DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 337 SP 009 574

AUTHOR Reynolds, Maynard C.
TITLE Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Exceptional (Atypical); Handicapped; Normalization (Handicapped); *Parent Associations; Regular Class Placement; Special Classes; *Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Special Programs; Special Schools; Teacher Role; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The "special" quality of special education is the body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes which are used in the education and training of exceptional school children. In practice, these children have been those who public school systems could not or would not teach. The history of education for exceptional children is a simple story of massive nelgect, denial, and rejection. The first institutions organized for the blind, deaf, and retarded were residential. Some distinctive programs for exceptional children were organized in public day schools at the turn of the century. But it was not until after World War II that a remarkable surge of activities on behalf of handicapped children began. Currently the field of special education is negotiating a more integrated place for exceptional children in both the public schools and the communities in which they live. There are many new trends in special education taking place today. Since 1970, parents have returned to the courts as a means of promoting public action. Individualism and mainstreaming have both emerged as important trends in this decade. Lastly, a more open view of human capacities seems evident. Special education is in the early phases of a major transformation. An unusual set of opportunities challenges special educators to influence their future and that of the children they serve. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ERIC

~~For U.C.E.A. only~~
~~Not for quotation or release~~
~~6/20/73~~
~~8/29/73~~

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE 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 NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED113337

Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel

Maynard C. Reynolds
Department of Special Education
University of Minnesota

INTRODUCTION

The "special" quality of special education is the body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes which are used in the education and training of the exceptional population of school children. In theory, this clientele has consisted of children with physiological, intellectual, and emotional handicaps. In practice, the children have been those our public school systems could not or would not teach. The difference between theory and practice represents a compound of cultural attitudes toward education, educational philosophy, teacher training, and public school funding.

Cultural attitudes have been an important determinant historically of the purposes assigned to our public school systems. During the mid-Nineteenth Century, free, public education was the response to the democratic need for a literate electorate. As industrialization of the country necessitated a great influx of immigrants, the purpose of education was seen to be the americanizing of the newcomers and the transmission to them of the country's cultural values. With the halt in immigration after World War I, education was conceptualized as a social investment in children who would be able to pay dividends on that investment by making returns to society. None of these notions included provisions for children with handicaps. Depending upon the extent of the handicap, the children were considered to be misfits and outcasts or burdens on the productive members of society.

These attitudes have taken a long time to die out. Although much progress has been made in the last twenty-five years in providing education for children with handicaps, it has been in the form of "special

SP009 574

education" which has tended to make the children more conscious of their differences from other children than their similarities. This is not to say that special educators consider the consumers of their services inferior children but that the position of special education in our school systems has, up until very recently, been subsidiary to regular education rather than a part of the main stream. This situation is slowly changing because regular educators need the expertise of special educators. The change should not be viewed, however, as an internecine struggle between professional groups but, rather, as the advocacy of special educators for the social, cultural, and educational recognition of exceptional children and of their rights as children.

As the advocates of the exceptional children of our society, special educators have fulfilled various roles to serve the children placed in their charge. The term "role," as used here, can only be defined as the way special educators function in order to solve the problems of providing exceptional children with education and training.

To the extent that there are known educational procedures for dealing with the several problems, as for example, teaching braille reading methods to children who cannot see or applying behavior modification techniques to increase "on task" behavior by easily distracted pupils, they are functions. When functions are combined for performance by an individual, a role emerges. Obviously, roles may vary in many ways. One might say that the teaching/learning "problems" define the domain of special education for inquiry, training, and service. To the extent that specific teaching functions are known to and can be performed by teachers to solve particular problems, they become "competencies" of the teachers. Combinations of competencies, if they are demonstrated by teachers, presumably are the basis on which roles are defined and individuals are credentialed or certified as special educators.

In a larger sense, one may use the term "role" to define an entire field. This larger usage can be identified in the discussion of the historical aspects of special education and in some of the projections for the future. The implications for the roles of special education personnel are obvious, even if they are not made explicit. Attention is also given to the expanding domain in which special educators are expected to serve and to the changing boundary lines between special education and other aspects of education.

This discussion of the changes in special education is by no means a trend study in a refined, quantitative sense. The field of special education has great difficulty in documenting its own history, mostly because the units to be attended to seem constantly in doubt. For many years, the U. S. Office of Education provided periodic reports on the numbers of children and teachers in the various categories of exceptionality occupied in special education, mainly in special classes. But new categories are constantly being added, new administrative arrangements keep appearing, and new teaching roles emerge. Thus, it has become increasingly unclear as to what ought to be reported and counted. Lately, nationally oriented data have been hard to locate; they are most often available in the form of congressional testimony or mimeographed federal or state reports. In any case, it has been necessary to depend mainly upon informal and largely subjective delineations to discern the trends of the field.

This chapter is organized around three topics: (a) a brief history of special education which leads up to its present status; (b) a discussion of current forces and trends; and (c) a discussion of problems, predictions, and their implications for the future.

ERIC

Historical Perspective

The history of education for exceptional children, if told from their point of view, is a simple story of massive neglect, denial, and rejection. For every Laura Bridgeman and Helen Keller, tens of thousands of children with similar or different handicaps were doomed to constricted lives because it was believed that they could not be taught or were not worth teaching. In a sense, the development of special education can be recounted as an assault on this discriminatory attitude. It began in the early Nineteenth Century with a handful of dedicated pioneers: Gaspard Itard (1774-1838), his student Edouard Seguin (1812-1880), and Maria Montessori, who began the study and training of mentally deficient children; Samuel G. Howe (1801-1876), who started the first school for the blind in the United States and proved that the blind could be educated by his work with blind and deaf Laura Bridgeman; Thomas H. Gallaudet (1787-1851), who organized the first school for the deaf in this country; and Louis Braille (1809-1852), the inventor of the system of writing which bears his name.

Nineteenth Century: Residential Schools

The first institutions organized for the blind, deaf, and retarded were residential; they became the models and set the dominant early pattern for special education in the United States. The institutions tended to be narrowly categorical in orientation and, since colleges and universities were not yet involved in professional training programs for teaching the handicapped, teachers were necessarily prepared for their specialized work by on-the-job training. The roles of teachers, therefore, were defined categorically as of the "blind," the "deaf," or the "retarded."

Although most states established residential schools for the children of residents and numerous private schools were also founded, not all exceptional children could be accommodated in the institutions. The facilities were limited in the state-operated schools and the private ones were too expensive for many families. Some parents considered the removal of their children more onerous than depriving them of educational opportunities. And children with multiple handicaps were often not eligible for admission to any school.

Residential schools are still in existence but more and more they are being used only for the most profoundly handicapped populations.

Early Twentieth Century: Community Prototypes

Some distinctive programs for exceptional children were organized in public day schools at about the turn of the century. In their earliest forms, these programs were dependent on the curriculums and leadership of residential schools, and those institutions also trained the needed teachers. Gallaudet College, for example, which was then serving deaf children, started a teacher training program in the 1890's (Craig, 1942), and in 1904, the Vineland Training School in New Jersey began summer training sessions for teachers of retarded children (Hill, 1945).

At their best, the community programs never more than tolerated the exceptional children and the movement developed slowly. For the first half of the Twentieth Century, most handicapped children were in schools for minimum periods only. Some children were forced to repeat grades until they became embarrassingly oversized in comparison with their classmates. In other school systems, "special" classes or "opportunity" rooms were instituted for handicapped children and the labels quickly took on derogatory connotations.

Until comparatively recently, of course, public schools had never seriously tried to serve all children, and especially not those who were

difficult to teach. Indeed, most children attended school only long enough to acquire a basic education, during the first decades of this century. Consequently, school systems were not prepared physically, philosophically, or financially to operate far-reaching programs for exceptional children. Special education is costly by definition because of its emphasis on individual problems and needs. When school budgets were limited, as during the Depression of the 1930's in particular, special class programs were not expanded.

The continuing neglect of atypical children was not a deliberate deprivation but, rather, an outgrowth of certain ideas which were pervasive at the time. Sloan (1963) attributed the educational lethargy of the period to the widespread public misinformation on genetics and criminal tendencies and to the accepted attitude that mental retardation was generally a hopeless condition. According to Zigler (1969), ideas about the "rigidity" of the retarded, which emerged during the 1930's, tended to become diffused in the public consciousness and to further delay and deny such children opportunities for training.

Nevertheless, during the 1920's and 1930's, formal programs to train teachers for the handicapped were instituted in a few universities, first at Wayne University and The Teachers College of Columbia University, and then at Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

1945-1970: Explosion of Simple Models

As if to make up through one large effort the neglect of centuries, a remarkable surge of activities in behalf of handicapped children began shortly after World War II. Our largest states launched programs on a broad scale to serve the handicapped in the public schools and numerous colleges and universities organized programs to train teachers in special education (News and Notes, 1948).

ERIC

The change that occurred over the quarter of a century is best reflected in statistics. In 1948, 442,000 children were enrolled in special education programs, in 1963, 1,666,000 (Mackie, 1965), and, according to estimates of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, during the 1971-72 school year, 2,857,551 handicapped children were receiving special education services. These data reflect more than a six-fold increase.

The increase in training programs for teachers of the handicapped was almost as great. About 77 colleges and universities were providing training sequences for special education teachers in one or more categories in 1948; by 1954, the number was 122 (Mackie & Dunn, 1954), and by 1973, over 400. In addition to special education teachers, school systems were employing growing numbers of administrators and supervisors for the rapidly proliferating programs of special education which were spreading across more and more categories of handicaps.

Although it is impossible to determine all the influences which brought about the sudden development of public school programs for exceptional children, three can be recognized. They were new on the educational scene.

1. Parents of handicapped children formed a number of organizations, such as the National Association for Retarded Children (chartered in 1950), which became socially and politically active. They influenced state legislatures and the Congress. Because of the activities of the politically aggressive parent organizations, the federal government established a national program in the field of special education. In 1957, supports were provided for research and leadership training in the area of mental retardation; in 1963, the supports were extended by Congress to cover virtually all areas of handicaps; and in 1967, the new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established to administer the burgeoning new programs.

2. Many state legislatures, in response to pressures from parents' groups, passed new legislation which mandated instruction in the schools for many categories of exceptional children. The legislatures provided excess cost aids in one form or another to local school districts that launched new programs. Because of the financial assistance provided by state legislatures, and later by the federal agencies, many school districts found that the operation of special education programs not only permitted the provision of services for exceptional children but also helped to improve the services for the school population as a whole.

3. As the nation became aware of and made necessary provisions for the rehabilitation of World War II and Korean veterans who had been seriously injured, facilities for their rehabilitation in Veterans Hospitals were enlarged and new research programs to further aid the veterans were established in various institutions and agencies. In colleges and universities, departments of clinical psychology, speech pathology, and physical medicine were expanded through federal rehabilitation funds and the influences of their investigations in behalf of veterans spread to the research and training being carried on for exceptional children. For example, because blinded veterans rejected isolation and dependency as their fate, programs for mobility and occupational training were begun for them at Veterans Hospitals. Some of the national leaders who participated in carrying out these programs were also involved with schools. Consequently, some transference of expertise took place which was reflected in programmatic developments for blind children. Many school systems found that these children could function in day school programs based on a resource room model, that is, in programs in which the children spend only part of the day away from the regular classroom. These programs have forced serious examination of the usual past practices of automatically

referring blind children to special schools or classes.

It should be noted, however, that the sheer quantitative leap in programming for exceptional children between 1945 and 1970 cannot be attributed to any great technological or ideological advances. There were some innovations, such as the development of low-vision and individual electronic hearing aids, but they are of limited account. In the main, the period can be said to have been one of rapid development based on simple models of the past. This is not to imply that the two-and-one-half decades were barren of new ideas; in fact, some of the trends that are discussed in the next section were generated during these important years. A few examples should suffice.

As part of the studies stimulated by President John F. Kennedy in the mid-1960's, a great many U.S. special educators were enabled to investigate developments in the field in other parts of the world. Visitors to the Scandinavian countries encountered what is known as the process of "normalization," that is, the strong community structures and support systems set up to deal with handicapped individuals and their problems. Since then, the principle has become an important part of the thinking and planning of American special educators.

The boundary lines of the categories of exceptional children were seriously examined and strong pressures were developed to extend special education services to children still not served. The specific case which was argued most strenuously was whether schools should serve the "trainable" as well as the "educable" retarded.[1]

Special education services were provided to children who do not fall into any of the special education categories of handicaps. In the late

---

[1]For the famous debate between I. Ignacy Goldberg and William M. Cruickshank, see the NEA Journal for December, 1958.

1960's, the largest increases in special education enrollments were in the area of "learning disabilities," an area that many observers consider not to be a handicap category in the traditional sense. The inclusion of the area in special education's province was welcomed, nevertheless, because it represents a move away from the overly simple medical and psychometric models of categorization which have increasingly come under attack.

Overall, one characteristic of the period is the greatest importance for the future: For the first time diverse programs of special education were consolidated in single institutions. For the first time, it became possible to look at and to work across all categories and to consider how they might be related to each other. This consolidation is reflected in the present research and training programs of many colleges and universities.

1970's: Negotiating An Integrated Place in the Schools and in Community Life

As a result of the experience gained during the busy period of 1945-1970, the field of special education is currently (early 1970's) negotiating a more integrated place for exceptional children in both the public schools and the communities in which they live.

The remainder of this paper is concerned with characterizing the current period, mainly in terms of trends and forces, and then with outlining some possible problems and developments in the future. Undoubtedly, the remote future will take unpredicted directions, but at least for the current scene and the near future it seems appropriate to summarize activities in terms of a closer integration of special education with the whole of the educational system. What follows is an expansion of this theme.

Sources of the Future: Current Forces and Trends

As used here, the term "forces" signifies those influences that relate to special education but are larger in scope and effect than special education itself. They are, essentially, a clustering of ideological and social phenomena that energize and define movements in the field of special education. Because they are of critical importance at this time, they should be understood in relation to possible future courses. The term "trends" is used in its usual sense.

Forces: Categorical Parent Groups Become Litigious

For some two decades now the schools and other institutions serving exceptional children have been goaded to develop their services by organized groups of parents of exceptional children. Professionals have usually found constructive ways of interacting with these groups, thus creating a broadly coordinated voice in such activities as achieving legislative consideration at state and federal levels, but they have not co-opted the associations. Parent groups are the watchdogs of the institutions that serve their children and they are quick to make themselves heard at all levels--school, community, state, and federal--whenever programs appear to be inadequate.

Initially, the associations used their political power. Since about 1970, however, they have turned to the courts as a means of promoting public action. This fact may be more important than any other in accounting for the changes in special education that are now occurring and are likely to continue, at least into the near future. Court actions are here subsumed under the rubric of parent groups because, clearly, the groups are the

ERIC

basic planning and motivating forces behind them. Should the courts not provide the leverage sought by the groups, other stratagems will unquestionably be employed.

In the context of recent court decisions, "right of education," "right to treatment," and "due process" have emerged as concepts which may change the face of all of education. Although the PARC (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children, 1971) and certain subsequent cases have not yet been fully litigated and become constitutionally precedent-setting, they have been extraordinarily persuasive in establishing the principle that every child, no matter how seriously handicapped he may be, has the right to education. In other words, public schools have the obligation to provide appropriate education for literally all children, either in their own local facilities or by arrangement with other agencies.

These cases also established a very broad concept of education. The appropriate function of public education was judicially decided to be the equipping of handicapped children with "life skills," a principle which goes far beyond the goal of transmitting academic skills. The court also made clear that it considered the enhancement of individual development to be the critical objective of education rather than consideration of the returns society might expect from providing the individual with education.

The PARC case also established the right of parents to participate in major decisions affecting their handicapped children. The State Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania was directed to train "hearing officers" who would be available to conduct proceedings for parents

ERIC

and school representatives on such matters as school placement. The court expressed the preference for placing handicapped children in regular classes with displacements to special classes and special schools requiring extraordinary justification.

Another set of cases, developed mainly in the context of institutional placements, established the individual's right to treatment, which was defined as including education. The Wyatt-Stickney case has prompted special interest because it helped to establish the principle that lack of funds is not an acceptable justification for failure to provide treatment; public agencies are required either to raise sufficient funds or to reallocate existing resources to fulfill their treatment responsibilities to patients (Wyatt v. Aderholt, 1971).

In addition to their litigious activities, parents' groups have continued, at the local and state levels, to oppose or support issues impinging on their interests, such as, mandatory education provisions in state legislation, more staff for residential schools, and the more secure funding of private schools. Special education administrators have been confronted by organizational representatives with demands for the inclusion of their children in various programs, for responsiveness to needs felt by the families of exceptional children, for the right to negotiate major decisions relating to their children, and for program improvements of all kinds. In some instances, the confrontations have occurred in adversary proceedings with attorneys representing the organizations.

Minority Groups

For the most part, parents groups concerned with children in the various exceptionality categories have drawn their memberships and active participants from among the parents of quite severely handicapped

children. A high proportion of the membership is white, middle-class, and relatively affluent. The programs instigated by the organizations, however, by no means have affected only the severely handicapped children in middle-class neighborhoods. Indeed, the greatest impact of the groups' activities have been felt in urban ghetto schools by minority group children in programs for the educable mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. These two categories probably carry more stigma than any of the others.

The President's Committee on Retardation (1968) found that children from impoverished and minority group homes are 15 times more likely to be diagnosed as retarded than are children from higher income families, and that three-fourths of the nation's mentally retarded are to be found in the isolated and impoverished urban and rural slums. Awareness of the spreading presence of "special classes" in ghetto schools has aroused resentment and resistance. As a result, administrators of school systems in our largest cities are under a virtual mandate to reverse the expansion of special education programs and to eliminate the testing, categorizing, and labeling practices which are associated with placement in the programs. In his review of Michael Young's book, <u>Rise of Meritocracy</u>, David Riesman (1967) lauded this kind of "resistance of parents to having their children fall like brass in Plato's social system."

In associations of professionals, such as the Council for Exceptional Children, minority group members have also voiced their concern for the excessive allocations of minority group children to programs that remove them from the mainstream of education, and they are working within the associations for changes in the policies and operations of the schools. In fact, there is a rising and very broad demand among special educators for

the elimination of any activities that degrade and stigmatize children. The minority groups and professionals who challenge the special placements and simple categorizing of children have taken a position that is, in fact, discordant with the strictly handicapping categories or concepts on which parents' groups are organized:

While associations of parents of handicapped children are seeking to expand the services of special education for their children, minority group members are tending to take strongly negative attitudes toward almost every activity conducted in the name of special education. The opposition is particularly a problem in our largest cities where the future of special education has been placed in doubt.

Trends: Individualism

Most states have long-standing laws requiring local school districts to provide education for all children and to compel all children of certain ages to attend the schools provided. Nevertheless, in the past, there have been many instances in which various categories of children have been excused or excluded from the schools. Indeed, many school authorities felt quite free to expel for any reason individual students who were troublesome or difficult. Few communities noted that the so-called compulsory school attendance laws were generally not being administered with vigor and, outside of the immediate families, the demissions of children went largely unnoticed also. The situation was such that in most communities, no one really knew how many children were out of school. In large cities, where the mobility of families is high, the situation was even more difficult to assess.

Radical changes have been occurring, however, in part because of the activities of students themselves. They have become increasingly aware of

their rights not to be denied valuable educational opportunities by arbitrary procedures. Lawyers, often supported by organized civil libertarians, have been eager to press cases for individual students, and professionals who, from various points of view, see the rights of individual students as a fundamental democratic right that surpasses in importance all rights and conveniences of institutions, have added their weight. In addition, support has been given by legislators who have removed categorical bases for the demission of children from schools, such as the repeal of laws allowing the exclusion of the "trainable" retarded, and thus forced the schools to deliberate each proposed demission on an individual basis. These elements of social action have been epitomized at the Harvard Center for Law and Education from which flow "packages" of legal materials, publications, and services in behalf of individual student rights.

The results of these activities are self-evident. Educators are increasingly enjoined not only to enroll all children who are presented to the schools but to actively seek out all children, including those with special needs, and assure their enrollment in appropriate school programs. Categorical exclusions are rapidly being eliminated by legislative enactments, thus achieving the same results as would the broad and binding application of court decisions. The difficult problems of individual pupils are accorded due process in all demission actions; if demission from the school is directed, special arrangements for out-of-school education are provided. The effect of this observance is to harden compulsory attendance laws and to safeguard at the highest levels the right of each student to appropriate education.

Implicit in this movement is the concept that the rights of the individual have primacy over institutional and even societal concerns and

values. There have been times, not long past, when it was argued that exceptional children need not be served by the schools when their returns to society would be minimal. In the Goldberg-Cruickshank debate, for example, Cruickshank argued that "Public education is . . . based on the belief that as a result of learning, the individual will be able to assume a self-directed role in society, and that he will probably assume responsibility for others--his wife and children or parents" (Goldberg-Cruickshank, 1958). It has become increasingly clear, since then, that the ability or potentiality of the individual to provide a return to society or to particular institutions is not a proper test in considering a child's enrollment in school. Even if all that can be anticipated is enhancement of his own life, it is sufficient.

The Council for Exceptional Children, in a 1971 Policy Statement, defined the principle of education as

> . . . the philosophical premise of democracy that every person is valuable in his own right and should be afforded equal opportunities to develop his full potential. Thus, no democratic society should deny educational opportunities to any child, regardless of his potentialities for making a contribution to society (Council for Exceptional Children, 1971).

The emergence of priority for the individual and the measurement of programs in terms of reward to the individual rather than to society, has spread to other areas. New approaches to measurement and monitoring are oriented to the individual. Journals now tend to accept studies based on N=1. New management systems, such as "Individually Guided Education (IGE)," stress individual development. Curriculums stress adaptations

ERIC

to individuals, as in Individual Prescribed Instruction (IPI) and innumerable systems for computerized assistance in instruction. The applied behavior analysts, who work in the schools, following principles developed by Skinner, Bijou, Lindsley, Haring and others, give preeminent position to data on and instruction for the individual.

Spears' (1973) recent opinion survey of Phi Delta Kappa members distinctly showed positive feelings toward and predictions on topics covering individualization. For example, 87% of his respondents agreed that IGE has a potential to improve education; 74% agreed that IPI has such a potential also; and 75% agreed that Individual Mathematics System (IMS) also has such a potential. The extent of agreement on these items was higher than on most others in the survey.

There can be no question that the new focus on the individual student reflects altered values as well as practices and that they portend fundamental changes in the schools.

Trends: Mainstreaming

A number of observers have long believed that the busy period of expansion for special education subsequent to World War II was, in fact, a sad example of special educators' complicity in perpetuating the rejection of children from mainstream educational structures and in attaching "child-blaming" labels on exceptional children. According to the argument raised, deviancy labels are given to children who are difficult or inconvenient to teach and, thus, they can be removed from the mainstream and isolated in special classes. It is a parallel of the criticism by Szasz (1961) of society's treatment of people who are different.

If one takes a limited view of schools during the period in question, the argument against special educators is valid. However, the critics

overlook one important factor: For the first time in the history of special education, stations for exceptional children were built into the schools and the children were made a part of the total school community. Educators who strongly support the importance of this point of view believe that the rapid expansion of special education in the schools, even in a largely "set aside" form, was a necessary transition to the more complete integration of exceptional children in the regular school structures.

The discussion has become somewhat academic because of what might be called the "mainstreaming" trend, which has become noticeable in many fields of human service, especially in mental health and social welfare, and which is moving special education in new directions. In the field of mental health, the rapid development of community psychiatry and psychology epitomizes the mainstreaming effect. Where, in past years, large numbers of therapists served individual patients in isolated clinics, now therapeutic help is given to troubled persons through the development of support systems and institutions at the community level, which prevent the emergence of serious problems. Dr. Gerald Caplan, Director of the Harvard Laboratory of Community Psychiatry, illustrates the trend in his call " ... for the community psychiatrist to start by getting firsthand knowledge of a problem through diagnosing and treating emotionally disturbed individuals; then he should become a consultant and educator to enable other caregivers to handle such cases; later, he should consult with organizations so that they may develop policies and programs for the prevention and control of these disorders..." (Caplan, 1972).

An assumption in the mainstreaming movement is that "much of what we consider to be mental disorder is both socially determined and defined. The major faults of society lie not with its people but in its systems, and

ERIC

this premise is basic" (Dorken, 1971). That theme has perhaps been most fully developed by Szasz (1961), who argued with growing force and effect that the first tendency of society is to reject those who are different and that this tendency can and must be altered.

A different argument for the development of community psychiatry and psychology can be read in the position of Albee (1959). He pointed out some years ago that the helping professions simply could not expect to grow sufficiently to meet all the therapeutic needs of the population through the individual treatment mode.

Each of the arguments raised in the field of mental health has been paralleled in the field of special education. Trippe (1971), has argued the social determiner position. Gallagher (1968) has demonstrated that "We can't get there from here," that is, that we will not be able to supply the needed specialized teachers for major categories of exceptional children for at least the foreseeable future if we proceed by our present modes.

Supports are also being rapidly developed in the informal care-giving networks of communities which make it possible for exceptional persons to remain in the community. Parent groups, churches, 4H groups, bowling leagues, summer camps, and similar groups form this informal network. The wide-ranging social actions in the community provide a framework of reference and support for mainstreaming in the schools.

Mainstreaming has become the single most conspicuous trend in the field of special education. In a recent open-ended survey conducted by the writer for the Council for Exceptional Children, special educators were asked to list the changes that they anticipated in the field for the next decade. Mainstreaming was listed more often than any other single topic. Although the specific predictions took a variety of forms, the central

element of each was that children with exceptional needs will be referred less often out of regular classes for treatment in special classes and centers.

Where the mainstreaming movement is taken seriously, attention is given to a number of implications (Reynolds, 1963). One is that regular classroom teachers need assistance to become more resourceful in accomodating exceptional pupils. This idea is not new. Wallin, in 1935, reported that "...for countless generations the public school education of handicapped and maladjusted children ... has been squarely placed upon the regular grade teacher, although they have never been required to qualify for this ... work by earning one credit in appropriate courses." Lately, many college faculty and local supervisors have begun to take seriously the matter of better preparation of regular educators in "exceptionality."

A correlative activity is the rapid change-over of many special education teacher-preparation programs to provide broadly trained resource or consulting teachers who can help to bridge gaps between regular and special education. A recent volume edited by Deno (1973) describes some dozen different models in which new kinds of personnel and new systems are being used to bring regular and special education into one total system to serve all children. The Deno monograph, and an earlier one edited by Reynolds and Davis (1971), focus on the specific efforts by one bureau of the U.S. Office of Education to support <u>mainstreaming</u> forms of special education. Similar developments have been encouraged by the "bloc grant" procedures of the Training Division of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U.S. Office of Education, which were made available as alternatives to categorical grants for training purposes, beginning in 1971.

Many special educators now think of their field as involving a broad continuum or cascade of administrative and instructional arrangements, varying from regular class placements to resource room plans, itinerant teaching plans, part-time special classes, full-time special classes, local day schools, residential schools, treatment centers and hospitals. In the past, exceptional children tended to be "rejected" to special stations with the most seriously handicapped rejected down through all levels to the "end of the line" residential centers. What clearly is happening now is that the negative cascade is reversing along the whole continuum. Institutions are emptying back to the community and special stations back to regular classes. At its worse, this trend is a cruelty if no decent arrangements are made to retrain personnel and reorder facilities; at its best, the trend permits the thrilling discovery of how the schools can indeed accommodate exceptional pupils without specialized displacements and become part of the broad community mainstream support structures for the children.

Trends: The Demise of Simple Predictions-A More Open View of Human Capacities

A variety of particular events can perhaps be best summarized under the theme that there is an emerging openness toward or more optimistic view of human capacities. The pervasive pessimism about some exceptional pupils, which existed for half a century and seemed to be derived in part from notions on testing and prediction, has started to disappear.

Binet's original task in the schools of Paris at about the turn of the century was to develop a means of predicting the achievement of children; he succeeded remarkably well, at least as compared with the general validity level of most other forms of psychological prediction.

The ideas of prediction and capacity were quickly linked. A study to predict academic progress was regularly interpreted as a study of the "capacity" of the pupil to carry a given course. The linkage of simple prediction and capacity was taken for granted. For at least half a century almost as much energy has gone into academic prediction and evaluation of children's "capacities" as into the prediction of horse races.

An early side effect of the academic prediction movement, which mostly used general intelligence test results as the predictors, was the development of individualized grading systems. It became a matter of misguided "fairness" that some children should be expected to achieve more and some less and that their report cards should reflect each child's achievement in relation to his individual capacity.

A refinement of this procedure was the special attention given to those children whose "capacity" was high but achievements were low--the socalled underachievers. Somehow, children achieving "below capacity" were made a special clinical group. It might equally have been argued that all children were doing exactly as should be expected of them if only we knew enough to make accurate predictions. In any case, the discrepancy cases might have been called the "over-predicted," putting the onus on the psychologists, rather than the "underachievers," which put the onus on the child. Discrepancies between "mental age" and "achievement age" are not indications of special aptitude for better work, but millions of dollars were invested in supporting the assumption.

Strangely, these discrepancy variables, reflecting differences between "capacity" and achievement, have never been carefully studied although they have been enormously popular in drawing distinctions between remedial cases and the retarded. The assumption was that children with high capacity but low achievement belonged to a different category

than those showing uniformly low, flat profiles, and there was a pervasive pessimism about the educability of children with low capacity estimates. No wonder parents of EMR children became hostile toward schools!

A subtle form of discrepancy analysis, using profile interpretations, involves the assumption that the general level of a profile yields some kind of capacity or "expectancy" level and that departures from the flat median line represent needs and potentialities for remediation. By some mystical process the average of several scores becomes the "expected" level on each variable and presumably flat profiles are preferred over irregular ones. This form of discrepancy analysis will stand up to rigorous examination no better than simpler approaches using general intelligence as the standard.

Lately, a variety of forces have broken the rigid molds of past notions. Scholars, reexamining studies on the nature-nurture controversy, have helped to create a much more open idea of the nurturance of intelligence (Hunt, 1961), concepts of mental retardation have been revised to exclude the facet of incurability (Heber, 1959), and studies in international education have helped to clarify the great influence of social forces in the achievements of individual human beings (Halsy, 1961). In addition, minority groups have militantly demanded a more guarded use of general intelligence tests.

B. F. Skinner has argued that we have permitted the adjective, as in <u>intelligent</u> behavior, to become the noun <u>intelligence</u>, and then made futile speculations about its determinants. Bijou and others, who have urged the educational community to adopt the viewpoint of the applied behavior analyst, have argued that "a retarded individual is one who has a limited repertory of behavior evolving from interactions with his environmental contacts which constitute his history" (Bijou, 1963).

In this framework a concept of general capacity seems to be superfluous. Ogden Lindsley has taken what might be the ultimate position when he wrote,

> Children are not retarded, only their behavior in average environments is sometimes retarded. In fact, it is modern sciences' ability to design suitable environments for these children that is retarded (Lindsley, 1964, p. 62).

Behaviorists have been classified with missionaries in that both believe behavior can be changed if the response is defined carefully and the environment is controlled to influence the probabilities of response.

The sources of new viewpoints on human capacity are many, but suffice it to say that notions of human capacity are much less fixed now than they were earlier. What might be expected of a person is seen, in important part, to be a function of his environment. It is increasingly appreciated also that intelligent behavior has many noncognitive determinants. Classifications of individuals according to capacity estimates are not so secure; and classifications according to discrepancy systems involving differences between capacity and achievements are tenuous, indeed. In this context, consequently, specific doubts arise over such classifications as "retarded," "underachiever," "remedial case," and "learning disabled."

The implications make early childhood education, particularly in disadvantaged communities, a primary target for action. A second territory is testing, where the new emphasis is on criterion-references and achievement monitoring systems, rather than norm-referenced tests. A related territory of expanding interest is evaluation, which is yielding new tools for studying programs or the instructional environment as an adjunct to studies of individual children.

Although yet in its infancy, the concept of Aptitude-Treatment-Interactions (ATI) is extremely promising as a way of looking at the varieties of capacities of individuals, depending upon the varieties of "treatments" to which they are subjected (Reynolds, 1963; Reynolds and Balow, 1972). The ATI concept, in a sense, represents a philosophy as well as a technical approach to the study of learners and learning environments. The view stresses the making of decisions which are optimal rather than straightforward estimations of how much of some attribute an individual has. This change in orientation could help to take much of the onus off psychologists who, in their measurements functions, too often have been simple labelers and measurers rather than responsible decision-makers.

A Look to the Near Future

On the bases of the brief outlines of the history of special education and of some of the current forces and trends in the field, it may be appropriate to consider the kind of agenda we have for the future. My orientation here is only mildly proactive; others will wish to project more radical ventures and describe more distant landscapes. For myself, contemplation of even the relatively near problems and challenges turns out to be a difficult and almost forbidding exercise. This section is divided into two main parts, headed "Some Major Problems" and "Organizational Changes."

Some Major Problems

Perhaps a suitable starting point is a few of the areas in which trends and forces conflict and deep difficulties appear to be imminent.

The Large Cities. The 23 largest cities enroll somewhat over ten percent of the children of the nation in public schools. These same cities have 30 percent of the children who qualify as "disadvantaged"

(as defined in certain U. S. Office of Education programs). The lives of many children in the cities are in disorder, especially the high proportion from minority groups (black, chicano, Indian). Minority group children are placed in special classes for the educable mentally retarded at two to four times the rate for such placement of white children. Special education has been used, more often than not, as a place to isolate disorderly children so that order can be kept in regular programs, rather than as a distinctly specialized education center for carefully placed children. Minority group parents are rebelling against special placements and the resulting negative labels and they are insisting on integrated programing for their children. But if difficult children are returned in large numbers from special education to regular classes, the teachers will resist and, in many situations, cities will lose special funds which are provided by the states in accordance with strict regulations. It would be desirable to undertake massive new programs to individualize instruction along with the use of special education personnel in support of regular programs, but funds and other resources needed for change--leadership, vitality, commitment, trainers--are usually lacking. Massive federally-supported specialized school programs of the 1960's are uncertain at best and often floundering and dying. In the meantime residential institutions for children who are mentally ill, retarded or adjudicated delinquent are being emptied and the receivers, in the main, are the cities.

There is little doubt that we have crowded a large share of children with problems into large urban centers which themselves seem to be in disorder and which, in turn, magnifies the disorder in the lives of children. These children have too few stable and constructive supports

ERIC

in their lives. They and their life situations provide the object toward which special educators ought to rally their best resources. But the fact is, that, so far, state departments of education and institutions of higher education are operated as if they were largely unaware of the distinct and massive problems of special education in the cities. There are a few signs that the cities themselves may organize new forces with which to "bootstrap" their own repairs, but mostly the future looks difficult, indeed, for special education and for all of education in the big cities.

Funding. Always a problem, the funding of specialized school programs looms now as a larger and, to some extent, new challenge. The courts are ordering new developments for special education but the courts have no money to provide, only power to direct. And, not surprisingly, the legislatures and the Congress seem reluctant to change their agendas and budgets at the behest of the courts. The result is that special educators have orders for new programs just as fund raising has become a severe problem and, therefore, they are forced into the position of arguing for the reallocation of insufficient local funds.

State and local authorities appear to be in the mood to hold down taxes, even though it means slighting the needs of special education, because votes against the "handicapped" are no longer political suicide. It is a cruelty to school leaders that as institutions for the mentally ill and retarded are being emptied back to the communities in many states, corresponding action to shift funds to the local schools, which must bear the brunt of the exodus, are not being taken.

Another very great difficulty is that as programs emerge for the integration of special education with mainstream programs, as interchanges of children between specialized and regular school elements are developed, the eligibility of the schools for state special education financial aids becomes uncertain.

In some states, the regulations are so written that special education administrators in departments of education are able to withhold special aids from resource and consulting programs. This stringent interpretation of regulations causes particular difficulties in schools which have been mandated to undo the excessive labeling of children as retarded, disabled, or defective, because the specialized programs devised to carry out the mandates are used to deprive the schools of state financial aids. Indeed, decategorized and delabeled programs are sometimes launched at the sacrifice of categorical funds. Preschool programs, known to be a needed form of education for children from economically and socially deprived homes, seldom involve "set aside" stations for exceptional children and, thus, seldom qualify for categorical special education aids.

A subtle but potentially devastating funding problem is the general loss in recent years of development funds. The Education Professions Development Act, for example, which provided federal funds to support innovative training modes and, indirectly, new service modes in the late 1960's and early 1970's, has been stripped of its force and resources. In the long run, this lack of development funds will impose severe limitations on the generation of new concepts and leadership in special education.

Private Schools. One convenient way for local schools to comply with "right to education" directives is to send difficult children to private schools. It creates no programmatic disturbances at local levels. Yet it is beset with many difficulties, chief among which is an unfortunate removal of the children from home and community supports. If the movement is large in this direction, costs can be enormous, as they now are in several states, and political forces develop to create predictable levels of use of the private schools.

Sometimes a special version of the "medical model" emerges in which psychiatrists or other non-educational specialists virtually control referral and admissions to private schools. The whole system can be turned to the advantage of relatively affluent families--those who can secure private diagnoses and maneuver through the necessary steps of referral and placement. There is evidence, in some places, that public payments for expensive private schools tend to be one way of preserving racial segregation. Exceptional children need all the help they can get and much of it must come from the private sector. There are excellent private schools and many other forms of private contribution to the education of exceptional children. There is a great need to make visible examples of healthy interaction between public and private programs for exceptional children. But unhealthy operations and trends need equally to be made visible.

The Distribution Problem. Special education services have always been maldistributed, but never so obviously as now when courts direct that all children be served. One key facet of the distribution problem is that specialists tend not to go to certain high-need areas for employment. For example, it is difficult to place highly trained teachers of braille and of mobility in rural areas where they may be needed to serve only a small number of widely scattered children and where a major portion of the specialist's time is spent in traveling. Somehow, better methods of recruitment and placement for specialized personnel must be found so that the obligation to serve children in normal environments can be realized. The major implementing changes in this domain may have to occur in the colleges; somehow they need to direct their training efforts to people who will serve where they are most needed.

One solution would be for federal and state officials to organize a rigidly hierarchical system in which personnel needs would be specified and corresponding training functions allocated to institutions of higher education. Recruitment and placement of trainees would be monitored rigidly and evaluated according to satisfaction of specific needs. There are some signs of movement that way, through encouragement of voluntary coordination by colleges and state departments of education which is then reviewed by federal officers before training grants are awarded.

A different approach would be to place training funds in the hands of local schools and agencies according to their needs, permitting them to purchase training. It might be assumed that they would recruit, select and support for training indigenous teacher-candidates, those who were firmly committed to return with their specialized skills to the communities sponsoring them. Another probable effect would be to draw training resources of the colleges out to communities where they are needed; this plan would force more "exportability" and packaging into college training departments of special education.

New Units for Accounting. In the process of dealing with exceptional children in a more integrated way and of de-labeling them, there is a loss of the common method of documenting performance and progress in the field of special education. Reports to governmental officers and to Congress have typically recorded by category the numbers of children served and teachers employed in special education programs. It is no longer acceptable nor accurate to keep records and to apportion resources according to the child-in-category unit.

ERIC

If the field is to develop a broad continuum of services, many of them not involving the categorization of children in traditional niches, it will be necessary to define new units for documenting the work of special educators. Part of the answer may lie in shifting the emphasis to the specialized teacher or other professional worker as the basic unit and permitting him/her to be employed in whatever various ways will provide opportunities for children with exceptional needs. A further step would be to fund broadly framed programs which would be justified through broadly framed evaluation efforts. In any case, the definition, dissemination and acceptance of "new units," other than child-in-category, is likely to be a major challenge to special education for some time.

Commitment. Many persons who are in strong positions to influence education are doubtful of some of the emerging principles and practices of special education. For example, some school administrators do not bend easily to the ideology represented in the "right to education" principle. Teachers' associations and unions are not always enthusiastic about the "mainstreaming" trend in school and community life, probably because it involves the return of exceptional children to regular classes, which is viewed as a threat of disorder and deterioration in the learning environment for other pupils.

Part of the problem, and of the answer, as well, is the awareness of everyone concerned that there are promising new models by which special education can be joined to the regular school system to create improved learning environments for all children. Beyond awareness, demonstrations of new practices and retraining programs are essential. With such efforts, there undoubtedly can be progress in winning commitment to the necessary

ERIC

developments, although the problem is large and formidable. Somehow, leading general administrators and lay leaders, such as members of boards of education, need to be persuaded that the trends cited in this report, such as those involving inclusion and integration of exceptional children, are ethically and practically right and feasible.

Organizational Changes

One might predict that the turbulence of the times will and should result in some restructuring of classrooms, schools, and professional organizations. To some extent, restructuring is a matter of revising concepts, but it must extend also to revising formal organizations of institutions and educators and to changes in basic legislation. Three areas of such anticipated change are considered below: 1) new classroom management systems, 2) new relationships between special education and "remedial" programs, 3) new bridges between programs for the handicapped and for the disadvantaged.

Individual Differences: New Management Systems in Mainstream. There is a rapidly accelerating movement in the schools to individualize instruction. In part, this movement derives from technological developments, such as criterion-referenced testing, programmed instruction, individually oriented classroom management systems, computer-assisted instruction, and task analysis. "Individual Differences" (IDs) as an emerging concept is very different from "IDs" as known only a decade ago. The latter is mostly descriptive of inter-individual differences as revealed through norm-referenced procedures. The new IDs are much more relevant to the instruction of individuals and little attention is given to norm-referenced procedures.

In a sense, special education is a second force toward the individualization of instruction, the other being the Individual Differences movement itself; when a confluence of these two streams is achieved, schools tend to change very rapidly. It is occurring now with increasing frequency; for example, in Texas, new regional education agencies have helped to lead

the way by providing support to local schools which are engaged in the reformation of special education along with the installation of broad systems for individualization of instruction.

It must be hoped that the "ID" and special education forces will converge in increasing numbers of situations. It will require exploratory and amalgamation efforts in agencies and schools and, perhaps, especially in colleges and universities. Special education will turn out to be quite a different structure and service wherever it joins in this changing scene.

<u>New Relationship with "Remedial" Specialists.</u> In recent years many of the long-standing programs of "remedial reading" have come over to special education under a "learning disabilities" banner, partly, one might suspect, because there has been more money on the special education side. Distinctions to the point of complete disjunctions are sometimes made between such fields as "remedial reading" and "learning disability" but they seem tortured and destined for short-life.

Congressman Quie introduced in the Congress a proposal to fund special programs for children who score low on criterion-referenced tests in basic academic skills (Quie, 1973). No distinctions are proposed according to whether the low-scoring child might be EMR, a remedial case or learning disabled. That kind of action on a broader front seems a promising step. Divisions of children into categories depending upon notions of "process disorders," as is sometimes said to be the problem of "learning disabled" children, or on changing patterns of discrepancy analysis, as in defining the remedial case, just are not holding up.

Movements toward this broader approach will be accelerated as colleges move out of their traditional departments and organize on a

"problems" base. Such a movement appears to be accelerating. The marked downturn in demands for regular school personnel in the past three years has forced a self-consciousness and drive for reorganization in many colleges of education. It might be guessed that fragile distinction between remedial work and "learning disabilities" will not hold up in such reorganizations or, at least, that they will be seen as more indicative of needs for proximity than of division in the new arrangements.

Organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the International Reading Association might well begin looking for bridges, and similar new affinities ought to be developed across relevant offices in state departments of education.

New Relationships with Programs for the "Disadvantaged." The negative attitudes toward special education in the urban ghettoes is not a revulsion against specialized school programs--indeed, there is demand for more specialized programs which focus on basic needs of children--but an intolerance for simplistic and degrading labeling systems and what appears to be the isolation and rejection of some children.

If and when special educators join up with those urging broad systems for the individualizing of instruction in basic skills, they will be accepted and will have a useful place in the school programs for children of the poor and disadvantaged.

Special educators have had an awkward time since 1965 in clarifying how they wish to relate to programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in part, because it was felt necessary to distinguish specialized programs for the handicapped from those serving "other" children. Again, the kind of simple, straightforward proposal offered by Congressman Quie - to support improved education for children whose learning is not progressing adequately - seems refreshing and

right. This proposes that the distinction between "Title I" and special education programs ought to be - and will be - blurred if not eliminated.

Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel

Most attention in this chapter, so far, has gone to the general changes in the domain of special education. All such discussion is relevant to <u>roles</u> of special educators, at least in the sense of indicating the changing external and internal boundaries within which roles are defined. But it may be well to focus somewhat more systematically and specifically on the topic of roles.

<u>Special Education as a Support System</u>. It appears already to be the case now and a likely persisting trend that more special education teachers will go into what might be called support roles, teaming with regular teachers, rather than operating largely in separate classes, schools, and centers. Some of the implications of this change are,

...special education personnel will be less identified with "categories" of exceptionality.

...regular teachers will, both through formal training and work experience with special educators, become more knowledgeable and resourceful in dealing with exceptional pupils.

...special education personnel will be selected and prepared for more indirect influences in the schools, as in consultation and "change agent" roles.

...major restructuring of college training programs for special education personnel.

<u>More In-School Child Study</u>. It might be predicted that traditional methods of referring children to specialists for diagnosis will decline in practice and, instead, a diagnostic capacity will be built up within individual school buildings. Some of the implications of such a change, with special reference to personnel roles, are,

...more dependence upon diagnosis by teams including school principals, special and regular teachers and others who also carry responsibility for follow-through instruction.

...more use of specialists such as psychologists in indirect roles as trainers and consultants to school-based personnel.

...much less simple categorizing of and prediction for children and more explicit orientation to the planning and evaluation of instruction.

...demise of the "waiting lists" for child study.

...broad integration of diagnostic functions within the school into learning centers, which may also include instructional materials and the library.

...more study of the child's school and total life situation as an adjunct to direct assessment of the child himself.

...more continuing involvement of parents in studying children and in making programmatic decisions.

...more effects on total school atmosphere as programs for exceptional children are integrated.

Simplified Formal Systems for Professional Standards. If, as anticipated here, boundary lines of the field of special education are changing and showing more overlap with other territories, such as "remedial" and "disadvantaged" programs, along with decategorization of internal structures, a variety of implications may be foreseen.

...a reduction in the number of different kinds of special education certificates.

...more individualized responsibility by special educators to document their own competencies and performances.

...more active participation in expanding programs of continuing education as a means of enhancing professional development and performance.

General Outlook for the Future

Trying to consider the total complex of forces and trends of the moment, their possible development in the near future, and the capacity of the field to respond, what can be anticipated with respect to the general quality of the developments? It appears to this writer that we must expect great unevenness in developments during the next few years.

There are situations in which special educators of great vitality are leading the way in the reformation of schools to the end that all children, even those with major exceptionalities, are accommodated with good effect. In such communities "right to education" and "due process" are welcomed as useful concepts and forces. But in other places, special educators are buried in ideas and practices of a decade ago and they are fighting against the pressures for change.

ERIC

Similarly, in some states leadership and funding patterns are being stretched to help build new programs to serve all children; but in others, old rules are observed all the more diligently as bulwarks against change.

It seems likely that special educators of the more vital, moving style will have the greater influence with general educators. Such influence is critical to developments of the present and immediate future. If one looks to the large cities, for example, line control of educational programs is going to general administrators in newly defined sub-areas or districts. In some of these districts special education is regarded as equivalent to "dental hygiene" in its insularity and irrelevance to broader issues, but in others, as one of essential forces for the general redesign of the schools.

Integration on an even broader base is occurring in many states where new super departments of "human services" are being formed. Those who wish to protect special education as a set of mainly categorical, clinical operations, will have but little impact in these major new conglomerates. But where there is more openness and vitality, special education can lead the way in these broad structures and help to create fuller and more coordinated services to those in need.

A disappointing aspect of the general outlook is that there is little fundamental energy spent on and so few really compelling ideas relating to gifted children. Following Sputnik, interest surged in assuring high supplies of brain power to societally essential functions - as seen from a kind of nationally defensive position. Research on creative thinking has shown promise and expanded some awareness, but still there are not the kinds of fundamental stirrings necessary to generate needed programs for the gifted.

ERIC

One of the emerging ideas and structures of some promise concerns what might be called "technical assistance" or "support systems" at a national level. What hope there is in the area of education for the gifted may well depend upon the success of a new U. S. Office of Education-supported Leadership Training Institute (LTI) in that field. The LTI has the mission of mobilizing systematic supports from across the nation for those who try to improve programs for the gifted. Similar national assistance systems have been created lately in the fields of early education for the handicapped, learning disabilities, and programs in "regular schools" for exceptional pupils. The attitudes as well as the specific activities of these programs, which stress the rallying of support to schools trying to serve exceptional children, are extremely important.

If the basic premise of this chapter is correct, that special education is in the early phases of a major transformation which can be characterized as negotiating for an integrated place in education, then, above all else, support should be provided for change. A particular need and hope is that special educators will be carefully planful, to the point of explicitly documented planning, and that the funding sources in our field will loosen the bindings on their regulations so that the necessary developmental work for the difficult period ahead can be accomplished.

An example of needed action is provided by the Training Division of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U. S. Office of Education. In the past two years, it has offered to all of its grantees the opportunity to go to "bloc" grants and to break out of categorical grants, on the condition that a careful plan was presented--including a

ERIC

definite plan for evaluation. And with regard to evaluation, the focus was shifted to essential outcomes, rather than to processes which might or might not hear valid relation to program goals.

This kind of flexibility, extended, replicated, and responded to seriously, and a genuine sharing of knowledge and tools among all agencies might possibly produce interesting activities for special educators and valuable education for exceptional children.

A Personal Statement on Alternatives and Preferences

This final section is a largely personal expression of preferences for goals special educators ought to seek and the instrumentalities they might use. I have tried to consider topics which touch on most of the trends, forces, and problems discussed in the earlier sections of this paper.

The "right to education" principle. Special educators are in the middle of what must be judged to be a truly remarkable event, one with profound philosophic and practical implications. This is the declaration that every child, even the most profoundly handicapped, shall be given formal opportunities to learn as a part of the public education system. Right to education makes no reference to payoff for society or various institutions; the enhancement of the life of the individual is the sole consideration and goal.

Of course, some special educators and many others do not believe fully in the right to education principle. They will resist the difficult steps necessary to achieve full implementation of the principle in programs for the profoundly handicapped. Many educators

still believe that education is a privilege and that children who fail to meet the standards established by school authorities should be de- mitted.

The education of severely handicapped children takes much time and money and some educators may feel that such expenditures lessen resources spent on other children. There is no evidence to support such a thesis; indeed, it can be argued that improvements in educational opportunities for the handicapped result in enhanced education for other children. In any case, I believe that special educators ought to stretch themselves to the very edge of their powers at this strategic time to help achieve in fact an appropriate education for every child.

Legislation. The field of special education finds itself increasingly hamstrung by a system of categorical funding and accounting. The "categorizing" and "labeling" of children, as presently practiced in special education, is largely unnecessary and self-defeating. The public outcry against the practice is mounting rapidly. The key practical changes required are at the level of legislation and regulations, at both federal and state levels. In a more fundamental sense, of course, the problem is conceptual and getting a "turn around" on basic concepts in the field may prove to be the most challenging problem.

One relatively simple way to begin working our way out of the problem is to make the highly competent "special educator" the unit on which special state and federal financial aids are paid, rather than to insist that the child-in-category is the unit which activates

special aids. So long as there are incentives for putting children on rosters of the "handicapped" we will continue on the self-defeating journey. Shifting aids to "specialized personnel" and opening up the ways by which they can serve children who need highly individualized programs should put special education into a new position in the urban communities where it is now in bad repute. Along with the shift in aids to a personnel unit, government agencies can, of course, require carefully framed programatic plans by which the personnel will be used.

This argument for the demise of categorical aids is directed only to their narrowest forms. In a broader sense, categorical funding for special programs seems essential for the forseeable future. There are those who will wish to preserve narrowly categorical aids and the present child-in-category accounting systems but their narrow perspective, which permits special educators to stay in the bounds of the traditional categories and to excuse themselves from many of the difficult problems of education in urban ghettoes, Indian reservations and elsewhere, is not, I believe, a viable alternative for the future; unless, of course, one wishes to see the field defined in terms of only the most severely and profoundly handicapped.

A Broader Responsibility. An alternative to the narrow concept of special education and a corollary to the point of view expressed above favoring decategorization, is that special educators move aggressively on a broader front. Following are some of the domains in which

special educators might well make a contribution: (a) installing systems for individualizing instruction for all children; (b) improving education of children of minority groups through application of individualized instructional systems; (c) forming new coordinating structures with fields such as "remedial reading;" (d) establishing support systems for children with unusual needs so that they may be retained in "mainstream" situations and yet receive proper instruction; (e) leading the way in strengthening research and development activities in education in the context of the needs of exceptional children; (f) leading the way in self and institutional development by launching retraining and program redesign activities of broad character. In urging this broader mission, my assumption and belief is that special educators have a contribution to make in all of these domains. A further assumption is that if the field does not move on this broader front it will increasingly fail to draw energetic and able young people to its ranks and fail for itself and for the children it presumes to serve to be an actively and broadly engaged element in open society.

Shared authority. One of the clear messages from much of the social change in America in recent decades is that the basic policies of institutions serving people should be and shall be made by the people affected. On this basis, college students have asserted their roles in higher education, welfare recipients theirs in welfare agencies, and parents their rights to influence local school policies. In special education, the concept of shared authority is also being implemented at the level of decisions affecting individuals - in the form of "due process" procedures. Special educators have had extraordinary opportunities to work with parents individually and in groups

and presumably they are in the position to help lead the way in developing school-wide systems that provide for participation of all persons affected in the decisions to be made. Assuming that one believes that authority for basic policy formulation ought to rest with those effected by the policies - and not everyone sees this as a positive value - then special educators have the basis for leading the way in creating new systems for structuring school policies and operations.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Two Broad Alternatives

Taken together and on the positive side, the above four elements comprise a broad agenda for the future of special education, one which will stretch the imagination and energies of everyone involved. Taken together, but on the negative side, special education has the alternative of a narrowly defined future, serving only the severely handicapped with special supports for special enclaves. The fact is, I think, that most of society - including most general administrators and leaders in education - see special education in its narrower versions and has little sense of the broader mission which it might perform.

But some general educators and many special educators do see the importance of opening up the enclaves and of joining the larger effort to serve all children. The severely handicapped need not be neglected as special education opens up and extends its engagements with regular education and the community at large. Indeed, as special education spreads its involvements in broader domains, understanding and opportunities for those handicapped should expand correspondingly.

ERIC

Decisions are being made every day in many places and at many levels on the extent to which special education will proceed in narrow categories or on a broader front, the extent to which special education will join in efforts for broad individualization of instruction, the ways "due process" requirements will or will not be implemented in the schools, the ways new legislation will effect program development, the ways roles of special educators will be defined in new certification standards and on many other topics.

Even the biologists concede that "the new evolution" could be the product of human awareness and decision, rather than simply of blind forces and trends. An unusual set of opportunities is present for special educators at this time to influence their future and that of the children they serve. Hopefully, their decisions will be equal to the challenge.

# # # #

REFERENCES

Albee, G. W. Mental Health Manpower Trends. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Bijou, S. W. Theory and research in mental (developmental) retardation. Psychological Record, 1963, 13, 99.

Caplan, G. Support Systems. In Caplan, R. B. Helping the helper to help. New York: Seabury Press, 1972.

Council for Exceptional Children. Basic commitments and responsibilities to exceptional children. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1971.

Craig, S. B. Fifty years of training teachers of the deaf. School and Society, 1942, 56 (1449), 301-303.

Deno, Evelyn (Ed.) Instructional alternatives for exceptional children Arlington, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Dorken, H. A dimensional strategy for community focused mental health services. In Rosenblum, G. Issues in community psychology and preventive mental health. By the Task Force on Community Mental Health of Division 27 of the American Psychological Association. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1971.

Gallagher, James J. Preparation of professional specialists for the mentally disturbed. Paper presented at Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Conference for Directors of Training Programs in Education of the Emotionally Disturbed, Nov, 1968.

Goldberg, I. I. & Cruickshank, W. M. The trainable but noneducable: Whose responsibility, NEA Journal, 1958, 47, (9), 622.

Halsy, A. H. (Ed.). Ability and educational opportunity. Report of the Conference, Organized by the Office for Scientific and Technical Personnel of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, June, 1961. Available in the U. S. from O.E.C.D. Mission, Publications Office, Suite 1223, 1346 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Heber, R. F. A manual on terminology and classification in mental retardation. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Monograph Supplement, 1959, 64, (2).

Hill, H. F. Vineland summer school for teachers of backward and mentally deficient children. The Training School Bulletin, 1945, May, 41-49.

Hunt, H. M. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Lindsley, O. Direct measurement and prosthesis of retarded behavior. Journal of Education, 1964, 147, 62.

Mackie, R. P. Spotlighting advances in special education. Exceptional Children, 1965, 32, 77-81.

Mackie, R. P. & Dunn, L. N. College and university programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1954, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

News and Notes. Journal of Exceptional Children. 1948, March, 181.

Pennsylvania Ass'n. for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257, (E.D. Pa. 1971).

President's Committee on Mental Retardation. MR Priority Report: The retarded victims of poverty. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 0-310-156, 1968.

Quie, A. H. An address entitled "A New Approach to the Education of the Disadvantaged" to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, in Chicago, Illinois, 1973.

Reynolds, M. C. A framework for considering some issues in special education. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28 (7), 367-370.

Reynolds, M. C. A strategy for research. Exceptional Children, 1963, 29 (5), 213-219.

Reynolds, M. C. and Balow, B. Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38 (5), 357-366.

Reynolds, M. C. and Davis, M. D. Exceptional Children in Regular Classrooms. Minneapolis, Minn.: LTI/Special Education. Distributed by Dept. of Audio Visual Extension, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 55455. 1971.

Riesman, D. Notes on meritocracy. Daedalus, 1967, 96 (3), 905.

Sloan, W. Four score and seven. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 68 (1), 6-14.

Spears, H. Kappans ponder typical school procedures. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 54, 615-618.

Szasz, T. S. The uses of naming and the origin of the myth of mental illness. Amer. Psychologist, 1961, 16, 59-65.

Trippe, M. J. See the cat? See the cradle? In Reynolds, M. C. and Davis, M. D. Exceptional Children in Regular Classrooms, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Dept. of Audio Visual Extension, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1971, pp. 31-42.

Wallin, J. E. W. Grade teachers are not qualified. The Nation's Schools, 1935, 10 (1), 38.

Wyatt v. Aderholt, 334 F Supp. 1341 (M.D. Alabama, 1971), 32FF. Supp. 781 (M.D. Alabama, 1971).

Zigler, E. Developmental versus difference theories of mental retardation and the problem of motivation. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1969, 73 (4), 536-556.