefore, there is an urgent need for a uniform and accepted standard of preparation for teachers. The certificate of the CEASD has served this purpose and continues to do so. The standards are generally understood and accepted both by those who prepare teachers of the deaf and those who employ them. Many State licensing agencies have adopted these standards, and many more have incorporated them within their own certification plans.

In recent years, the accumulation of knowledge related to the education of deaf children and the increase in numbers and kinds of institutions offering teacher education programs have stimulated scrutiny of the present certification program of the Conference of Executives. Among the specific questions raised both by professional groups and legally constituted certifying and accrediting agencies are: (1) Since certification of teachers is the legal prerogative of the various states, should not a representative professional or organization recommend realistic, attainable standards? (2) Because the Conference of Executives represents only the executive heads of schools for the deaf, can it be considered as representative of a total body of individuals involved in the education of deaf children? (3) Should not those individuals engaged in the preparation of teachers, such as university personnel, supervisors of practicum and cooperating teachers also be represented by the certifying or accrediting agency? (4) Does the present certification program provide adequately for important ancillary areas such as speech and hearing, elementary education and child development?

When Public Law 87-276 was enacted in 1961, it stated that grants should be made to approved programs of teacher preparation. Approval was to be given by some "recognized" national accrediting organization; the organization to be designated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. After due deliberation and consultation with interested persons, the Commissioner chose the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the organization to conduct accrediting of programs for preparing teachers of the deaf, with the CEASD to act as an advisory body.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education is one of 23 organizations which comprise the National Council for Accreditation (NCA). The NCA was established by colleges and universities in an attempt to bring some order out of the proliferation of accrediting organizations. At the time of its establishment, colleges and universities were confronted with a growing demand by many professional organizations to be allowed to evaluate

and accredit various programs conducted by the colleges and universities. The demands upon the time and finances of the institutions of higher learning led the universities to establish the NCA. All accrediting activities within colleges and universities now are conducted by the NCA, which designates the particular organization which will be permitted to evaluate and accredit any given activity. The policy of the NCA is never to recognize any new organization as an accrediting body if the accrediting activities of that organization can be conducted adequately by an existing member organization of the NCA.

In keeping with this basic policy, the NCA suggested the NCATE as the official accrediting body for programs preparing teachers of the deaf on the grounds that all accrediting of teacher preparation programs could be conducted by this member organization. Because of the highly specialized and technical nature of preparing teachers of the deaf, site visits to programs seeking accreditation which have been conducted by members of NCATE usually have included a representative of CEASD.

It was the consensus of the conference, however, that the establishment of professional standards should be the prerogative of the professionally trained people in the area under consideration. The imposition of professional standards by persons outside the professional area (and the establishment of standards is implicit in any accrediting procedure) should be opposed by the persons from the professional specialty. The emphasis, it should be noted, was on the establishment of standards by persons who are, themselves, professionally trained in educating deaf children. Presumably, this would mean that any member of a committee seeking to accredit programs and certify teachers should be professionally trained as a teacher of the deaf or in the associated area which was under consideration. Since accrediting procedures and organizations exist for most of the important ancillary areas in the education of the deaf, it would appear that a primary requirement for membership on an accrediting body would be recognized training as a teacher of the deaf.

All discussion groups commended the CEASD for its fine service in establishing and maintaining minimal standards for teachers of the deaf. In addition, they recommended that the present certification and accreditation procedures of the CEASD be continued until some equally acceptable system could be substituted, and that a professional group acceptable to the existing organizations, such as the Council on Education of the Deaf (CED), address itself to this problem. Since this group would represent the three major profes-

sional organizations concerned with the education of the deaf, any certifying committee which it established could draw from the total range of people in the profession. It was anticipated that this broader professional base would be conducive to the development of standards that would be comprehensive in such related areas as speech and hearing, and elementary education. Needless to say, the establishment of such standards would require the cooperative effort of persons who were professionally qualified in the particular ancillary areas.

This part of the discussion reflected an urgent concern about present and future accreditation. However, specific resolutions were limited to: (1) opposition to the establishment of standards by persons or organizations outside the education of the deaf; (2) commendation of the CEASD for its leadership in establishing and maintaining professional standards; (3) the recommendation that these standards be continued until a more comprehensive program of accreditation and certification can be established, and (4) the recommendation that the CED or a similar professional group representative of the major organizations concerned, be requested to work toward the establishment of a broadly based committee including representatives of the primary ancillary areas to develop comprehensive standards for the preparation of teachers of the deaf.

Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf

Education of the deaf should be considered both as a part of the mainstream of professional education and as an area of specialization within that field. A program for training teachers of the deaf, although it must place some emphasis upon the unique problems of language and communication, which differentiate this from other areas of education, should include training in liberal arts and sciences and in professional education in general.

The advocacy of such a program again raises the question of whether preparation should involve graduate work, or should be solely at the undergraduate level. When the participants discussed the selection and recruitment of students and the area of curriculum, they seemed to be slightly in favor of undergraduate programs, although they recognized the trend toward the graduate level. During the discussion of evaluation, accreditation, and administration, however, a preference for graduate level programs began to appear. The number of credit hours required for a sound base in both liberal arts and sciences, plus professional education courses with superimposed specialization did not appear feasible within the 4-year undergraduate curriculum. The conference had met merely to discuss prob-

lems and did not have the time to resolve them, but it did recommend that any future conference should have as one of its ends the further discussion of this issue.

In the general discussion which arose in connection with accreditation and certification there was considerable comment on the need for specialization within the education of the deaf and, consequently, the need for particular types of certification. Although it is not now feasible to require that the preparation of teachers of the deaf be differentiated on the basis of subspecialties such as vocational education, preschool, elementary, mentally retarded, secondary, and college-level teachers, all staff members in schools for the deaf should be certificated as teachers of the deaf, and special teachers should be qualified also in the area of their specialization. Such a recommendation could ultimately lead to special types of certification for various specialties.

Accreditation

Accreditation means approval for an institution to conduct a specified program of training, in this instance a program for preparing teachers of the deaf. The approval is to be conferred by a nationally recognized accrediting agency after the agency has determined that the program in question has met certain professional standards which usually include appropriate facilities for the conduct of academic work and practicum, a curriculum meeting professionally established standards, and a faculty qualified to teach the curriculum and direct the practicum.

Having accepted the proposition that the education of the deaf is a specialized area built upon a base of professional education and the liberal arts, the conference was confronted with accreditation problems broader than those pertaining simply to the area of the deaf. It would follow from the acceptance of this proposition, that not only should the specialized program meet certain standards but the foundation areas of liberal arts and sciences and professional education must of necessity also meet certain standards. No matter how well the specialized area meets professional standards, the total preparation of the teacher is weak if the foundation is weak. Since the liberal arts and sciences and professional education have their own accrediting systems, it seems to follow that the accreditation system of the education of the deaf would have to function within this broader framework of accreditation. This need not involve any loss of identity or control over the professional area. It means simply a cooperation with other accrediting agencies and a recognition that the preparation of a

teacher of the deaf is more than the satisfying of certain specialized professional requirements.

The conferees recommended that programs for preparing teachers of the deaf be located in accredited schools, or colleges of education departments, within accredited colleges and universities. With the university meeting accrediting standards, and the professional education area meeting the same kind of standards, it remains only to determine if the program for preparation of teachers of the deaf meets the professional standards for that area. This approach would require cooperation with other accrediting agencies, and the conferees urged the CED, or any similar body that was designated, to explore various ways in which such cooperation could be established.

In making this recommendation, the participants did not mean to imply that schools or colleges of education were the only appropriate settings for programs, but that they were the usual settings. Speech and hearing departments may also sponsor programs, but this decision is the prerogative of the institution of higher learning. The one point that the conferees stressed most was that no matter where the program is located, it should have as its primary goal the development of teachers, and not clinicians.

Certification

There was some question as to whether certification should be automatic upon graduation from an accredited institution, or whether certification and accreditation should be considered as separate entities. Although graduation from an accredited institution almost assures qualification for certification, there are definite advantages in keeping certification and accreditation as separate entities. This separation would serve as a double check on a program and its products.

There are more problems inherent in certification than in accreditation. The major one is that certification of teachers is the prerogative of the various States and, unless it is adopted by the appropriate certifying agency of a State, no certification has legal sanction. Furthermore, even when a State adopts the established standards of a national organization, it is not recognizing the certifying powers of that organization; those powers are still its own.

A major problem, then, facing national certification (and at the same time one of the strongest arguments in its favor) is the wide variety of State requirements for certification. It is, for example, difficult for teachers to move from State to State without some special provisions for certification, temporary or otherwise, on the part of the

States. In connection with this, some conferees noted that the present minimal standards of the CEASD are below the minimal standards of some States.

This problem should be approached in two ways. First, strong efforts should be made by a nationally recognized and acceptable body to gain acceptance of accreditation standards by all programs preparing teachers of the deaf. This would help to insure that the products of the programs would meet minimal national standards. Second, the professional organizations serving teachers of the deaf should seek ways of interacting and cooperating with the certifying agencies within the States. The intent of this recommendation is that master teachers, supervisors, administrators, and personnel engaged in the preparation of teachers should have some channel through which they can assume an active role in the development of guidelines and standards used in legal certification within the States.

It was specifically recommended that there should be certification of supervisory and administrative personnel in schools and classes for the deaf. The requirements for such certification were not listed, but it was agreed that graduation from an accredited teacher preparation program, appropriate certification as a teacher, and a certain amount of practical experience (unspecified by the conferees) should be included in any minimal standards. In spite of the problems this involves, supervisors and administrators should be no less well prepared in teaching than the teachers whose activities they must supervise and administer.

The same air of concern which prevailed in the discussions on accreditation was apparent in the discussions on certification. There is a need for national consideration of certification and accreditation procedures, and the specialized areas relating to the education of the deaf should be evaluated by persons who are educators of the deaf. The changes presently taking place within education in general and the vast growth in research and knowledge in professional areas relating to the education of the deaf demand a new look at the preparation and certification of teachers of the deaf. These changes require a broader outlook than we have had in the past. They require cooperation with other organizations in establishing standards. Above all, it was indicated that no longer could the preparation of a teacher of the deaf be regarded as confined to requiring a restricted range of specific skills devoted primarily to the development of language and communication.

This idea prompted the recommendation that a conference be conducted soon to deal only with questions of accreditation and certi-

fication. Such a conference should be based on the concept that accreditation and certification include the foundation programs in liberal arts and sciences and professional education, as well as the area of specialization involved in preparing a teacher of the deaf.

Enforcement of Certification

There was no agreement on what could be done to enforce certification once a system had been agreed upon by the total body of educators of the deaf. Certification without effective enforcement would not maintain professional standards. The various possibilities of legal sanctions, voluntary adherence to standards, and the establishment of status for certification were discussed. It was agreed that national certification is not likely to receive legal recognition in the near future. National certification can have legal weight only to the extent that the States adopt recommended national standards in their own certification procedures.

The participants believed that the best method for establishing minimal national standards was through the accrediting of programs. Certification at present can be successful only to the extent that it is voluntarily accepted by teachers and enforced by administrators as a requisite for employment. Perhaps due in large part to the tremendous teacher shortage, the latter approach appears to have been only partially successful. If a greater sense of professionalism can be established among teachers of the deaf, certification may become something which automatically will convey a certain status to an individual. The threat of loss of such status can perhaps be the best possible means of enforcement presently available.

Administration

This topic was discussed along with the selection and recruitment of students but was moved to this section of the report because the sequence appeared to be more logical. Most of the points discussed by the conference participants on the matter of administration of teacher preparation programs have already been presented in various sections of this report. The conferees agreed that the trend is to vest administration of all professional curriculums in colleges and universities and this trend includes programs for preparing teachers of the deaf. The usual placement of such programs is within education or special education, but in some instances other administrative units might provide effective locations.

While the administration of teacher preparation programs is becoming the prerogative of colleges and universities, the cooperating school for the deaf remains a vital part of any program and should be an equal partner in the program. The school serves not only as a practicum center, but also plays an important part in the teaching of methods courses and supervision of students. The person, or persons, employed on the university faculty to coordinate the program, teach the methods courses, and advise and supervise students, should have close working relationships with the personnel of the school, and preferably should have some staff status within the school as well as within the college or university.

Changes brought about by the movement of programs into the colleges and universities would have to progress further before any general, national patterns of administration could be detected and assessed.

CHAPTER VI CONCLUSIONS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Conference on the Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf, held in Virginia Beach, Va., from March 15 through March 19, 1964, was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. In attendance were 109 persons selected from throughout the country as participants, observers, and speakers. An attempt was made to have a representative from each of the 50 programs engaged in training teachers of the deaf. In addition to these persons, the group consisted of individuals from schools for the deaf and from a variety of disciplines and areas related to the education of the deaf such as speech and hearing, psychology, and elementary education. The conferees discussed four basic topics with the discussions culminating in a series of recommendations which are contained in the body of this report. The following sections summarize the major recommendations of the conferees on each topic.

Topic I: Recruitment and Selection of Students

In the area of recruitment, the conferees concentrated on two points: new sources of teachers and systematic recruitment efforts. The participants emphasized that the traditional recruiting sources for potential teachers are no longer adequate to fill the demand. These sources have been the local communities surrounding schools for the deaf and persons who have had some personal contact with deafness. Many of the programs which have been established recently under Public Law 87-276 and Public Law 88-164 are attracting persons who have had no such personal contact. While this has the presumed advantage of attracting persons of diverse backgrounds to the education of the deaf, it could have the presumed disadvantage of attracting persons whose commitment to teaching deaf children is superficial. A nationwide campaign should be conducted in the high schools and in those liberal arts colleges and large universities which do not have programs of special education. Efforts should be made in such campaigns to stress the humanitarian aspects of this profession, as well as the other rewards, in an attempt to attract persons who would have a permanent commitment to teaching deaf children.

The proposed campaign would need to be coordinated by some national professional body representing the majority of persons interested in the education of the deaf. The conferees recommended that the Council on Education of the Deaf consider accepting this responsibility. The CED has performed a useful service in coordinating the support of Federal legislation in this field, and it represents an outlet for expressing the views of the three major groups whose primary interest is the education of the deaf: the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; the American Instructors of the Deaf; and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. The conferees also recommended that the CED coordinate its recruitment efforts with those of other organizations, particularly the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Education Association. In this respect, better use should be made of organized groups of parents of deaf children in recruiting potential teachers.

In relation to the selection of students for teacher preparation programs, the conferees discussed the desirable academic admission level for students: previous preparation, psychosocial, and physical characteristics. Here, again, specialization became an issue. Discussion of Topic I showed many in favor of undergraduate programs of preparation for all types of teachers of the deaf. This support weakened in discussions of later topic areas, when it became apparent that the type and quality of curriculum and practicum considered desirable by the conferees would make graduate programs almost imperative in such areas as training teachers for the secondary school level. The issue was not formally resolved, but it was clearly delineated and will undoubtedly be the stimulus for much self-examination on the part of many institutions as they examine their teacher preparation programs in the light of this conference.

In discussing desirable preparation for the student prior to entering a program of teacher preparation, the conference participants considered a diversity of backgrounds to be not only acceptable but desirable. The only major emphasis was on all candidates having good backgrounds of preparation in liberal arts. While there was some support for prior preparation in speech and hearing and elementary education, these could usually be incorporated as part of the teacher preparation program, whereas work in liberal arts could not.

The focus of discussions on desirable psychosocial and physical characteristics of potential teachers was, of course, deafness itself and the deaf teacher of the deaf. After full and free discussion of the assets and liabilities of the deaf teacher, the conferees recommended that no physical disability, including deafness, should automatically ex-

clude a student from teacher preparation programs. The conferees did point out, however, that no program other than Gallaudet College is equipped to prepare such students, and also that employment opportunities are likely to remain limited. Recommendations also were made concerning the need for research to discover objective means of evaluating personal and social traits which are important in teaching but which cannot at the present time be readily measured.

Topic II: Curriculum

The teacher of the deaf is a teacher who is concerned with the development and conservation of language and communication in children whose hearing impairments are so great that they cannot learn or retain language and communication through normal developmental means. In addition, he must be, at certain levels, a teacher of subject matter. This definition of the role of the teacher led the conferees to conceive of the curriculum for teacher preparation as including the following general areas of knowledge and skill: (1) a sound background in liberal arts and sciences; (2) specialization within professional education at either the elementary or secondary levels; (3) specialized training in developing language and communication with deaf children and in developing understanding of content areas; and (4) knowledge of ancillary areas such as audiology and psychology. In relation to the development of language and communication, the teacher should have specific knowledge of: (1) the structure of the English language; (2) normal language development in children; (3) the deficiencies in a person's acquisition of language which might develop for various reasons; and (4) methods for treating such deficiencies.

The outlining of such an extensive curriculum again raised the question of specialization and the various levels at which teachers of the deaf might be prepared. Sentiment now appeared to be in favor of specialization but there was disagreement as to the desirable kind. Majority sentiment finally favored the following specialties: (1) pre-school education; (2) elementary education; (3) secondary education; and (4) physical education, art, home economics, and various vocational subjects. It was recommended that teachers who are prepared in one of these specialties should be employed only within the grade levels of their specialty and universities should be encouraged to offer only those specialties which their resources permit.

While recommending specialization, the conferees still maintained that every teacher of the deaf is always a teacher of the English language regardless of his subject or the level at which he teaches. This

means that in addition to his specialty, each teacher must have a common core of knowledge and skill which will enable him to work with the language and communication problems of deaf students. While there was disagreement by participants who favored decreasing training in language and communication with increasing grade level of teaching, the majority clearly favored the recommendation of a common core of training.

Considerable concern was expressed about the need for special programs and specially trained teachers for deaf children with other handicaps. Any specialization in this area should be in addition to regular preparation as a teacher of the deaf rather than a part of it. Also, classes of such children should not be given to beginning teachers. These teachers are not prepared to teach multiple-handicapped deaf children without additional training.

A final recommendation on curriculum was for postgraduate workshops, institutes, and programs to reduce the obsolescence of teacher skills in content areas and teaching techniques and materials. The postgraduate programs which have been supplied for teachers of hearing children in such areas of science, mathematics, and English should apply equally to teachers of deaf children.

Topic III: Practicum

Most of the discussions of Topic III emphasized the need for good coordination and cooperation between the college or university and the practice facility. Both institutions need certain strengths and resources if the teacher preparation program is to be of high quality. The university must have trained and experienced personnel for the teaching of methods courses and the supervision of practice teaching, and these personnel must be given the same considerations and privileges as other faculty members. The practice facility must have a wide range of classes and types of deaf children, sufficient numbers of well qualified cooperating teachers to allow one for each student teacher, and good supervisory personnel to aid in the supervision of student teaching.

Support was expressed for a system of accrediting practice facilities to insure that they meet certain standards, but the conferees were uncertain as to how this should be accomplished. The importance of an accrediting system was readily recognized as an aid to universities in helping them determine the adequacy of their programs. If a training institution does not have ready access to an adequate practice facility, it should seriously question its ability to prepare teachers of the deaf. The question of which group in the education of the deaf

could be considered representative enough to make such a judgment was not resolved, although accreditation of practice facilities was recognized as a basic issue.

An important recommendation on Topic III was that the first year of teaching be regarded as an internship or sponsored professional practice. An essential feature of the internship would be continued contact with, and supervision by, the training institution. Such contact would help the training institutions to evaluate their programs and would provide additional support and guidance to beginning teachers. To recognize and preserve the autonomy of the employing institutions, contact with the training institution should be with the administration of the employing school rather than with the intern himself, and the school should make reports to the university on its recent graduates.

Topic IV: Evaluation, Accreditation, and Administration of Teacher Preparation Programs

The evaluation and accreditation of programs was one of the most vital issues considered by the conference and it engendered a great deal of discussion. The conferees noted that the quality of future teachers would be directly related to the establishment and enforcement of high standards. They were also aware of the difficulties involved in these activities. One of the basic problems which emerged concerned the designation of an organization or organizations to perform the evaluation and accreditation. Presently, two types of groups are involved in this. Accreditation and certification activities in the education of the deaf are conducted by the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf on the one hand and by various State certifying bodies on the other.

National standards should be established by a single organization representative of all or most of the persons involved in the teaching of deaf children and in the administration of teacher preparation programs. However, there is difficulty in deciding on a representative organization. While the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf is to be commended for establishing and maintaining minimal standards which have been responsible for improving the preparation of teachers of the deaf, and such standards should be continued for the present time, there is now a need, in view of the rapid expansion of knowledge relating to the education of the deaf, for an accrediting committee drawn from the total body of educators of the deaf. The conference participants recommended that the Council on Education of the Deaf and the Conference of Executives

of American Schools for the Deaf cooperate in establishing such a committee within the CED, and that the membership of the committee be restricted only in that all members must be trained and experienced teachers of the deaf. Any standards set by such a committee would have legal status only to the extent that they were adopted by State certifying bodies. Ways could be found, however, of persuading the State bodies to use the national standards if those standards were high and justifiable.

While certification for various specialties within the education of the deaf is not yet feasible, it appears to be a definite trend. The conferees did recommend the establishment of special certification for supervisors and administrators in schools for the deaf and that requirements for certification include graduation from an accredited teacher preparation program, appropriate certification as a teacher of the deaf, and a certain amount (unspecified) of teaching experience. The general intent of the recommendation was to insure that supervisors and administrators be at least as well prepared professionally as the teachers whose activities they must supervise and administer.

APPENDIX A THE FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR TRAINING TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

Samuel A. Kirk

I am not only pleased but actually enthusiastic about this conference and the people participating in it. For many years, I have been considered a critic of teacher training programs, not only in the deaf, but in other areas of special education. I have felt that we have not placed sufficient efforts on improvement of teacher education but that we continue to do what we have done for many years.

My general impression now is that the special education of the deaf is moving at a more rapid pace than other areas of special education. Public Law 87-276 has injected not only a ray of hope, but also a great deal of enthusiasm within and outside of the profession. This conference is unique and I will predict that the deliberations of the group and the results will accelerate the education of the deaf by 5 years.

As I am sure all of you know, Congress amended Public Law 85-926 which dealt with the training of professional personnel in the mentally retarded, to include all handicapped children. This bill, Public Law 88-164, is a very broad bill. Title III includes training of professional personnel in all areas of the handicapped, the mentally retarded, the hard of hearing, the speech impaired, the crippled and other health impaired, the emotionally disturbed, the deaf, and other specialized personnel required in the program for the education of handicapped children. Under this bill, we are now authorized to train (a) teachers at the senior undergraduate level, (b) teachers at the master's degree level, (c) supervisors and administrators of teachers, (d) college instructors, and (e) research personnel.

For 1964, training teachers of the deaf was not included in the general bill since up to June 30, 1964, Public Law 87-276 is in force and the \$1.5 million appropriated will, under forward financing, include teachers of the deaf for 1964-65. Next year teacher training for the deaf will be under Public Law 88-164. This means that:

1. We will be able to train teachers of the deaf at the senior level and at the first-year graduate level similar to the present program under Public Law 87-276.
2. In addition, next year we will be able to (a) train supervisors and administrators of programs for the deaf at the graduate level, (b) train college instructors to train teachers of the deaf, and (c) train research personnel.
3. There will be a change in stipends for students in the education of the deaf under Public Law 88-164 next year. Undergraduate students at the senior level will receive \$1,600 stipend as before. At the first-year graduate level, they will receive a \$2,000 stipend. At the second-year graduate level, they will receive a \$2,400 stipend, and at the third-year

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

graduate level, they will receive a \$2,800 stipend. In addition to this, a dependency allowance of \$400 for each dependent will be given to all fellows at the graduate level.

4. At the present time, colleges at the graduate level receive \$2,000 support grant. Under the new program next year, colleges and universities will receive \$2,500 support grant for each graduate fellow.
5. In addition to training programs, we also have under Section 302 of Title III a research and demonstration program. Actually, research and demonstration applies to the 1964 budget in the field of the deaf as it does in all other areas. Consequently, we will now have an opportunity to develop new methods of teaching, to conduct research on major problems for the deaf, and to conduct demonstration programs on new developments.

The results of this conference give you the deliberations of the group of specialists in the deaf and specialists in the related areas. I stated earlier that this was a unique conference since it included not only educators, supervisors, and administrators of programs for the deaf, but it also included many people in the general field of education, psychology, speech and hearing, and other areas related to the programs of deaf education. This is a significant forward step since any field can learn from related disciplines and related disciplines always contribute to any field of education.

APPENDIX B CURRENT TRENDS IN CURRICULUM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

*H. W. Schooling
Dean, College of Education
University of Missouri*

Not since the days of Horace Mann has so much attention been focused upon teacher education. The increasing number of teacher education articles appearing in popular magazines as well as in professional journals attests to the realization that there is a significant relationship between the quality of preparation teachers receive and the quality of education children receive in the schools they attend.

There are many reasons for the increased interest in teacher education. Foremost is the fact that the importance of education is being recognized by many who a decade ago gave it little thought—chiefs of state, military leaders, economists, political scientists, scholars; individuals who express the view that the only real and lasting solution to the many problems that plague our society is education.

Responsible leaders have since the founding of our free society emphasized the significance of education to insure its preservation but far too few have really accepted the belief that all children—no matter what their particular requirements may be—should have provided for them an educational program appropriate to their needs. As with civil rights and public service, pronouncements have in many instances been empty phrases that impressed the uninformed and lulled others into the complacent acceptance of political inequality, economic and educational neglect.

What does this new educational awakening have to do with the preparation of teachers? Because the most important factor in any program of education is the competency of the teacher, it can be expected that all those concerned about education will sooner or later critically examine programs of teacher education. Therefore, it is not surprising that Dr. James B. Conant in his concern about education, after looking at the American high school, turned his attention to the preparation of teachers for the kind of school he envisioned.

Those of us in teacher education are convinced that effective teachers in sufficient numbers to staff America's schools will not emerge with the competencies required, without a planned and systematic program for preparing them. Few disagree that a well-planned preparatory program is necessary for those who work with children with special needs or even so-called normal children in elementary schools and high schools, but there are doubters when we talk about the necessity for teacher education programs at college level.

Yes, there is a new concern, a new urgency, about teacher education. Even the whispers about teacher education are now being heard when in the past the

shoutings about it went unnoticed. This is due in part to the urgency of meeting a need that is now widely recognized; in part because the whispers are coming from individuals to whom the public is attuned. Thus regardless of the acceptance or rejection of Dr. Conant's views about teacher education we can join Will Maucker and those concerned about teacher education in saying, "Thank God for Mr. Conant."

What are the problems to which we must give attention if we would adequately prepare teachers for the bright and the dull; the economically favored and the disadvantaged; the physically fit and the physically handicapped; the motivated and the disinterested?

It seems to me there are four basic concerns to which we must direct attention:

1. Who shall be encouraged to prepare for teaching?
2. What shall they be taught?
3. What resources are required for an adequate program?
4. How shall we evaluate the results of our efforts?

All of these problems are of course interrelated. The program of preparation cannot be planned without regard for the qualifications of those who shall participate in it. The type of program determines the resources that will be required and the evaluation of the product must relate to what has been attempted.

Every college and department in a university concerned with professional preparation wants to select those who participate in its program. Our colleagues in medical education test many but select few. Not every young man or woman who aspires to be a veterinarian is given the opportunity. Engineering students must have demonstrated competency in mathematics. Students desiring to enter the School of Journalism must have a superior grade point average. The School of Business and Public Administration limits the number who will be accepted for preparation in business and management. Do those of us in teacher education dare be less discriminating in the selection of students we accept for teacher training?

Do we limit those accepted in our program to the upper third in the academic hierarchy as Dr. Conant has suggested? How do we assess the personal qualities that must undergird intellectual potential: dedication to the service of others; sensitivity to others' needs and aspirations; the ability to relate effectively to children, colleagues, parents and the general public?

It is obvious that we must actively recruit those we believe have the potential effective teaching requires through careful screening, retain those who show promise, and divert to other endeavors those about whose fitness for teaching we have doubts. But do we know what qualities the successful teacher must possess? What competencies he must have the abilities to acquire?

I am aware that research in the area of teacher competency has been fitful and not too fruitful, but I am convinced that experienced, discerning individuals who know what the end product must be, with considerable success can select those whose entry and preparation for teaching should be encouraged.

Needs are too urgent to wait serenely for the right young people in the right numbers to apply for admission to our colleges of education. They must be sought, they must be exposed to the opportunity for service which teaching affords, they must be given scholarships and financial aid. Society's stake in education and in the proficiency of those who direct learning is too great to leave the recruitment of teacher education students to chance.

The competent teacher must be above all else an educated individual, one who understands and appreciates the heritage of a free society, who has probed in considerable depth into the mysteries of some facet of our culture and who possesses the motivation and tools for continued learning. Thus I subscribe to a preparatory program that devotes considerable time to general education—more time than many programs now provide.

But more is required. In teaching there must be concern about learning and the learner as well as learning. What teacher can be successful if he does not understand the process of learning, the kind of environment which makes it most likely to occur and the characteristics of the learner which determine the efficacy of particular procedures and methods? You people perhaps more than any others in education know the importance of right teaching procedures, the necessity for awareness of the unique composition of each individual child.

How shall we provide the resources and perhaps more importantly, what are the resources which must be focused upon the preparation of teachers?

Of first importance is a qualified staff in the teacher training institutions. With few exceptions, the dedication of the student to the cause of properly educating children and youth, the enthusiasm with which the preparatory task is approached, the vision he has reinforced by research and continuous study will be no greater than the instructor or professor portrays. Successful experience in teaching children, first-hand awareness of the frustrations of inappropriate teaching procedures and knowledge of the resources effective teaching requires, presupposes extensive and intensive attention to the actual role of a teacher of children. This means the most enthusiastic will be recruited to develop in others the art of teaching. Practical experience coupled with a demonstrated scholarly concern about the learner and the learning process and the ability to communicate to others the results of his continual probing of the mysteries of effective teaching are essential for those who would teach others.

Unfortunately, such people are in short supply and in great demand. Three things seem to be necessary. Schools and institutions employing teachers with the potential to teach others must be willing to forego their services in the interest of improved preparation for greater numbers. Secondly, financial aid must be made available to encourage such individuals to obtain the advanced training and preparation teaching others requires. Finally, teacher preparing institutions must be able to provide the financial rewards and working conditions that will permit them to recruit and retain able teachers of teachers.

Perhaps second in importance in terms of the resources an effective program of preparing teachers requires is a posture of active concern about the preparation of teachers on the part of the entire institution. Fortunately there appear to be increasing signs of interest in the preparation of teachers on the part of individuals in disciplines outside colleges and departments of education. Professors of English, for example, are recognizing that deficiencies in the preparatory background of students in their college English classes are in part due to deficiencies in their contribution to preparation of those teaching English who were once enrolled in their classes. While many of our colleagues in liberal arts education are primarily interested in preparing able students for careers not related to teaching, there are increasing numbers who accept the fact that the number of students interested and capable of graduate study in their disciplines depends upon the quality of their earlier educational experience in elementary and secondary schools. Interdisciplinary approaches to the preparation of students for a variety of occupational pursuits is no longer unusual.

In the institution with which I am connected the College of Education and the School of Medicine have combined resources in research and teaching in assisting in the operation of a church financed residential center for severely retarded children. Cooperative programs in occupational and in physical therapy perhaps point the way to other cooperative efforts in the preparation of teachers.

Preparing teachers must be recognized as a task involving not only the educational institution that assumes the major role in preparing teachers but also the profession itself and the schools and agencies that use the product. This partnership role has not been clearly defined but there are signs that joint responsibility for establishing and maintaining effective programs is being assumed.

The teacher education institution cannot prepare teachers without resources which frequently only the public schools or other public agencies can provide. While for specialized training, where there should be much emphasis upon research, an institutionally operated laboratory school is essential, it cannot provide for all of the experiences a student in education should have. This means student teaching, observation, demonstration, pilot program, and research must be a joint endeavor of the college and school systems.

Furthermore, there must be an awareness that the institution preparing teachers cannot produce a finished product. At best, the teacher-preparing institution can provide basic background for the task, establish some knowledge of theoretical considerations that relate to teaching, and provide enough observation and practical teaching experience to indicate the limits of the task. There is much to be learned by the pilot after his solo flight. Induction into teaching, providing conditions that insure a reasonable chance for success and the maintenance of a purposeful and well planned in-service education program, is the responsibility of the employing institution.

It is for this reason the college alone cannot assume sole responsibility for the success or failure of its product. Impossible working conditions, failure to provide essential supervision on the job and opportunity and encouragement for continued learning are responsibilities the employing school system must assume.

Perhaps an additional word needs to be said about student teaching. Dr. Conant in his recent study of teacher education observed that the one aspect of teacher preparation which seemed to meet with universal acceptance was student teaching. Perhaps it is well that he did not probe too deeply into the programs which many institutions call student teaching. Most of us know that inadequate supervision, unwise selection of cooperating teachers and limited time characterize many programs. This need not be so, and perhaps under the impetus of Dr. Conant's prodding and our own dissatisfaction improved programs will result. One of our problems is the recruiting of individuals who can effectively supervise the student teacher, who can relate methodology and educational theory to practice. Rewards for such service must be greater than they have been up to now, and budgets must reflect the contribution these individuals make in the preparation of a teacher. How helpful it would be if the supervisor could assume responsibility for the satisfactory transition of the student teacher to full-time teaching and could systematically continue to give helpful advice and encouragement until the beginning teacher becomes an independent learner and practitioner of the art of teaching.

It seems obvious that teachers, particularly those who must develop specialized skills for work with atypical children, cannot acquire the knowledge and skills they require in the usual 4-year undergraduate program. While there is merit to an early identification with teacher education even at the freshman level, a major portion of the student's time must necessarily be directed to the pro-

gram of general education and the basic theories and principles involved in teaching and learning. Thus increased attention will need to be given to fifth-year programs, either as a part of the preteaching program of preparation or as a planned program of continued preparation after the initial teaching assignment.

In a consideration of teacher education it seems to me we must reiterate fundamental concepts and principles that should characterize any acceptable program.

1. If we believe in the education of all children who can profit from formal and systematic instruction, then teachers must be prepared to direct the learning experiences of all types of children. Thus, the teachers of the disadvantaged must understand the sociological and cultural factors that make instructional techniques and instructional materials used in the upper-class suburb ineffectual. Likewise, society has an obligation to prepare teachers for those children whose handicaps require specialized instructional procedures and methods. Because such children have the inalienable right to have the opportunity to develop whatever potentialities they may have, society must make available required resources.
2. Every child possesses a uniqueness that is characterized by strengths and weaknesses, assets and handicaps, and the task of the teacher is to provide experiences in learning appropriate to his special needs. This means that while there are common elements in the preparation of all teachers, specific groups of children and differing levels of maturity call for specialized preparation.
3. Effective teaching involves more than a knowledge of teaching methods and procedures. The teacher must first of all be an educated person, one who demonstrates a breadth of interest and a depth of understanding that surpasses those of persons engaged in other endeavors.
4. The preparation of teachers is a total institutional responsibility. Failure to utilize or to have available for the preparation of teachers all institutional resources makes a teacher education program less effective than it ought to be.

There are many unresolved problems in the proper education of teachers. The future for teacher education is bright, not because the solutions are obvious but because the necessity for improved programs is so clearly recognized.

APPENDIX C PRELIMINARY SURVEY INFORMATION PROGRAM FOR TRAINING TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

*Ralph L. Hoag, Coordinator,
Unit on Education of the Deaf
Francis V. Corrigan, Research Assistant,
Educational Programs for the Deaf
H. Ross Stuckless, Special Assistant
to Specialist, Programs for the Deaf*

The data reported in this special survey report were compiled for the expressed purpose of furnishing conferees attending the National Conference on the Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf with information thought to be useful to them in their deliberations and discussions of the topics to which the conference is addressed. The information was drawn from program proposal descriptions submitted by participating institutions for academic year 1963-64. Modifications in programs planned for 1964-65 are not reflected in this report.

The kind of information reported here is routinely collected by the Office of Education from program applications and other reports from participating institutions. It has been found that these descriptions often do not provide all information in a uniform manner. Consequently the breakdown as recorded here does not reflect full reliability but should provide a general picture of the status of training as it exists during this current academic year.

I. Institutions of higher education participating and number of scholarship students:

Participating institutions.....	46
Scholarship students.....	427

II. Number of college or university credits (converted to credit hours) required in programs for training teachers of the deaf which may or may not lead directly to a degree:

Distribution:

<i>Credit hours</i>	<i>Programs</i>
28-31.....	8
32-36.....	20
37-41.....	6
42-46.....	3
47-50.....	0
50-over.....	5
credits required not clearly delineated.....	4
Total.....	46

Mean: 34.5 credit hours.

Median: 33 credit hours.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY INFORMATION PROGRAM

III. Department responsible for Administration of the Program:

	<i>Programs</i>
Education departments.....	32
Speech and hearing departments.....	10
Other.....	4
Total.....	46

IV. College faculty and instruction of courses:

Number of programs using <i>only</i> full-time university or college faculty for program.....	18
Number of programs using <i>no</i> full-time university or college faculty for program.....	7
Number of programs using <i>both</i> full-time university faculty and part-time faculty from the practice teach facility.....	26
Total.....	46

V. Distances between college or university campus and principal practice teaching facility:

Distribution:	
Up to 5 miles.....	21
6 to 25 miles.....	18
26 to 100 miles.....	5
Over 100 miles.....	7
Total.....	46
Mean: 89 miles.	
Median: 7 miles.	

VI. Practice teaching and observation experience for students:

Total clock hours (practice teaching, observation based on 37 programs where information was most clear).
 Minimum: 180 clock hours.
 Maximum: 900 clock hours.
 Mean: 400 clock hours.
 Median: 400 clock hours.

Distribution:	
<i>Clock hours</i>	<i>Programs</i>
180-250.....	6
251-320.....	7
321-390.....	5
391-460.....	10
461-530.....	4
531 plus.....	5
Total.....	37

Clock hours of practice teaching only (based on 24 programs reporting specific information).

Mean: 280 clock hours.
 Median: 245 clock hours.

Clock hours of directed observation 20 programs reporting specific information.

Mean: 139 clock hours.
 Median: 130 clock hours.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

VII. Type of practice teaching centers used for observation and practicum experiences:

	<i>Programs</i>
Programs using residential schools only-----	28
Programs using day schools only-----	18
Programs using both day and residential schools--	10
Total-----	46

Profile of Student Trainees

February 27, 1964

Program for Training Teachers of the Deaf

Public Law 87-276

Academic Years 1962-63 and 1963-64

The student trainees:	1962-63	Percent	1963-64	Percent
Men.....	72	19.5	73	17.1
Women.....	298	80.5	354	82.9
Mean ages:				
Men.....	28.1 (Range 22-48)		27 (Range 21-48)	
Women.....	26.2 (Range 20-57)		25.1 (Range 20-60)	
Marital status:				
Men-single.....	87	51.4	86	49.3
Men-married.....	35	48.6	36	49.3
Divorced.....	-----	-----	1	1.4
Women-single.....	198	66.4	250	70.6
Women-married.....	100	33.6	98	26.2
Widow.....	-----	-----	4	1.2
Divorced.....	-----	-----	7	2.0
Educational background of trainees:	1962-63 number	Percent	1963-64 number	Percent
Education.....	207	55.9	226	52.9
Hearing and speech.....	55	14.8	73	17.1
Liberal arts.....	101	27.3	128	30.0
Not specified.....	7	2.9	-----	-----
Level of training:				
Graduate.....	225	60.8	273	63.9
Undergraduate.....	145	39.2	154	36.1
Related statistics:				
Trainees having previous experience with the deaf.....	83	22.4	90	21.1
Students who applied to more than one training center.....	25	6.7	21	4.9
Students offered more than one scholarship..	18	4.9	18	4.2
Number of participating institutions.....			1962-63	1963-64
Number of respondents.....			43	46
Number of students.....			370	427
Number of men.....			72	73
Number of women.....			298	354

APPENDIX D REFERENCES

Copies of the following papers were furnished to participants prior to the National Conference on the Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf.

1. Graunke, W. Lloyd, Tentative statements relating to accreditation standards for preparation of teachers of the deaf. Unpublished paper prepared for the Committee on Professional Standards of the Council for Exceptional Children.
2. Hoag, Ralph L., Role of the United States Office of Education in the preparation of teachers of the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 108, 1963, 408-418.
3. Mackie, Romaine P., *Teachers of Children Who Are Deaf*. Washington: United States Office of Education, 1966.
4. Murphy, L. J., Problems in selection and training teachers of the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 108, 1963, 408-407.
5. O'Connor, Clarence D., The preparation of teachers of the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 108, 1963, 396-402.
6. Quigley, Howard M., The evaluation of teacher preparation. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 108, 1963, 392-395.
7. Silverman, S. Richard, Education of deaf children—past and prologue. Keynote address: The International Congress on the Education of the Deaf, Washington, 1963.
8. Streng, Alice, Educating teachers of the deaf for tomorrow's schools. Paper presented at the convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, 1963.
9. Training centers for teachers of the deaf. Washington: *American Annals of the Deaf*, 1963.

APPENDIX E LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

Conference Participants

- Alacoque, Sister Mary, C.A.G.S. (Boston, 1960).
Supervisor of Student Teaching, The Boston School for the Deaf, Randolph, Mass.
- Ambrosen, Lloyd A., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1941).
Superintendent, Maryland School for the Deaf, Frederick, Md.
- Bartley, Father Thomas R., M. Ed. (Duquesne, 1956).
Director, The DePaul Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Birch, Jack W., Ph. D. (Pittsburgh, 1951).
Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Consultant.
- Black, John W., Ph. D. (Iowa, 1935).
Professor of Speech, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Blevins, Bill G., M. Ed. (Massachusetts, 1960).
Assistant Principal, Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., Recorder.
- Blish, Isabel Steele, M.A. (Smith, 1938).
Supervising Teacher, Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass.
- Boatner, Edmund B., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1933).
Superintendent, American School for the Deaf, West Hartford, Conn.
- Brasel, Melvin H., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1949).
Director of Education, Nebraska School for the Deaf, Omaha, Nebr., Interpreter.
- Brill, Richard G., Ed. D. (Rutgers, 1950).
Superintendent, California School for the Deaf, Riverside, Calif., Topic and Group Chairman.
- Brooks, Margaret G., B.A. (Oklahoma, 1935).
Director, Jane Brooks School for the Deaf, College of Women, Chickasha, Okla.
- Case, Harold C., D.D. (Pacific School of Religion, 1964).
President, Boston University, Boston, Mass., Speaker; Consultant.
- Cochran, John R., Ph. D. (Utah, 1959).
Director, Graduate Program for Teachers of the Deaf, Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, N. Mex.

- Connor, Frances P., Ed. D. (Columbia, 1953).
Head, Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Connor, Leo E., Ed. D. (Columbia, 1955).
Assistant Superintendent, Lexington School for the Deaf, New York, N.Y., Topic Editor.
- Corrigan, Francis V., M. Ed. (Boston, 1961).
Research Assistant, Educational Programs for the Deaf, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., O.E. Conference Staff.
- Costello, Mary R., Ph. D. (Northwestern, 1957).
Audiologist, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich., Recorder.
- Craig, Sam B., M.A. (George Washington, 1928).
Superintendent, Western Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Craig, William N., Ph. D. (Pittsburgh, 1962).
Director, Program Preparing Teachers of the Deaf, Oregon College of Education, Salem, Oreg.
- Crawford, Gladys H., M.S. (Washington, 1955).
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Curtis, W. Scott, Ph. D. (Purdue, 1960).
Administrator, Speech Pathology Program, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
- Detmold, George E., Ph. D. (Cornell, 1948).
Dean, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
- Eaton, Joseph W., Ph. D. (Columbia, 1948).
Professor of Social Work, Research, and Sociology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Consultant.
- Michholz, Gerhard C., Ph. D. (Ohio State, 1960).
Director, Division of Educational Resources, University of South Florida, Tampa, Fla., Consultant.
- Fant, Louis J., Jr., M.A. (Columbia, 1955).
Assistant Professor of Education, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C., Interpreter.
- Flint, Richard W., M.S. (Kansas, 1952).
Director, Education of the Deaf Program, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
- French, Sophie L., M.A. (Columbia, 1947).
Assistant Professor of Special Education, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Mich., Recorder.
- Frisina, D. Robert, Ph. D. (Northwestern, 1955).
Director, Hearing and Speech Center, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C., Topic Editor.
- Gall, Elena D., Ed. D. (Columbia, 1949).
Coordinator of Special Education, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

59

- Garretson, Mervin D., M.A. (Wyoming, 1955).
Assistant Professor of Education, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
- Gertrude, Sister Rose, Ph. D. (Niagara, 1938).
Superintendent, St. Mary's School for the Deaf, Buffalo, N.Y.
- Gilbert, Edna, Ph. D. (Wisconsin, 1950).
Chairman, Division of Special Education, Minot State College, Minot, N. Dak.
- Gough, Harriet, M.A. (Gallaudet, 1932).
Supervising Teacher, Kendall School, Washington, D.C., Conference Planning Committee.
- Graunke, W. Lloyd, Ph. D. (Northwestern, 1959).
Superintendent, Tennessee School for the Deaf, Knoxville, Tenn., Topic and Group Chairman.
- Hester, Marshall S., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1932).
Superintendent, New Mexico School for the Deaf, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Recorder.
- Hoag, Ralph L., Ed. D. (Arizona, 1961).
Specialist, Coordinator, Unit on Education of the Deaf, Washington, D.C., Conference Coordinator.
- Hoffmeyer, Ben E., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1947).
Superintendent, North Carolina School for the Deaf, Morganton, N.C., Interpreter.
- Holloway, William J., Ed. D. (Illinois, 1961).
Superintendent, Virginia State School, Hampton, Va.
- Houchins, Rollie R., Ph. D. (Wayne State, 1962).
Assistant Professor, Special Education and Speech, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Huckleberry, Alan, Ed. D. (Indiana, 1948).
Director, Special Education and Clinics, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
- Jenson, Pauline M., M.A. (Columbia, 1950).
Supervisor, Education of the Deaf, Trenton State College, Trenton, N.J.
- Johnson, T. Earle, Ph. D. (Wisconsin, 1945).
Head, Department of Speech, University of Alabama, University, Ala.
- Kean, William F., Ed. D. (Buffalo, 1957).
Director, Graduate Division, Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y.
- Kent, Margaret S., M.A. (Columbia, 1948).
Principal, Maryland School for the Deaf, Frederick, Md.
- Kopp, Harriet G., Ph. D. (Columbia, 1961).
Principal, Detroit Day School for the Deaf, Detroit, Mich., Topic Editor.
- Kopra, Lennart L., Ph. D. (Northwestern, 1964).
Director, Speech and Hearing Clinic, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., Recorder.
- Kraus, Sister Anna Rose, M.A. (Western Reserve, 1952).
Coordinator, Deaf Education, Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo.

Kronenberg, Henry, Ph. D. (Minnesota, 1935).
Dean, College of Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., Conference Planning Committee.

Krug, Richard F., Ph. D. (Oklahoma, 1960).
Associate Professor, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Levine, Edna S., Ph. D. (New York, 1948).
Adjunct Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, New York University, New York, N.Y., Recorder.

Lord, Francis E., Ph. D. (Michigan, 1936).
Head, Department of Education, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Lowell, Edgar L., Ph. D. (Harvard, 1952).
Administrator, John Tracy Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif., Conference Chairman.

Mangan, Kenneth R., Ed. D. (Washington, 1959).
Superintendent, Illinois School for the Deaf, Jacksonville, Ill. Topic and Group Chairman.

Masson, Jacques, Teacher for deaf and blind, Brussels 52, Belgium.
Head, Training School for Teachers for Exceptional Children, Brussels, Belgium.

McCauley, John M., Ph. D. (Loyola, 1959).
Director, Institute of Rehabilitation, De Paul University, Chicago, Ill.

McClure, William J., M.A. (George Washington, 1942).
Superintendent, Indiana School for the Deaf, Indianapolis, Ind., Participant.

Megles, Marie E.
Secretary, Educational Programs for the Deaf., U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., O.E. Conference Staff.

Mencke, Gene, Ph. D. (Oklahoma, 1963).
Supervisor, Training Teachers of the Deaf, University of Oklahoma Medical School, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Meyerson, Lee, Ph. D. (Stanford, 1950).
Professor of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz.

Milesky, Samuel D., M.A. (Harvard, 1942).
Supervisor, Schools for the Deaf and the Visually Handicapped, Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wis.

Miller, June, Ed. D. (Columbia, 1958).
Educational Director, Hearing and Speech Department, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, Kans., Recorder.

Miner, Katherine D., M.A. (Michigan, 1950).
Assistant Professor of Special Education, Kent State University, Kent Ohio.

Moore, Lucy M., A.M. (Illinois College, 1930).
Director, Program for Training Teachers of the Deaf, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., Recorder.

- Mulholland, Ann M., M.A. (Northwestern, 1956).
Assistant Professor, Deaf Education and Guidance, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Recorder.
- Munson, Edith W., M.Ed. (Chicago Teachers College, 1958).
Supervisor, Division of Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Chicago Board of Education Chicago, Ill.
- Newkirk, June E., M.A. (Illinois, 1937).
Teacher, Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind, Tucson, Ariz.
- Neyhus, Arthur I., Ph. D. (Northwestern, 1962).
Assistant Professor, Deaf Education and Guidance, Northwestern, University, Evanston, Ill.
- O'Connor, Clarence D., M.A. (Columbia, 1934).
Superintendent, Lexington School for the Deaf, New York, N.Y., Conference Planning Committee.
- Orman, James N., M.S. (Illinois, 1951).
Supervising Teacher, Illinois School for the Deaf, Jacksonville, Ill.
- Owsley, Peter J., M.A. (Northwestern, 1950).
Assistant Headmaster, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Panara, Robert F., M.A. (New York, 1948).
Associate Professor of English, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
- Pelone, Anthony J., Ed. D. (Columbia, 1956).
Director, Division for Handicapped Children, New York State Education Department, Albany, N.Y.
- Phillips, Frances I., M. Ed. (Rutgers, 1948).
Chairman, Department of Education, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
- Phillips, Wm. Desmond, Ed. D. (Columbia, 1963).
Assistant Professor, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Recorder.
- Pittenger, Priscilla, Ed. D. (Stanford, 1954).
Professor of Education, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Calif., Recorder.
- Powell, Frank W., M.S. (Gallaudet, 1960).
Coordinator of Deaf Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
- Pronovost, Wilbert, Ph. D. (Iowa, 1939).
Director, Programs in Speech, Hearing and Deafness, Boston University, Boston, Mass., Topic and Group Chairman.
- Quigley, Howard M., M.A. (Columbia, 1937).
Superintendent, Minnesota School for the Deaf, Fairbault, Minn., Recorder.
- Quigley, Stephen P., Ph. D. (Illinois, 1957).
Associate Professor, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Conference Editor; Conference Planning Committee.

Reid, William R., Ph. D. (Iowa, 1968).

Coordinator, Department of Special Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Schooling, Herbert W., Ed. D. (Missouri, 1954).

Dean, College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., *Speaker*; *Consultant*.

Schunhoff, Hugo F., Ed. D. (Maryland, 1956).

Superintendent, California School for the Deaf, Berkeley, Calif., *Recorder*.

Scott, Edward W., M. Ed. (Illinois, 1957).

Head, Deaf Education Division, Department of Education, MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill.

Siegenthaler, Bruce M., Ph. D. (Michigan, 1951).

Director, Speech and Hearing Clinic, Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pa.

Scouten, Edward L., M.A. (Gallaudet, 1941).

Principal, Louisiana School for the Deaf, Baton Rouge, La., *Recorder*.

Silverman, S. Richard, Ph. D. (Washington, 1942).

Director, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo., *Conference Planning Committee*.

Simmons, Audrey Ann, Ed. D. (Washington, 1963).

Director, Aural Rehabilitation Department, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo., *Recorder*.

Stahlem, Evelyn M., M.A. (Columbia, 1941).

Principal, Mary E. Bennett School for the Deaf, Los Angeles, Calif.

Streng, Alice H., M.A. (Columbia, 1938).

Professor, Education of the Deaf, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis., *Recorder*.

Stroud, James B., Ph. D. (Chicago, 1930).

Director of Special Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Stuckless, E. Ross, Ph. D. (Pittsburgh, 1968).

Assistant Coordinator, Program Preparing Teachers of the Deaf, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., *O. H. Conference Staff*.

Tasker, Vivian R., M.A. (Northwestern, 1948).

Assistant Professor of Education, Illinois State University, Normal, Ill.

Tervoort, Bernard Th. S. J., Ph. D. (Amsterdam, 1953).

Principal, Instituut Voor Doofstommen, St. Michielgestel, The Netherlands, *Consultant*.

Vaughan, Tony, Ed. D. (Oklahoma, 1951).

Director of Special Education, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo., *Conference Planning Committee*.

Vincent, Sister Agnes, M. Ed. (Buffalo, 1961).

Principal, St. Francis de Sales School, Long Island, N.Y.

- Wilman, M. Catherine, M.A. (Columbia, 1939).
Principal, Junior High School No. 47, School for the Deaf, New York, N.Y.
- Woodward, Helen M., M.A. (Washington, 1963).
Supervisor of Education, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo., Topic Editor.
- Youngs, Joseph P., M.A. (George Washington, 1954).
Superintendent, Governor Baxter State School for the Deaf, Portland, Maine, Interpreter.

Conference Observers

- Flynt, Ralph C. M., B.A. (Virginia, 1928).
Formerly Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Featherston, El. Glenn, Ed. D (Missouri, 1940).
Formerly Deputy Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Gonzales, John I., M.A. (San Francisco Valley, 1962).
Specialist, the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of H.M.W., Washington, D.C.
- Hourihan, Father John F., M.A. (Columbia, 1960).
Director, Special Education Department, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J.
- Kirk, Samuel A., Ph. D. (Michigan, 1935).
Director, Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Mackie, Romaine, P., Ph. D. (Columbia, 1942).
Special Assistant to Director, Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Norwood, Malcolm, M. Ed. (Hartford, 1957).
Program Specialist, Captioned Films for the Deaf, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Prewitt, T. A.
Board member, Arkansas School for the Deaf, Little Rock, Ark.
- Sava, Samuel G., Ed. D. (American, 1963).
Program Officer, Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Winalski, Patria
Assistant to the Congressional Liaison Officer, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.