

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 864

EC 080 936

AUTHOR McDonnell, John J.; And Others
 TITLE Summary of Impact of Title VI-B Funds on the Education of Oregon's Handicapped Children, June 1968-June 1973.
 INSTITUTION Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.; Oregon State System of Higher Education, Monmouth. Teaching Research Div.

PUB DATE 73
 NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Federal Aid; Financial Support; *Handicapped Children; *Program Evaluation; State Programs; *State Surveys
 IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VI; ESEA Title VI; *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Summarized are results of a survey to determine the impact of 133 projects funded through Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VI-B funds on handicapped children in Oregon by examining the number of children being served, the number of staff, and the number of dollars being expended. Significant findings are listed such as that deaf, blind, and trainable mentally retarded populations would not have been served if Title VI-B had not been available between 1968 and 1970, and that 87 percent of projects funded for an academic year were still in operation compared to only 44 percent of projects funded for the summer only. Among the 11 recommendations are that Title VI-B monies be awarded as seed money only and that the new special education service priorities be established every 3 years. General information includes report purpose, a summary of Title VI provisions, definitions of handicapping conditions, a description of eligible agencies, program purpose, program guidelines, evaluation model, and methodology. Seventeen tables are provided giving statistics such as the number and percentage of children served by handicapping condition. Five special projects are individually described including "A Study of the Extreme Learning Problem Program in Oregon." Appended are the questionnaire used in the survey and the cover letter. (DB)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *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. *

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.

SUMMARY

of

Impact of Title VI-B Funds

on the

Education of Oregon's Handicapped Children
June 1968 - June 1973

Prepared for
The Oregon Department of Education

by

The Teaching Research Division of the
Oregon State System of Higher Education

John J. McDonnell
Victor L. Baldwin
H. D. Bud Fredericks
William G. Moore
Roy B. Anderson
Bruce A. Dalke

ED117864

EC 080 936

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments | i |
| Significant Findings | 1 |
| Recommendations | 3 |
| General Information | 5 |
| Report Purpose | 5 |
| ESEA Title VI-B, Public Law 91-330, Education of the Handicapped | 5 |
| Definition of Handicapping Conditions | 5 |
| Eligible Agencies | 6 |
| Program Purpose | 7 |
| Program Guidelines | 7 |
| Evaluation Model | 9 |
| Methodology | 10 |

Tables Listed by Title:

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Number of Title VI-B Projects Funded (1968-1973) | 13 |
| 2. Number and Percentage of Children Served by Handicapping Condition (1968-1973) | 14 |
| 3. Title VI-B Budget Allocation by Handicapping Condition (1968-1973) | 16 |
| 4. Summary of the Projects Funded Under Title VI-B Funds 1968-1973 | 18 |
| 5. Location of Projects by County for Each Title VI-B Funding Period | 20 |
| 6. In-Service Training Provided for Staff, Volunteers and Parents Through Title VI-B Project Funds | 22 |
| 7. Number and Percentage of Title VI-B Projects Continued and Discontinued Since 1968 | 23 |
| 8. Status of 92 Projects Continued Without Title VI-B Funding | 24 |
| 9. Summary of 92 Projects That Have Been Continued Without Title VI-B Funding | 25 |
| 10. A Summary of Present Dollar Support Sources for Title VI-B Projects Still Operational | 26 |
| 11. Comparison of the Number of Children Served by Handicapping Conditions of Continued Projects | 27 |
| 12. Responses From Project Directors Regarding the Advantages of Third Party Evaluation | 29 |
| 13. Responses From Project Directors Regarding the Disadvantages of Third Party Evaluation | 30 |
| 14. Responses From Project Directors to the Question, "Did the Third Party Evaluators Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Evaluation Assistance to Your Project?" | 31 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 15. Summary of Responses for Those 19 Project Directors Who Answered "no" to the Question, "Did the Third Party Evaluator Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Evaluation Assistance to Your Project?" | 32 |
| 16. Responses From Project Directors to the Question, "Did the Oregon Board of Education Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Technical Assistance to Your Project?" | 33 |
| 17. Summary of Responses from 9 Project Directors Who Answered "no" to the Question, "Did The Oregon Board of Education Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Technical Assistance to Your Project?" | 34 |
| Special Projects Listed by Title: | |
| 1. A Study of the Extreme Learning Problem Program in Oregon | 37 |
| 2. A Study of the Funding Relationships of Special Education Facilities For Handicapped Children in State Aided Private Agencies | 39 |
| 3. Education of Oregon's Sensory Impaired Youth | 41 |
| 4. Needs and Concerns for Special Education in Oregon | 43 |
| 5. A Validity Study of the Diagnosis and Placement of Certified EMR Pupils in Oregon | 45 |
| Appendix A - Questionnaire | 47 |
| Appendix B - Cover Letter | 53 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The type of data requested in this report by the Oregon Department of Education required the authors to ask staff from 58 local education agencies to provide data for 133 projects dating back as far as September, 1968. Staff from each local education agency responded to this request expeditiously and without complaint. Without their cooperation, the authors could not have completed this report. Before the local education agencies responded to our questionnaire and telephone calls, the authors concluded that we would have been happy with a 90% response. The 100% response that we received was an indicator that the staff from the local education agencies were as interested in the content of this report as the State Department of Education and the authors.

Further, we would like to thank Connie Lilley, Sally Peyree and Gloria Olivier who typed and edited countless drafts of this report. Also the authors would like to thank Becky McDonnell who spent many hours reducing the raw data into the usable form that appears in the body of this report.

Finally, the authors would like to compliment the project directors and staff of each of the 133 Title VI-B projects funded between 1968-1973 for providing outstanding service to countless handicapped children who might otherwise not have been served.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

1. Between 1968 and 1973, \$1,288,456 of Title VI-B Funds were spent in Oregon to provide service to 5,947 handicapped children in 133 projects conducted by 58 local education agencies. The average per child cost across all handicapping conditions was \$217.
2. The deaf-blind and TMR populations in Oregon would not have been served had Title VI-B not been available between 1968 and 1970.
3. The allocation of projects to the various counties in Oregon appears to be appropriate as the majority of projects were awarded to the greatest areas of population.
4. In-service training was provided to 1,500 professional staff, volunteers and parents to assist local education agencies to successfully implement their projects.
5. Of all projects funded for an academic year, 87% are still operational on local, state or other federal funds.
6. Of all projects funded for the summer only, 44% are still operational.
7. For the 92 projects still operational, the original funding was \$637,306. Current funding from other sources for these projects is \$2,145,793 which reflects an overall increase of \$1,508,487.
8. Of the \$2,145,793 for continued projects, 54% is from local funds, 21% is from state funds, and 25% is from other federal funds.
9. The majority of the local education agencies indicated that the utilization of a third party evaluator allowed them to more adequately serve handicapped children.
10. The majority of local education agencies feel that staff from the State Department of Education and the third party evaluators provided them with sufficient and appropriate technical assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Title VI-B monies should be awarded as "seed money" only and not used for long term support of local education agency projects.

Rationale: The "seed money" concept has demonstrated itself to be successful. The mean funding for projects between 1968-1973 was \$9,687. For those projects funded for an academic year, 87% are still operational on other funds.

2. Continue the utilization of third party evaluation for all Title VI-B Projects and incorporate this evaluation model in other state and federally funded special education programs.

Rationale: The consensus of the local education agencies is that third party evaluation forced them to provide better service for handicapped children. In addition, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), U.S. Office of Education, felt that Oregon was successful in demonstrating the impact of Title VI-B funds, and that the information was useful for planning. Teaching Research has discovered in working with a large number of other states that the "Oregon Model" can be applied to a wide variety of programs.

3. Continue the policy of funding academic or year long projects in lieu of summer only projects.

Rationale: Between 1968 and 1973, 87% of those projects funded for an academic year are still operational while only 44% of the projects funded for a summer are operational.

4. Encourage local education agencies to design programs to examine the effectiveness of integration of the handicapped child into regular public school classrooms and vocational programs for the handicapped child.

Rationale: These two areas are demonstrated needs in the state. Title VI-B funds have not been used to examine these areas and by providing "seed money" it may be possible to encourage the development of some exemplary projects that can serve as a model for the rest of the state.

5. Special education service needs of local education agencies should be examined and new priorities established at least every three years.

Rationale: Needs and priorities change frequently for special education in Oregon. In order to assure that Title VI-B funds are used for the greatest special education needs, a needs survey should be conducted at least every three years.

6. Funding levels awarded to local education agencies should approximate the average project costs over the last eight years, i.e. \$10,000 per project.

Rationale: 87% of the academic year projects are still operational. The mean cost of these projects per year is \$9,637. Local education agencies should participate with local contribution whenever possible during first year projects. For second and third year funding the local districts should be encouraged to increase their fiscal participation. If the federal support for a particular project is significantly larger, one runs the risk that the district will become too dependent and reduce the likelihood that the project can be continued locally.

7. *Local education agencies that have not received Title VI-B funding in the past should be encouraged and assisted to write a proposal.*

Rationale: Many projects in small rural areas have been funded and many of these are still operational. Had Title VI-B funds not been available, this service would not have been provided to handicapped children. There are several other local education agencies that have either not applied or not been funded. The reason for this should be systematically examined and where possible the district should be encouraged to submit.

8. *Inservice training components of Title VI-B projects, should be funded only if they are required to provide service to a specific group of handicapped children.*

Rationale: The precedent of Title VI-B funds in Oregon being used for direct service to children should be continued. A very large number of persons have received inservice training in conjunction with direct service projects. There would appear to be little merit in changing this procedure and funding projects that were only concerned with inservice training.

9. *When selecting a third party evaluator, insure that the potential evaluators have a wide range of special education expertise as well as evaluation skills.*

Rationale: Third party evaluators need to be able to talk with special educators about project content. This gives local education agency staff confidence in the third party evaluator and subsequently makes the third party evaluation more effective.

10. *It needs to be stressed that a very important part of the third party evaluation process is the on-site visits, and every effort should be made to insure that these visits are made by both the third party evaluator and the State Department representative.*

Rationale: Frequent and scheduled visits by the third party evaluators and State Department representatives provide the following service to local education agencies:

- (a) Reinforce the project staff for their efforts;
- (b) Solve problems that the local education agency staff are experiencing before they become major ones;
- (c) Provide feedback and assist in planning;
- (d) Help the project prepare for writing their final report; and
- (e) In general, assure that there is communication between the local education agency, the State Department of Education and the third party evaluator.

11. *The step by step procedures contained in the document Training for the Utilization of Third Party Evaluation should be followed very closely.*

Rationale: The chronological steps for the Local Education Agencies, State Department of Education and Third Party Evaluator are precise and written in detail. Following these steps insures that each activity will be completed by each agency at the right time. Using these procedures, the whole process can be easily monitored. This reduces communication errors and clearly spells out responsibilities that help to avoid any "surprises" at the end of the project.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Report Purpose

Since the summer of 1968, 133 projects have been funded to 58 local education agencies in Oregon through Title VI-B funds. The Coordinator of Federal Programs at the Oregon State Department of Education expressed an interest in knowing what impact these projects have had on handicapped children in Oregon. Consequently, a contract was awarded to the Exceptional Child Research Program of Teaching Research, A Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, to conduct a survey of all projects that had been previously funded under Title VI-B funds to determine the current status of these projects as to the number of children they were serving, the number of staff used to serve the children and the number of dollars that were being expended. Consequently, the purpose of this report is to provide a current summary of the status of all projects funded between 1968 and 1973 under Title VI-B funds.

ESEA Title VI-B, Public Law 91-330, Education of the Handicapped

Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-750, as amended, authorizes that the U.S. Commissioner of Education make grants for the purpose of assisting states in the initiation, expansion and improvement of programs and projects for the education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary and secondary school levels. The term "handicapped children" includes the mentally retarded, hearing impaired, deaf, speech impaired, visually impaired, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who because of their handicaps require special education and related services. The handicapped child must have the mental health and ability to benefit from special education. No lower age limit is set in the Handicapped Child Law, but an upper age limit of 21 years is specified.

Children who are mentally retarded and who meet eligibility criteria receive education through special classes. Oregon law sets the age range for mentally retarded children between 6 and 21 years of age.

Definitions of Handicapping Conditions

Blind: A legally blind child is one whose corrected vision in the better eye is 20/200 or less or one whose visual field is restricted to five degrees or less at 20 feet.

Partially Sighted. A partially sighted child is one whose corrected vision in the better eye is 20/70 or less or one who cannot function at an academic level commensurate with his mental ability because of an eye problem.

Deaf: A deaf child is one whose sense of hearing is nonfunctional even with a hearing aid, and who is unable to understand speech and develop language successfully without specialized instruction.

Hard of Hearing: A hard of hearing child is one whose sense of hearing, although defective, is functional with or without a hearing aid, and who develops speech and language through his hearing.

Speech Impaired: A child is considered to have a speech problem:

- (a) when he has difficulty in one or a combination of the four parameters of speech: articulation, phonation, rhythm, and symbolization;
- (b) when his speech deviated from the accepted general developmental age norms;
- (c) when his speech difficulties interfere with communication; and
- (d) when his speech difficulties cause him emotional stress.

Crippled: Crippled children are those who have orthopedic conditions or motor impairments, congenital or acquired, which temporarily or continuously prevent successful functioning in an educational program.

Chronically Ill: These children have chronic physical conditions which temporarily or continuously prevent successful functioning in a regular educational program.

Extreme Learning Problems. Children with extreme learning problems have potentially average or above average ability but show an inability to profit from regular classroom methods or materials. They may be, or will become, extreme under-achievers in reading, spelling, or arithmetic. The broad category of extreme learning problems includes children described by such terms as brain injured, neurologically handicapped, and educationally handicapped and children described as having minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, or learning disabilities.

Emotionally Disturbed: These are children who require special education in order to obtain the education of which they are capable because they are socially or emotionally maladjusted to the extent that they cannot make satisfactory progress in the regular school program.

Educable Mentally Retarded: Mentally retarded children include children between the ages of 6 and 21 who:

- (a) because of well established, retarded, intellectual development are incapable of receiving a common school education through regular classroom instruction, but whose intellectual ability would indicate a possible scholastic attainment of third grade level with the benefit of special instructional methods, and
- (b) are competent in all aspects of the school environment except academic.

Multiple Handicapped. Multiple handicapped children have combinations of various handicaps which may require several special education services including, in some cases, the services of teachers with various kinds of special training, such as teachers of children who are deaf-blind (ORS 343.301).

Eligible Agencies

Ten percent of Oregon's Title VI-B money is allocated to the Oregon Department of Education to operate special education projects which have statewide significance. The remaining 90% of the money is allocated to local education agencies. A "local education agency" is defined in Title VI-B regulations as:

A public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a state for either administrative control or direction of or to perform a service function for public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a state or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a state as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. The term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

Title VI-B funds cannot be granted to state operated schools or to nonpublic schools. Provisions are made for handicapped children in state operated schools under Public Law 89-313. Handicapped children attending nonpublic schools have the opportunity to receive the benefits of Title VI-B through local education agencies.

Program Purpose

Title VI-B grants aid to the states in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of programs and projects to improve the education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. Title VI-B is not a general support program nor is it a construction, media, or training act. It is a child centered program of special education, and almost any type of activity or service can be supported under this title if it is designed to meet the special education and related needs of participating handicapped children.

Title VI-B funds are generally used to stimulate the development of comprehensive quality programs and services to support activities which are in addition to or go beyond basic state supported special education programs. Thus, federal funds would generally not be used to establish more special classes for retarded children or to employ additional special education staff for this area or for other special education areas.

Program Guidelines

Application forms for Title VI-B funds are available from the Oregon Department of Education. Applications must contain five legible copies of the application form. The original copy of the application must be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant agency. Project applications received after the application deadline will be disqualified. The application deadline will be announced by the State Director of Special Education.

Applications submitted by local education agencies under Title VI-B will be evaluated by an ad hoc project review team. This team may include superintendents, directors of special education, supervisors, teachers, principals, college faculty, representation from private schools, allied fields and other personnel with experience in special education from public and nonpublic agencies throughout Oregon.

Foundation of the Title VI program within any state is the State Plan, the contract or agreement between the state and the U.S. Office of Education, for the operation of programs and projects for handicapped children at the preschool, elementary and secondary school levels. The plan submitted by the State of Oregon was approved by the State Department of Education on April 10, 1968 with an effective date of April 18, 1968. This plan was approved by the U.S. Office of Education on May 5, 1968.

The State Plan described the present statewide educational program for handicapped children. This description is excerpted and included as Annex A of the publication, *Impact of the Title VI Programs in the State of Oregon*. The State Plan described the procedures for the administration of Title VI within the state.

In order to determine which projects were funded under Title VI, the State Department of Education, with the assistance of the Advisory Committee, defined and selected the following criteria for establishing priorities for funding projects and programs:

1. The extent to which the project will provide special education services to categories of handicapped children who are not being served adequately through the state special education program.
2. Adequacy of description and documentation of the need for the special education service described in the project. *Highest priority is given to projects that stress unmet needs by documenting the number of handicapped children who require the proposed special education services.*
3. Extent to which the project stresses early identification of handicapped children and includes aspects of early treatment. *Highest priority is given to projects that provide preschool special education services to handicapped children.*
4. Adequacy of the project procedures for identifying the handicapped children to be served. *Highest priority is given to projects that provide adequate diagnostic provisions for selecting children who need special education.*
5. Extent to which the project is of sufficient size, scope and quality to give reasonable assurance of meeting the educational needs of handicapped children to be served. *Highest priority is given to projects that provide special education services which focus on manageable numbers of handicapped children qualifying for the service and to projects that are designed to provide comprehensive service for these children.*
6. Evidence of supplementation of the regular school program by the proposed project or program. *Highest priority is given to projects that made specific realistic plans for integrating handicapped children served by the project back into the regular school program.*
7. Extent to which other community and state resources are represented in the planning and operation of the project or program. *Highest priority is given to those projects that made full use of other community and state resources in the planning and operation of the project.*
8. Provisions for evaluating the effectiveness of the special education services to be provided in the project. *Highest priority is given to projects that include specific evaluation procedures which are consistent with the objectives of the project.*
9. Provisions for participation of qualified, nonpublic school handicapped children in the project. *Highest priority is given to projects that make provision for participation of eligible handicapped children enrolled in private schools.*

10. Adequacy of the size and qualifications of the staff. *Highest priority is given to projects employing or purchasing the services of well qualified staff. The ratio of project staff to the number of handicapped children should be high enough to insure effective service.*
11. Adequacy of the facilities, both existing and proposed, for conduct of the project or program. *Highest priority is given to projects where school facilities are already available and appropriate to meet the needs of the project children.*
12. Economic efficiency of the proposed budget. *Highest priority is given to those projects that list a detailed budget of estimated amount of funds required for operation of the project including cost-servicing ratios that are consistent with the special education services to be provided.*

Evaluation Model

From the inception of the Title VI-B program in Oregon, it was determined that Oregon should have, as part of its Title VI-B Plan, a Third Party Evaluation. Consequently, the State Department of Education contracted with Teaching Research, A Division of the Oregon State System of High Education, for technical assistance for the development of a third party evaluation plan for Oregon for Title VI-B. The report of the evaluation of the Summer 1968 funded projects under Title VI-B is contained in *Impact of the Title VI Programs in the State of Oregon*.

This evaluation model was considered so acceptable by not only the State Department of Education but also by the U.S. Office of Education that it was continued for subsequent funding periods. The following is a summary of third party evaluators for subsequent *Impact* reports:

| Year | Report | Third Party Evaluator |
|-------------|----------|-----------------------|
| 1968-69 | Impact 2 | Teaching Research |
| 1968-Summer | Impact 3 | University of Oregon |
| 1969-70 | Impact 4 | Teaching Research |
| 1970-71 | Impact 5 | Teaching Research |
| 1971-72 | Impact 6 | Teaching Research |
| 1972-73 | Impact 7 | Teaching Research |

The third party evaluation was conducted in Oregon using the following model: after the projects had been selected for funding by an ad hoc advisory committee, research consultants from the Teaching Research Division and the Coordinator of the Title VI programs within the State met with each of the project directors prior to the commencement of the project. The purpose of this meeting was to finalize an evaluation plan for the particular project. This final evaluation plan entailed the determination of which measurement instruments were to be used and the method of conducting the measurements with these instruments.

During the school year, Teaching Research consultants visited each project twice to insure that the evaluation procedures were being provided as planned. Special education consultants of the State Department of Education visited projects associated with their speciality, not only serving as advisors to project directors in the conduct of this project, but also concerning themselves with the progress of the evaluation. Finally, the Title VI Coordinator visited each of the projects as a further check to insure that their progress and evaluation procedures were proceeding in accordance with the plan.

After the final report of each project was prepared and submitted by the project director, the results were examined, treated statistically where necessary, and determination made as to how successfully the project achieved its stated purposes.

The cost to the State for this third party evaluation by the Teaching Research Division in 1973-74 was \$22,407 which included not only the initial planning with project directors and visits to project sites, but also the drafting of this report, including computer usage for statistical computations.

This evaluation plan which is utilized by the Oregon Department of Education to evaluate Title VI Projects has been selected as an exemplary model by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), U.S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C. Staff from BEH have repeatedly indicated to staff at the State Department of Education that this evaluation plan and the resulting *Impact* reports are unique in the United States. BEH staff are particularly interested because the Oregon Title VI projects have objectives that are stated in precise behavioral terms, evaluation strategies that are applicable to the objectives and result in an ability to demonstrate behavioral changes in handicapped children.

These components allow BEH to present data to substantiate that monies spent for Title VI resulted in positive changes in handicapped children. The result of this is that the federal money appropriated for services for handicapped children has been increased since the inception of Title VI in 1968.

Methodology

Six staff members from Teaching Research were responsible for collecting the data from the various school districts who had previously been funded by Title VI-B funds. One of these staff members acted as coordinator of the project.

Initially a meeting was held with the six staff to determine what pertinent information needed to be gathered from the various school districts. After this information had been compiled, the coordinator of the project designed a questionnaire which could be used to gather the information for the local districts (See Appendix A). The cover page containing general information about the project was usually filled out in advance by Teaching Research staff. The first thing that we wanted the local education agency staff to tell us was whether or not their project was still operational.

If it was, the questionnaire asked the number of children it was serving, the number of staff being utilized, and the current amount of budget available. In addition, questions were asked regarding the source of the current budget. Also, the questionnaire asked the projects to identify the type of children being served as to their handicapping condition. Four other

questions were asked with regard to the third party evaluation model that has been used in Oregon since 1968. These were:

- (1) Did the Oregon Board of Education provide adequate and/or appropriate technical assistance to your project?
- (2) Did the third party evaluators provide adequate and/or appropriate evaluation to your project?
- (3) Make a statement as to the advantages of third party evaluation; and
- (4) Make a statement as to the disadvantages of third party evaluation.

Since we were asking local education agencies special education staff to go back and retrieve information from six years back in some cases, it was anticipated that the directors of special education or the project directors in the local education agencies might be reluctant to respond to the questionnaire. Consequently, Teaching Research staff decided to offer each of the project directors a \$25 stipend for a prompt response to the questionnaire for all Title VI projects for which they had been funded. The result of this procedure was that each of the 58 agencies who were funded for the 133 projects responded and provided the required data.

After the first page of the questionnaire was filled out by the project staff using general information readily available from past *Impact* reports, questionnaires were mailed to the local education agencies on April 26, 1974 with a cover letter which can be seen in Appendix B.

Seven days after the questionnaires were mailed, the 58 agencies were allocated to the six Teaching Research staff members who telephoned all of those local education agencies that had either one or two Title VI-B projects funded. Information was secured over the telephone to complete each questionnaire and then the local education agency staff was asked to mail the questionnaires in as well. In some cases it was necessary to call the local education agency back a second or third time to clarify certain items on the questionnaire. For those local education agencies who had more than two projects funded, it was determined that telephoning would be an inappropriate procedure. Consequently, Teaching Research staff made appointments with the local education agency staff and went out on-site to visit them and secure the information through an interview.

As the questionnaires came into Teaching Research they were filed in notebooks according to the year in which the project was originally funded. The coordinator of the project then had the responsibility to summarize this raw data. Research assistants were employed to compile the data into the various tables and do whatever work was necessary on a calculator to get totals and means, which are displayed. After the tables were formulated, the coordinator of the project analyzed the data, drew conclusions and made recommendations.

TABLES

Introduction to Table 1

Table 1, is a summary of the number of projects funded through Title VI-B funds by the Oregon State Department of Education from 1968 through 1973. *Impact 1* through *Impact 7* are reports of the activities for those funding periods. *Impact 1* (1968) and *Impact 3* (1969) reported projects that were conducted during the summer only (June-August) by local districts. *Impacts 2, 5, 6, and 7* are reports of projects funded primarily for the academic year (September-June). *Impact 4* reports the results of both summer and the academic year for the years 1969-70.

Summary of Data in Table 1

The data in Table 1 indicates that 133 projects were funded to local education agencies between June 1968 and June 1973. Fifty-five projects were funded for the summer only and 78 were funded for the academic year. The Coordinator of Federal Funds from OSDE determined after *Impact 4* 1969-70 that no more summer projects would be funded. This change was made due to a recommendation made by Teaching Research in *Impact 4*. The child data indicated that summer projects did not have significant impact on child behavior to warrant the expenditure of funds.

From an examination and count of all 133 projects, these data showed that 58 local education agencies conducted them. There was a range of projects funded yearly from 9 (Academic year 1968-69) to 24 (Summer 1969). The mean number of projects funded for summer only was 11 and for the academic year the mean was 16. Overall, the mean was 19 for seven funding periods.

TABLE 1
Number of Title VI-B Projects Funded
(1968-1973)

| Funding Period | PROJECTS | | TOTALS |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | SUMMER | ACADEMIC YEAR | |
| Impact 1, 1968 | 20 | — | 20 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | — | 9 | 9 |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 24 | — | 24 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 9 | 14 | 23 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | — | 18 | 18 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 1 | 17 | 18 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 1 | 20 | 21 |
| TOTALS | 55 | 78 | 133 |

Introduction to Table 2

Table 2 summarizes the number and percentage of children served by handicapping condition with Title VI B funds from 1968 through 1973. Both the total children served by funding period and by handicapping condition are noted. In addition, the percentage of the total children served by handicapping condition by year and for all seven funding periods are listed.

Summary of Data in Table 2

These data indicate that 5,947 children were served from 1968 through 1973 with Title VI-B funds. The number served per funding period ranged from 334 in 1968-69 to 1,877 in 1970-71. The mean number of children served per funding period during this time was 850. With regard to the 1,877 children served in 1970-71, it should be noted that 1,056 of these were hearing impaired children who were evaluated by an audiologist in Jackson County.

With regard to the number of children served by handicapping condition, the range was from 39 (deaf/blind) to 1,695 (hearing impaired). When analyzing these data, one should be aware that EMR, TMR, multiply handicapped and deaf/blind programs funded under Title VI-B funds generally serve children in small self-contained classrooms of 5 to 10 children, while the visually impaired, hearing impaired, and speech impaired children are served on an itinerant, intermittent basis. Consequently, one can understand why such an inordinately larger number of children were served in this second group.

Data for the TMR population would indicate that for four funding periods from 1968 through 1970 a range of from 20% to 29% of all children served were TMR. However, from 1970 through 1973, the range was from 6% to 9%. The reason for this dramatic reduction in service was that until 1970 Oregon had no other funding for TMR programs. In 1970, the Oregon Legislature provided the Mental Health Division of Oregon with a budget to serve this population. Consequently, this became less of a funding priority for Title VI-B funds.

The same facts were true of the deaf/blind children. One can see that 39 deaf/blind children were served between 1968 and 1970. After 1970, all deaf/blind children were served under federal funds disseminated by the Northwest Regional Program for Deaf/Blind Children. Consequently, Title VI-B funds were not available for deaf/blind programs.

One should also note the numbers and percentage of learning disabled and emotionally disturbed children served beginning with the 1971-72 academic year and continuing through the 1972-73 academic year. For learning disabled, 193 children were served in 1971-72 representing 25% of the total population; 1972-73 data indicates 333 learning disabled children were served representing 36% of the population. In 1971-72, 25% of the child population served were emotionally disturbed; this increased to 32% in 1972-73.

This raise in service can be attributed to priorities set by the Oregon State Department of Education. Their staff felt there was a need to provide additional service to these two populations.

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Children Served by Handicapping Condition.

(1968 - 1973)

| Funding Period | EMR | | TMR | | Multiply Handicapped | | Visually Impaired | | Hearing Impaired | | Physically Handicapped | | Learning Disabled | | Emotionally Disturbed | | Speech Impaired | | Deaf/Blind | | Total | | |
|-------------------|------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------|---|--|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Impact 1, 1968 | 114 | 19 | 118 | 20 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 65 | 11 | 1 | 33 | 6 | 246 | 41 | 598 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 63 | 19 | 66 | 20 | 19 | 6 | 91 | 27 | 2 | 83 | 25 | 334 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 112 | 17 | 191 | 29 | 11 | 2 | 106 | 16 | 14 | 200 | 30 | 659 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 53 | 7 | 166 | 21 | 10 | 1 | 329 | 42 | 1 | 70 | 9 | 793 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 27 | 2 | 166 | 9 | 361 | 19 | 1,874 | 57 | 25 | 182 | 10 | 1,877 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 15 | 2 | 40 | 6 | 33 | 4 | 33 | 4 | 144 | 19 | 193 | 25 | 762 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 42 | 4 | 75 | 8 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 333 | 36 | 924 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 426 | 7 | 822 | 14 | 459 | 8 | 30 | 1,695 | 29 | 175 | 3 | 779 | 13 | 603 | 10 | 919 | 15 | 39 | 1 | 5,947 | 100 | | |

Note. Impacts 1 and 3 were summer projects only; Impact 4 had 9 of 22 projects that were summer only.



Introduction to Table 3

Table 3 is a summary of Title VI-B dollars allocated by handicapping condition. Funding periods are in the left column beginning with 1968 and ending with 1972-73. Handicapping conditions are across the top of the page beginning with educable mentally retarded (EMR) and ending with speech impaired. In the summer of 1968 one can see that \$23,858 was expended in the area of EMR, \$15,656 expended in TMR, and so on. In the totals column, the total amount expended by handicapping condition is noted as well as the percentage of total. In the last three columns on the right side of the Table, the total number of dollars is shown for each year, the total number of projects is noted and the mean number of dollars per project is provided.

Summary of Data in Table 3.

Table 3 indicates that between 1968 and 1973, 133 projects were funded by Title VI-B funds for a total of \$1,288,456, with a mean cost per project of \$9,688. The range of funding for handicapping conditions was a low of 1% or \$14,510 for visually impaired to 22% of the total or \$278,560 for the emotionally disturbed. All handicapping conditions where the percentage of the total dollars expended was 14% or more, were considered at one time or another between 1968 and 1973 to be priority areas. For example, the multiply handicapped category, which is 14% of the total, includes the deaf-blind population which had no other potential funding source between 1968 and 1970. TMR children between 1968 and 1970 also had no other funding sources available to them; consequently they were heavily funded by Title VI funds. Learning disabled with 14% of the total and emotionally disturbed with 22% of the total were both considered to be priority areas for funding in the State.

TABLE 3

Title VI-B Budget Allocation by Handicapping Condition

(1968 - 1973)

| Funding Period | EMR | TMR | Multiply Handicapped | Visually Impaired | Hearing Impaired | Physically Handicapped | Learning Disabled | Emotionally Disturbed | Speech Impaired | Totals | | Average Cost |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | Dollars | Projects | |
| Impact 1, 1968 | 23,858 | 15,656 | 15,440 | - | 9,144 | - | - | 12,092 | 36,532 | 112,722 | 20 | 5,636 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 7,882 | 20,791 | 24,472 | - | 11,071 | - | - | - | 17,263 | 81,479 | 9 | 9,053 |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 15,565 | 33,261 | 20,918 | 3,785 | 9,374 | - | 11,554 | 3,875 | 34,474 | 132,806 | 24 | 5,534 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 17,059 | 83,458 | 27,247 | 2,400 | 28,373 | - | 20,259 | 23,858 | 26,730 | 229,384 | 23 | 9,973 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 33,270 | 25,084 | 62,093 | - | 25,961 | 10,000 | 46,041 | 37,548 | - | 239,997 | 18 | 13,333 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 5,000 | 32,213 | 26,817 | - | 10,260 | 10,500 | 67,733 | 83,043 | 11,762 | 247,328 | 18 | 13,740 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 33,901 | 16,102 | 10,245 | 8,325 | - | - | 33,000 | 118,144 | 25,023 | 244,740 | 21 | 11,654 |
| TOTALS | 136,535 | 226,565 | 187,232 | 14,510 | 94,183 | 20,500 | 178,587 | 278,560 | 151,784 | 1,288,456 | 133 | 9,688 |
| | 11% | 17% | 14% | 1% | 7% | 2% | 14% | 22% | 12% | 100% | | |

Note: Multiply Handicapped includes the deaf/blind children funded by Title VI-B from 1968 through 1970.

Introduction to Table 4

Table 4 is a summary of all 133 projects funded under Title VI-B funds between 1968 and 1973. Column one is the handicapping conditions that were served with these funds. Column two is the total number of projects funded for each handicapping condition. Column three is the number of children served through all Title VI-B funds by handicapping condition with the total at the bottom. Column four is the percent of total children served by handicapping condition. Column five is the number of dollars funded for each area of handicapping condition over the seven funding periods. Column six is the percentage of total dollars expended by handicapping condition and column seven is the cost per child.

Summary of Data in Table 4

This summary indicates that 133 projects were funded under Title VI-B funds between 1968 and 1973 in seven different funding periods and served 5,947 children. A total of \$1,288,456 was expended with a mean cost per child of \$217. With regard to the number of children served per handicapping condition, the data indicates that this ranges from a low of 30 visually impaired to a high of 1,695 hearing impaired. With regard to dollars expended, it ranged from a low for visually impaired of \$14,510 to a high of \$278,560 for the emotionally disturbed. This range in terms of percentage is a low of 1% for the visually impaired to a high of 22% for the emotionally disturbed. The cost per child ranged from \$56 for the hearing impaired to a high of \$484 for the visually impaired. One should note that of the 1,695 hearing impaired children served, a large portion of these were served in an evaluation program only and that remedial services were not provided which made the cost per child considerably low. In addition, one should note that the 30 visually impaired served for a cost of \$484 per child was representative of an itinerant program in Eastern Oregon over a three county area. This three county area represents a large geographic area. Consequently, the cost of traveling from town to town was high.

TABLE 4
 Summary of all Projects Funded
 Under Title VI-B Funds (1968-1973)

| Handicapping Condition | Number of Projects | Number of Children Served | Percentage of Total | Dollars Funded | Percentage of Total | Cost Per Child |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Educable Mentally Retarded | 19 | 426 | 7 | 136,535 | 11 | 321 |
| Trainable Mentally Retarded | 31 | 822 | 14 | 226,565 | 17 | 276 |
| Multiply Handicapped | 12 | 498 | 9 | 187,232 | 14 | 376 |
| Visually Impaired | 3 | 30 | — | 14,510 | 1 | 484 |
| Hearing Impaired | 11 | 1,695 | 29 | 94,183 | 7 | 56 |
| Physically Handicapped | 3 | 175 | 3 | 20,500 | 2 | 117 |
| Learning Disabled | 15 | 779 | 13 | 178,587 | 14 | 229 |
| Emotionally Disturbed | 20 | 603 | 10 | 278,560 | 22 | 462 |
| Speech & Language Impairment | 19 | 919 | 15 | 151,784 | 12 | 165 |
| TOTALS | 133 | 5,947 | 100 | 1,288,456 | 100 | 217 |

Note. Multiply Handicapped includes the deaf/blind children funded by Title VI-B from 1968 through 1970.

Introduction to Table 5

Table 5 is a summary of the location of projects by county for projects funded under Title VI-B funds for each funding period. Column one lists the counties in Oregon, column two is the 1972 population of the county, columns three through nine show the number of projects funded for each county during a specific funding period and column ten is the total of all projects funded for each county from 1968 through 1973.

Summary of Data in Table 5

There were 133 projects funded in Oregon under Title VI-B funds between 1968 and 1973 and there are 36 counties in the State. Fourteen counties did not receive funding through Title VI-B funds. This leaves 22 counties who received the 133 funded projects. Five counties received 9 or more funded projects. Multnomah County was first with 30 projects, Clackamas County second with 14, Washington County was third with 12, Jackson County was fourth with 11, and Lane County was fifth with 9. On a per capita basis, the number of projects that these five counties received appears to be appropriate in that these five counties have the greatest population. The population range is from 100,100 (Jackson) to 560,000 (Multnomah). However, there are five counties with populations ranging from 26,100 to 73,950 people who received no funding at all. We do not know whether the schools in these counties did not apply for the funds or whether they applied and were not given priority as these data are not available from the State Department of Education. These counties are Lincoln (26,100), Polk (37,060), Yamhill (42,190), Klamath (51,940), and Douglas (73,950). However, Douglas County has been funded for both the academic years 1974-75 and 1975-76.

TABLE 5

Location of Projects by County for each Title VI-B Funding Period

| COUNTY | POPULATION | 1968 Impact 1 | 1968-69 Impact 2 | 1969 Impact 3 | 1969-70 Impact 4 | 1970-71 Impact 5 | 1971-72 Impact 6 | 1972-73 Impact 7 | TOTAL |
|---------------|------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Baker | 15,200 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| Benton | 59,800 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 4 |
| Clackamas | 178,400 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
| Clatsop | 28,800 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 4 |
| Columbia | 30,070 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Coos | 57,300 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 4 |
| Crook | 10,610 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Curry | 13,300 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Deschutes | 33,800 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 7 |
| Douglas | 73,950 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Gilliam | 1,980 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Grant | 6,910 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Harney | 6,900 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| Hood River | 13,540 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Jackson | 100,100 | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Jefferson | 8,980 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Josephine | 38,500 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Klamath | 51,940 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Lake | 6,740 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| Lane | 227,200 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Lincoln | 26,100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Linn | 75,540 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 6 |
| Malheur | 23,380 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Marion | 157,200 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 7 |
| Morrow | 4,320 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Multnomah | 560,000 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 30 |
| Polk | 37,060 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Sherman | 2,100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Tillamook | 18,400 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Umatilla | 45,450 | 2 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | 7 |
| Union | 20,660 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Wallowa | 6,210 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Wasco | 20,520 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Washington | 178,300 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Wheeler | 1,820 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Yamhill | 42,190 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| TOTALS | | 20 | 9 | 24 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 133 |

Introduction to Table 6

Table 6 is a summary of in-service training that was provided for professional staff, volunteers, teacher aides, and parents under Title VI-B funds from 1968 through 1973

Summary of Data in Table 6

It can be seen that 1,510 persons were trained in each of these four categories. These included 396 professional staff, 69 volunteers, 42 teacher aides and 1,003 parents. One should note the increased emphasis in the training of professional staff and parents from 1970 through 1973. This indicates an increased emphasis in special education in the State of Oregon as to the value of training parents to provide prescriptive programming for their children in the home to increase the acquisition of functional skills and to decrease inappropriate behaviors.

Training for professional staff was primarily on-site technical assistance by various consultants throughout the state as opposed to formal class instruction. The consultants came from agencies of the State System of High Education, including Teaching Research and various private colleges.

The training of parents was done primarily by the project staff themselves. In some instances the consultants assisted with this parent training. It should also be noted that while the data in Table 5 indicates that only 69 volunteers were trained under Title VI funds, there is an increased emphasis in the use of volunteers in special education programs to increase the intensity and frequency of services to handicapped children in the state.

TABLE 6
In-Service Training Provided for Staff, Volunteers and Parents
Through Title VI-B Project Funds

| Funding Period | Professional Staff | Volunteers | Teacher Aides | Parents | Totals |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Impact 1, 1968 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 82 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 19 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 49 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 5 | 40 | 0 | 9 | 54 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 211 | 0 | 2 | 310 | 523 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 90 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 157 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 69 | 22 | 12 | 542 | 645 |
| TOTALS | 396 | 69 | 42 | 1,003 | 1,510 |

Introduction to Table 7

Table 7 is a summary of Title VI-B projects continued and discontinued since 1968. The table is separated into three categories:

- (a) summer projects
- (b) academic year projects
- (c) totals

Both the number and percentage continued and discontinued are noted.

Summary of Data in Table 7

This table shows that 92 (69%) of the 133 projects funded are still operational. One must note, however, that for summer projects only 24 (44%) of 55 are still ongoing, while 68 (87%) of the 78 projects funded for an academic year are still operational.

TABLE 7
Number and Percentage of Title VI-B
Projects Continued and Discontinued Since
1968

| Status | Summer Projects | | Academic Year Projects | | Total Projects | |
|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Continued | 24 | 44 | 68 | 87 | 92 | 69 |
| Discontinued | 31 | 56 | 10 | 13 | 41 | 31 |
| TOTAL | 55 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 133 | 100 |

Introduction to Table 8

Table 8 summarizes the current status of budget, staff and children served for projects which are still operational but for which Title VI-B funds are no longer available.

Summary of Data in Table 8

For the 92 projects still operational, 14 are operating on the same budget, 23 are operating with the same number of staff as in the original project and 14 are serving the same number of children that they were originally funded to serve. Nine are operating at a reduced budget, eight are operating with a reduced number of staff and eight are operating with a reduced number of children. Sixty-nine are operating currently with a higher budget, 61 with a larger number of staff and 70 with a larger number of children.

TABLE 8

Status of 92 Projects Continued
Without Title VI-B Funding

| Project Component | Increased | Decreased | No Change | Total |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Budget | 69 | 9 | 14 | 92 |
| Staff | 61 | 8 | 23 | 92 |
| Children Served | 70 | 8 | 14 | 92 |

Introduction to Table 9

Table 9 notes for all 92 projects that are still operational a comparison of the original funding (the last Title VI-B funding period) and their current level of funds available. In addition, the table shows a comparison of the number of staff under original funding with the present staff.

Summary of Data in Table 9

The original funding for the 92 projects that have continued to be operational was \$637,306. Their current level of funding is \$2,145,793. This represents an increase of \$1,508,487 over the original level of funding. There were 297 staff involved in the 92 projects that were funded originally under Title VI-B funds. These same 92 projects now have 488 staff; a difference of 191 staff more than the original funding.

TABLE 9

Summary of 92 Projects That Have Been Continued
Without Title VI-B Funding

| Original Funding Period | Original Funding | Current Funding | Increase | Original Staff | Current Staff | Increase |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Impact 1, 1968 | \$ 32,666 | \$ 654,398 | \$ 621,732 | 34 | 113 | 79 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 40,525 | 90,940 | 50,315 | 28 | 16 | (12) |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 56,012 | 283,206 | 227,194 | 58 | 99 | 41 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 89,198 | 265,103 | 175,905 | 24 | 52 | 28 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 109,238 | 212,994 | 103,756 | 39 | 58 | 19 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 80,319 | 160,196 | 79,877 | 54 | 80 | 26 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 229,248 | 478,956 | 249,708 | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| TOTALS | \$637,306 | \$2,145,793 | \$1,508,487 | 297 | 488 | 191 |

Introduction to Table 10

Table 10 is a summary of present dollar support sources for all Title VI-B projects that are still operational. Column one was the year the project was originally funded. Column two is the number of projects that are still operational from that funding year. Column three is the total current budget amount for all projects. Column four is the percentage of that total funding that is currently coming from local funds. Column five is the percentage that is coming from state funds. Column six is the percentage coming from other federal funds and column seven is the total percentage of local, state and federal funds. One can see, for example, that for those projects funded in 1968 there were eight projects funded that are currently operating with a funding base of \$654,398 with 65% of those funds from local sources, 17% from state funds and 18% from other federal funds.

Summary of Data in Table 10

One can see that for the seven funding periods there are 92 projects still operational of the original 133 funded. Their current level of support for handicapped children is \$2,145,793. Of this money, the mean percentage of all continuing projects or money coming from local funds is 54%. The mean percentage of money coming from state funds is 21% and the percentage coming from other federal funds is 25%.

TABLE 10

A Summary of Present Dollar Support Sources For Title VI-B Projects Still Operational

| Original Funding Period | Number of Project Continued | Current Funding | % Local Funds | % State Funds | % Other Federal Funds | Total Percentage |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Impact 1, 1968 | 8 | \$ 654,398 | 65 | 17 | 18 | 100 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 9 | 90,940 | 28 | 30 | 42 | 100 |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 12 | 283,206 | 64 | 20 | 16 | 100 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 15 | 265,103 | 42 | 28 | 30 | 100 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 15 | 212,994 | 60 | 13 | 27 | 100 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 14 | 160,196 | 61 | 37 | 2 | 100 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 19 | 478,956 | 42 | 17 | 41 | 100 |
| TOTALS | 92 | \$2,145,793 | 54 | 21 | 25 | 100 |

Introduction to Table 11

Table 11 is a comparison of the number of children served during their last year of Title VI-B funds and the present. The left column shows the year that the project was last funded. Across the top of the columns are the various handicapping conditions with the total by year in the far right hand column. The totals of each handicapping condition currently being served are at the bottom of each column. Under each handicapping condition is the number of children served during their last year of funding under Title VI-B funds. Next to it is the number of children currently being served and the difference.

Summary of Data in Table 11

The 92 projects that continue to be operational since Title VI-B funds were not available are currently serving 4,715 children. Nine areas of handicapped children are being served. Numbers of children served range from 20 visually impaired children to 1,491 hearing impaired children. The original number of children served for these same 92 projects was 3,636. This reflects an increase in the number of children served of 1,079.

TABLE 11

Comparison of the Number of Children Served by Handicapping Conditions
of Continued Projects.

| Funding Period | EMR | | TMR | | Visually Impaired | | Hearing Impaired | | Multiply Handicapped | | Physically Handicapped | | Learning Disabled | | Emotionally Disturbed | | Speech Impaired | | Totals | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - | N ¹ | N ² + or - |
| Impact 1, 1968 | 32 | 32 - | 90 | 90 - | 1 | 1 - | 25 | 15 -10 | 0 | 8 +8 | 1 | 1 - | 0 | 0 - | 1 | 1 - | 91 | 162 +71 | 241 | 310 +69 |
| Impact 2, 1968-69 | 62 | 62 - | 66 | 66 - | 0 | 0 - | 90 | 90 - | 0 | 23 +23 | 1 | 1 - | 0 | 0 - | 0 | 0 - | 66 | 66 - | 285 | 308 +23 |
| Impact 3, 1969 | 21 | 46 +25 | 130 | 130 - | 13 | 13 - | 58 | 58 - | 0 | 53 +53 | 0 | 0 - | 0 | 0 - | 0 | 0 - | 139 | 158 +19 | 361 | 458 +97 |
| Impact 4, 1969-70 | 44 | 44 - | 102 | 116 +14 | 0 | 0 - | 6 | 229 +223 | 0 | 18 +18 | 0 | 0 - | 0 | 62 +62 | 19 | 19 - | 0 | 0 - | 171 | 488 +317 |
| Impact 5, 1970-71 | 27 | 27 - | 21 | 46 +25 | 0 | 0 - | 1066 | 1066 - | 8 | 21 +13 | 0 | 25 +25 | 60 | 182 +122 | 0 | 215 +215 | 0 | 0 - | 1182 | 1582 +400 |
| Impact 6, 1971-72 | 0 | 6 +6 | 40 | 40 - | 0 | 0 - | 33 | 33 - | 3 | 19 +16 | 144 | 144 - | 126 | 142 +16 | 20 | 168 +148 | 0 | 111 +111 | 366 | 663 +297 |
| Impact 7, 1972-73 | 42 | 42 - | 0 | 0 - | 6 | 6 - | 0 | 0 - | 85 | 85 - | 2 | 2 - | 333 | 333 - | 294 | 282 -12 | 268 | 156 -112 | 1030 | 906 -124 |
| TOTALS | 228 | 259 +31 ⁰ | 448 | 488 +39 | 20 | 20 - | 1278 | 1491 +213 | 96 | 227 +131 | 148 | 173 +25 | 519 | 719 +200 | 334 | 685 +351 | 564 | 653 +89 | 3636 | 4715 +1079 |

N¹ = at time of original fundingN² = at present time on other funds

Introduction to Table 12

Table 12 is a summary of responses from the 58 project directors regarding the advantages of third party evaluation. The numbers in the left column are the responses that were provided by the project directors for each of the statements listed. It should be noted that all project directors did not respond to each of the four statements for each of their funded projects. In some cases where project directors had more than one project funded they responded one way for one project and a different way for the other projects. Consequently the responses given do not total either 58 or 133. There were 18 responses which were given that were other than the four possible statements listed. These are summarized following Table 12.

Summary of Data in Table 12

One can see from these data that 63 responses indicated that children were more adequately served because objectives and evaluation strategies were clarified and agreed upon between the third party evaluator and the project director before the project was initiated. Fifty-three responses indicated that accountability for the use of federal funds was requested by the third party evaluator and thereby providing a higher quality of service for handicapped children. Forty-one responded that on-site visits by the third party evaluators provided feedback which ultimately improved the quality of service to children served in the project and that dissemination of the results of the project was improved by the third party evaluators' comments in *Impact* and their preparation of the final report.

Table 12
Responses From Project Directors
Regarding The Advantages of Third Party Evaluation

| NUMBER | RESPONSE |
|--------|---|
| 53 | Accountability for the use of federal funds is requested by the Third Party Evaluators, thereby providing a higher quality of service for handicapped children. |
| 63 | Children were more adequately served because objectives and evaluation strategies were clarified and agreed upon. |
| 41 | On-site visits by the third party evaluators provided feedback which ultimately improved the quality of service to children served in the project. |
| 41 | Dissemination of the results of your project was improved by the Third Party Evaluators' comments in <i>Impact</i> and their preparation of the final report. |
| 18 | Other Responses |

Summary of Other Responses

Several of the respondents felt that the on-site visits provided positive reinforcement to the project staff. Others felt that the evaluators provided a source of new ideas and solutions to problems in the project. Several districts indicated that they used the "Third Party Evaluators' Comments" in the final report to sell the idea to administrators and school boards so it could be continued. Others felt that the evaluators assisted the project staff to understand what "reasonable" expectations for the project should be.

Introduction to Table 13

Table 13 is a summary of the responses of 58 project directors regarding the disadvantages of third party evaluation. The left hand column is the number of responses to the statements on the right. Again one should note that not all project directors responded to the statements. Twenty-four responses had remarks other than the possible disadvantages listed. These are summarized following Table 13.

Summary of Data in Table 13

Ten responses indicated that the evaluators were not sufficiently familiar with handicapped children and their problems to adequately evaluate the procedures used by the project staff. Three indicated that an inordinate amount of time was spent meeting with third party evaluators in Salem, preparing for on-site visits and for on-site visits. Nine indicated that the monies expended for third party evaluators could better be spent if they were disseminated in school districts or other projects.

Table 13
Responses From Project Directors
Regarding The Disadvantages of Third Party Evaluation

| NUMBER | RESPONSE |
|--------|--|
| 10 | Evaluators are not sufficiently familiar with handicapped children and their problems to adequately evaluate the procedures used by the project staff. |
| 3 | An inordinate amount of time is spent in meeting with the third party evaluators in Salem, preparing for on-site visits and for on-site visits. |
| 9 | Monies expended for third party evaluators could be better spent if it were disseminated to school districts for projects. |
| 8 | Other Responses |

Summary of Other Responses

Comments included that the third party evaluator was only interested in data and did not understand the total project. One comment indicated that the third party evaluator changed the intent of the project by modifying the original objectives. First visits to the project came too late in the year. Some staff indicated that the monies used for evaluation should be given to districts to hire staff to provide their own evaluation. Larger districts have evaluation staff and therefore third party is not necessary.

Introduction to Table 14

Table 14 is a summary of responses from 58 project directors of 133 projects to the question, "Did the Third Party Evaluators provide adequate and/or appropriate evaluation assistance to your project?" It should be emphasized that some project directors responded for each funded project and others did not. Also, some responded "yes" for one project and "no" for another.

Summary of Data in Table 14

Seventy-three responses indicated "yes" and 19 indicated "no". For further discussion see Table 15.

Table 14

Responses From Project Directors to the Question, "Did The Third Party Evaluators Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Evaluation Assistance To Your Project?"

Yes 73 No 19 Total 92

Introduction to Table 15

Nineteen project directors did not feel that the third party evaluator provided adequate service to at least one of their projects. Table 15 summarizes their reasons for this response. Eight responses were other than those specified in Table 15. These are summarized following Table 15.

Summary of Data in Table 15

Of the 50 responses made, 13 indicated that the third party evaluators did not make a sufficient number of visits to the project. In addition, 6 responses indicated that the evaluation strategies were not practical and that the third party evaluators' comments were not accurate regarding the success or failure of the project. Six responses indicated that the evaluators did not provide enough help in assisting the project staff to prepare the final report and five responses indicated that they did not receive help in the clarification of objectives and evaluation plans.

Table 15
Summary of Responses for Those 19 Project Directors
Who Answered "no" to the Question,
"Did the Third Party Evaluators Provide Adequate and/or
Appropriate Evaluation Assistance to Your Project?"

| NUMBER | RESPONSE |
|--------|--|
| 5 | Third party evaluators did not assist in clarifying the project objectives and evaluation plan. |
| 1 | When project objectives and evaluation strategies were modified, this tended to change the intent of the original project. |
| 6 | Evaluation strategies suggested by the third party evaluator were frequently impractical to implement because of the background and training of the project staff. |
| 13 | A sufficient number of on-site visits were not made. |
| 5 | Third party evaluation staff did not sufficiently assist us to implement data collection systems. |
| 6 | Inadequate amount and type of information relative to the content and design of the final report was not provided. |
| 6 | In <i>Impact</i> , third party evaluation comments were not accurate in terms of the success or failure of the project. |
| 8 | Other. |

Summary of Other Comments

Third party evaluators suggested data collection procedures that our staff did not understand and could not implement. Subjective evaluation was not considered only data that could be fed to a computer. The amount of data that was required was too much and required too much time to collect for the amount of funding. The third party evaluators slanted their comments negatively toward any project that did not use behavior modification procedures.

Introduction to Table 16.

Table 16 is a summary of responses from 58 project directors of 133 projects to the question, "Did the staff from the Oregon State Department of Education provide adequate and/or appropriate technical assistance to your project?" It should be emphasized that some project directors responded for each funded project while others did not. Also, some responded "yes" to one project and "no" to another.

Summary of Data in Table 16

Seventy-nine responses indicated "yes" and 9 indicated "no." For further discussion see Table 17.

Table 16
Responses From Project Directors to the Question,
"Did the Oregon Board of Education Provide Adequate and/or
Appropriate Technical Assistance to Your Project?"

Yes 79 No 9 Total 88

Introduction to Table 17

Nine project directors did not feel that staff from the Oregon Department of Education provided adequate assistance to their project. Table 17 summarizes their reasons for this response. Three responses were other than those specified in Table 17. These are summarized following Table 17.

Summary of Data in Table 17

Of the 24 responses made, 10 indicated that a sufficient number of on-site visits were not made. Five indicated that the consultants from the various handicapping areas did not provide assistance and four indicated that the timelines for the submission of letters of intent, proposals and interim and final reports were not adequate.

Table 17

Summary of Responses from 9 Project Directors Who Answered "no" to the Question, "Did the Oregon Board of Education Provide Adequate and/or Appropriate Technical Assistance to Your Project?"

| NUMBER | RESPONSE |
|--------|---|
| 0 | Priorities for potential fundable projects were not clearly defined. |
| 1 | Guidelines for preparing proposal were not sufficient. |
| 1 | Assistance in writing the proposal was not provided. |
| 5 | Specialists in various handicapping areas (EMR, TMR, etc.) did not provide assistance to the project. |
| 10 | A sufficient number of on-site visits were not made by OBE Staff. |
| 4 | Timelines for submission of letters of intent, proposal, interim reports and final reports were not adequate. |
| 3 | Other. |

Summary of Other Responses

Services were available during the planning stages of the project that we were not aware of until they were past. Consultants from the State Department had little information about TMR children. Consultant took personally the negative comments made by the third party evaluators in the final report.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

In addition to the 133 projects funded through Title VI-B funds which were disseminated to local school districts in Oregon, there were five special projects funded using administrative Title VI-B funds between 1968 and 1973. These projects were undertaken because special education staff at the State Department of Education determined that the subjects of each of these research projects were priority information necessary to more functionally administer the special education programs for children in the State. An abstract of each of the five projects follows.

Title: *A Study of the Extreme Learning Problem Program in Oregon*

Author: *William G. Moore*

Agency: *Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon 97361*

Duration: *1971-72 - 1972-73*

Funding: *\$28,821*

Purpose:

There were three major purposes of the study and they were to: (1) determine if ELP programs were changing children's reading behavior; (2) measure the extent of the change; and (3) determine what factors contributed to changing the reading behavior of the children served.

Methodology:

Six school districts were selected to participate in this study. The six were representative of districts in the State who conducted ELP programs and they were selected from some of the largest and smallest districts in the State. Subjects in the study were all of the new ELP pupils in the six districts entering the program in the 1971-72 and 1972-73 school years. In addition to being members of the new intake population, the subjects also must have had no previous remedial reading assistance in a special setting. All subjects from each district were under the direct supervision of the director of special education of the district. Each district used its own selection procedure for identifying pupils to receive remedial assistance in the district's program and these procedures were not altered. However, as a part of the study, each district was required to administer a Metropolitan Reading Test to all subjects in the study. The level of test to be administered was dependent on the grade level of the child. In addition, the Gilmore Oral Reading Test was administered at this time. Districts had also been encouraged to use an Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) for assessment purposes. However during the first year of the study not all teachers in all districts administered an IRI. At the end of the first year of the study all subjects were tested with the appropriate Metropolitan Reading Test for their grade level.

In the second year, 1972-73, the new intake population followed the same testing procedures as that of a new intake population identified in the first year. In addition, they all received an IRI on a pre-posttest basis. After a child had been accepted into the district's ELP program the teacher completed an information sheet for him. The teacher provided information concerning the child's age, grade level and I.Q. She also provided instructional information concerning the operation of the ELP classroom in which the child was enrolled, pretest scores from the tests administered, and information concerning instructional procedures and tests used to identify the child in the ELP program. An information sheet was also compiled for the child at the end of the school year. This sheet included posttest scores and information on the instructional procedures and materials used in the child's program both in the ELP and the regular classroom setting. The completed information sheets were sent to Teaching Research for review and then forwarded to the Computer Center at Oregon State University where common data for each subject was punched on IBM cards.

Significant Findings:

The following conclusions were drawn from the results of this study: (1) children served in an ELP program made better than average growth in reading as compared to the normal expectancy for one year's growth of reading for one year of instruction; (2) ELP pupils in the primary grades made greater growth in reading than pupils in the upper grade levels; (3) ELP pupils returned to the regular classroom setting after one year of reading intervention made less progress in reading than those pupils retained in the ELP program for a second year; and (4) ELP teachers who used instructional materials in conjunction with regular classroom teachers obtained more growth in reading with pupils they served than did those ELP teachers who did not use similar materials with the classroom teacher.

Title: *A Study of the Funding Relationships of Special Education Facilities for Handicapped Children in State Aided Private Agencies*

Authors: *Arthur Young and Company, 900 S.W. 5th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204*

Funding: *\$19,000*

Duration: *June 1, 1972 to December 30, 1972*

Purpose:

The purpose of this study was: (1) to provide the Ways and Means Committee of the Oregon State Legislature and the Oregon State Department of Education with information that would be of assistance in dealing with the issue of public responsibility for the education of handicapped children living in or under control of various non-profit social service agencies or the implications of ORS 326.510. The specific objectives of the study were to identify and analyze the funding sources of state aided private social services agencies serving children with special handicapping problems, emphasizing the impact and relationship of state and federal financial assistance; (2) to define and identify the educational costs within the context of the total program of services provided by the subject agencies; and (3) to develop and recommend eligibility criteria for participation of such agencies in the state supported educational costs for reimbursement programs.

Methodology:

The scope of the study embraced the following eleven state aided private agencies:

1. Louise Home, Portland
2. Boys and Girls Aide Society of Oregon, Portland
3. Children's Farm Home, Corvallis
4. Salvation Army White Shield Home, Portland
5. Edgefield Lodge, Troutdale
6. Christie School, Marylhurst
7. Perry Center for Children, Portland
8. St. Mary's Home for Boys, Beaverton
9. Villa St. Rose, Portland
10. Waverly Children's Home, Portland
11. Villa Gerard, Eugene

Significant Findings:

The reported findings were: (1) The eleven subject agencies provided residential care services for a broad spectrum of client problems. Consequently there exists such substantial differences among the programs in the agencies so as to make inter-agency comparisons somewhat tenuous. (2) There is virtually no uniformity among the eleven subject agencies and their financial and management information systems, particularly in methods of allocating costs thereby precluding any uniform measures of accountability or evaluation. (3) The financial burden of maintaining an educational program appropriate to the needs of the handicapped child poses the potential threat to the other service programs for some of the subject agencies and to the continued existence of at least one agency. (4) The present

level of funding for the educational programs of the subject agencies and provision of Title I in the Elementary and Secondary School Act could be potentially increased if the agencies were to become state educational agencies. (5) The present fragmented approach of funding the educational programs of the subject agencies affords no assurance of maintaining programs of high quality and raises the serious question of equity allocation of state funds.

In addition to the findings, two recommendations were given to the Oregon State Department of Education by the Arthur Young and Company following this study: (1) the State of Oregon ought to assume the financial responsibility of those educational programs for handicapped children receiving residential care and treatment in private agencies and institutions; and (2) the State of Oregon ought to adopt criteria of eligibility governing the participation of private agencies under the provision of ORS 326.510.

Title: *Education of Oregon's Sensory Impaired Youth*
Authors: *James H. Beaird, John J. McDonnell, Loring M. Carl*
Agency: *Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon 97361*
Funding: *\$30,710*
Duration: *September 1971 through March 1972*

Purpose:

The purpose of this study was to examine in depth services provided by the State of Oregon to the deaf/hearing impaired and blind/visually impaired populations. After examining Oregon's program, the project staff were to look at "model programs for the deaf and blind throughout the United States, make comparisons of these with Oregon's programs and subsequently make recommendations to the State for the Improvement of Oregon's programs."

Methodology:

Three staff from Teaching Research visited each of the regional programs and the State schools for the deaf and for the blind. Observations were made of teaching methodologies, budgets, ways services were delivered to children, and qualifications of teachers and teaching staff of each of these agencies. Interviews were conducted with teaching staff, administrators and parents. Various agencies who were supported to run "model programs" for the deaf or for the blind in the United States were visited during the course of the study. Comparisons were made between Oregon's programs and the observations taken from the "model programs."

Significant Findings:

When compared with the programs across the nation, Oregon fares well. Its students, both deaf and blind, are as well prepared academically as most and better than many. The combinations of residential and regional local programs found in Oregon are common place in the nation. The philosophical controversy over instructional strategies and the use of residential and regional programs were found nationally as well as in Oregon. Inappropriate coordination of residential and regional services in Oregon are not unique. The expenditures for programs, both in residential and regional local settings compare favorably with those from similar programs in other states, excluding the southeastern states which are lower. The failure of Oregon's programs, low academic performance, inadequate career preparation, unreadiness for contributory integration into society are the same for all. Fifteen recommendations were offered to the Oregon Board of Education at the conclusion of this study in the final report. The recommendations are as follows:

1. Take steps to vacate the school building at the Oregon State School for the Deaf prior to September 1972.
2. Begin immediately to initiate steps which affect greater information flow among various segments of the State Department of Education's programs for the sensory impaired.
3. Combine dietary operations of the Oregon State School for the Deaf and the Oregon State School for the Blind such that food preparation for both schools is accomplished at the Oregon State School for the Deaf.

4. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should initiate those actions necessary to insure that special needs of handicapped children are addressed in the planning, development and leadership activities of all major departments within the State Department of Education.

5. By September 1978, all singularly handicapped sensory impaired children should be enrolled in regional programs or public school classrooms.

6. Each regional facility for the deaf and blind shall develop and implement a plan which will allow it to provide educational services for those children at OSSD (207) and OSSB (20) who will be transferred to the regional facility as a result of the emphasis on integration at the residential schools.

7. Develop a plan to increase the amount of comprehensive training of parents to train their infant (chronological age .6 to 3.8) sensory handicapped children in the home.

8. Develop evaluation procedures at OSSD and OSSB and the regional facilities so that decisions relative to students, instructional programs, and staff can be made on a data based model.

9. The Oregon Board of Education should provide a central resource center to dispense specialized equipment and materials on a short or long term loan basis to regional facilities, residential schools, and regular classroom teachers who have sensory handicapped children.

10. Each regional facility and residential school should provide parent training programs for all parents of sensory handicapped students.

11. The Superintendent of the Oregon State School for the Deaf should develop a living skills program that is consistent with the psycho-social development patterns of children enrolled at the school.

12. Develop a plan to provide career and vocational education for sensory handicapped children in Oregon. Emphasis should be given to the following areas:

- (1) Modify regular (public school) vocational education programs to serve sensory handicapped students in regular classrooms.
- 2) Provide work experience in existing special vocational education programs for sensory handicapped students.
- (3) Improve vocational education programs for sensory handicapped students in regional programs and residential schools.
- (4) Provide post-secondary education for the sensory handicapped by utilizing the Community Colleges in Oregon.

13. Personnel of the Oregon State Department of Education should initiate planning for professional services (i.e., psychological, audiological, and ophthalmological) programs for both residential and regional programs that provide information appropriate to the decisions teachers and parents must make relative to the education of sensory impaired youth.

14. Every appropriate state agency should be directed to increase the emphasis placed on programs which contribute toward the prevention of hearing and visual losses.

15. Plan, develop specifications for and constructive facilities for the Oregon State School for the Blind that will be ready for occupancy by September 1975.

Title: *Needs and Concerns for Special Education in Oregon*

Authors: *H.D. Bud Fredericks, Victor L. Baldwin, Ronald R. Hofmann*

Agency: *Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon 97361*

Funding: \$26,654

Duration: *January, 1970 through August 3, 1970*

Purpose:

This study proposed to examine each of the handicapping conditions as defined by the Oregon State Department of Education and attempt to pinpoint the most critical needs for each area. These data would then lend themselves to the development of a set of priorities for each handicapping condition which would allow the state to make systematic efforts to increase the impact of special education within the State of Oregon.

Methodology:

It was determined that the major vehicle by which information about needs would be collected would be a structured questionnaire. It was also believed that the most effective way of administering this questionnaire was an oral face to face visit with the person identified as having relevant information concerning a particular handicapping condition. The respondents to the questionnaire were selected from a group of leaders throughout the State of Oregon. These leaders were selected from superintendents of schools, principals, directors of special education, professors of higher education, teachers in all the handicapping areas, parents of handicapped children, clinic directors, superintendents of institutions and representatives from special interest groups.

A series of tentative questions within each handicapping area were formulated by the various consultants at the Oregon State Department of Education and the Teaching Research staff. These were combined into a tentative questionnaire. A needs study board was formulated of people who were knowledgeable about the area of special education to represent virtually every type of agency concerned with educating handicapped. The tentative draft of questions was presented to this board who made recommendations and changes and additions to be incorporated into the final questionnaire. The final questionnaire was established and presented to a firm of professional polsters (Bardsley and Haslachner) who had been chosen to conduct the face to face interviews with selected populations of respondents. Staff from this firm then presented the questionnaires to the respondents during the summer and fall of 1970.

Significant Findings:

A sampling of the needs that were found are as follows: *Deaf and hard of hearing* - 69% of the responses indicated that there were weaknesses in training teachers of the deaf and 53% of the respondents indicated that there were weaknesses in the training of teachers of hard of hearing children. *Visually handicapped* - 51% of the respondents indicated that there were weaknesses in the education of teachers of the visually handicapped. They indicated that these weaknesses were primarily in the areas of identification and diagnosis and the need for more practicum. *Educable mentally retarded* - 67% of the respondents

indicated that there was a weakness or needs in the education of the teacher of the educable mentally retarded at the college preparation level. The primary needs were considered to be more practicum, more behavior modification training and better selection of teachers. *Trainable mentally retarded* - 82% of those expressing an opinion indicated that certification was needed for teachers of the trainable retarded. Those who expressed this need indicated that teachers needed specialized knowledge and administrators needed to know whether these teachers had the necessary qualification and experience. *Speech handicapped* - 74% of those responding indicated that there was a need for speech correctionists to receive additional preparation in the diagnosis and the remediation of language problems. The additional type of training was primarily indicated as more practicum experience, language training and diagnosis and identification training. *Multiply handicapped* - 77% of the respondents indicated that the multiply handicapped population could best be served by a regional program rather than having separate programs for the school district. They indicated that the services should be for small districts who cannot provide services and that they should provide complete educational services with some emphasis on diagnosis and evaluation. *Physically handicapped* - of the present services offered, those needing change or expansion are primarily in the area of vocational training. The respondents also indicated that their programs needed general improvements without specifying what those improvements were. *Emotionally disturbed* - all parents and all teachers responding indicated that in-school work experiences are needed for emotionally disturbed children. All parents and all teachers responding indicated out-of-school work experiences were needed for emotionally disturbed children. Five out of six parents and all teachers indicated that the students should receive pay for their work experience. *Extreme learning problems* - 7 out of 12 teachers were satisfied with the identification procedure used for identifying extreme learning problem children. When all respondents were queried about what might improve identification procedures, the majority indicated earlier identification and better identification instruments. However, teachers and directors of special education did not indicate a need for earlier identification.

Title: *A Validity Study of the Diagnosis and Placement of Certified EMR Pupils in Oregon*

Authors: *H.D. Bud Fredericks, Victor L. Baldwin, James M. Harter*

Agency: *Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon 97361*

Funding: *\$18,909*

Duration: *March 1969 through July 1969*

Purpose:

The purpose of the study was twofold: (1) to arrive at some determination of the percentage of pupils who are in special classes for the educable mentally retarded in Oregon for reasons other than mental retardation and thus to determine the validity of placement procedures; and (2) to examine the adequacy of documents used in certifying EMR pupils.

Methodology:

It was decided that a diagnostic evaluation on a sample of children in EMR classes was needed to determine the validity of the pupil's placement. An advisory board was established to help determine the criteria for the diagnostic evaluation. The educational tests administered to all children were the phonic and spelling subtests of the Durrell Analysis Word Study and Word Meaning subtests of the standard reading tests and the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary and Comprehension tests and the Mathematic Subtest from the Wide Range Achievement Test. In addition it was decided that the Walker Behavior Problems Identification Checklist was to be completed by the teachers for all children in the sample. Evaluations were conducted at Fairview Hospital and Training Center, Crippled Children's Division, University of Oregon Medical School, Clackamas County Child Development Center, University of Oregon, and by contracted psychologists. In addition, a private physician was contracted to conduct the medical examinations.

Significant Findings:

The study reported that only one child out of a sample of 97 was inappropriately placed in an EMR class although I.Q. scores revealed that of the children who had I.Q. scores of above 80, the evidence of educational performance and medical evidence strongly supported their being placed in an EMR class.

In relation to the adequacy of forms utilized by the State Department of Education, recommendations were made for the inclusion of more stringent visual and hearing acuity tests to be a standard part of the medical evaluation. Also an electroencephalogram was considered appropriate. The inclusion of standardized educational tests is also recommended.

Finally, the variance noted between the scores of the present I.Q. test and those previously administered indicates that school administrators must be wary of placing a child in an EMR class with an I.Q. score as the primary source of evidence.

PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE
Title VI Summary Report

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: _____
(ADDRESS) _____

CONTACT PERSON: _____
PHONE _____

TITLE OF PROJECT: _____

NO OF STAFF: _____ BEGINNING DATE: _____

TYPE OF STAFF _____ ENDING DATE: _____
(CHECK ONE)

NO. OF CHILDREN SERVED _____

TEACHERS _____

TYPE OF CHILDREN: (BY NO.)

AIDE _____

EMR _____

PSYCHOLOGIST _____

TMR _____

_____ THERAPIST _____

M.H. _____

SPECIFY OTHER _____

VIS. IM. _____

SPECIFY

HEAR. IM. _____

AMOUNT OF FUNDING: _____

PHY. HAND. _____

TRAINING PROVIDED FOR STAFF

LEARN. DIS. _____

TYPE OF TRAINING _____

EMOT. DIS. _____

SP. IMP. _____

NO. OF STAFF TRAINED:

TEACHERS _____

VOLUNTEERS _____

TEACHER AIDES _____

PARENTS _____

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS AFTER TITLE VI FUNDING WAS TERMINATED

(Please check (✓) one.) If statement number 1 is checked, do not respond to the remaining statements.

This project was: 1. Discontinued 2. Continued

- a. Same Budget Same # Staff Same # Children
b. Reduced-Budget Reduced # Staff Reduced # Children
c. Higher Budget Larger # Staff Larger # Children

If 2b or 2c were responded to in any category, please indicate the change in staff, budget or number of children served below:

FUNDING

Current Level _____ % Local _____ % State _____ % Federal _____

STAFF

Current Number: _____
Teachers _____ Aides _____ Psychologist _____ Therapist _____
(Specify) _____
(Other) _____

CHILDREN SERVED

Current # of children served _____
Type of Children (by number) EMR _____ TMR _____ Multiple Handicapped _____ Visually Impaired _____
Hearing Impaired — Physically Handicapped — Learning Disabled
Emotionally Disturbed — Speech Impaired

Are there other areas of expansion not covered in the sections above? Yes No

If yes, please specify them:

Did the Oregon Board of Education provide adequate and/or appropriate technical assistance to your project? Yes No

If no, check the boxes (✓) next to the appropriate statements below.

- Priorities for potential fundable projects were not clearly defined.
- Guidelines for preparing proposal were not sufficient.
- Assistance in writing the proposal was not provided.
- Specialists in various handicapping areas (EMR, TMR, Speech, etc.) did not provide assistance to the project.
- A sufficient number of on-site visits were not made by OBE Staff.
- Timelines for submission of letters of intent, proposal, interim reports, and final reports were not adequate.
- Other (specify) _____

Did the Third Party Evaluators provide adequate and/or appropriate evaluation assistance to your project?

Yes No

If no, check (✓) the boxes next to the appropriate statements below.

- Third Party Evaluators did not assist in clarifying the project objectives and evaluation plan.
- When project objectives and evaluation strategies were modified, this tended to change the intent of the original project.
- Evaluation strategies suggested by the Third Party Evaluator were frequently impractical to implement because of the background and training of the project staff.
- A sufficient number of on-site visits were not made.

- Third Party Evaluation staff did not sufficiently assist us to implement data collections systems.
- Inadequate amount and type of information relative to the content and design of the final report was not provided.
- In *Impact*, Third Party Evaluation comments were not accurate in terms of the success or failure of our project.
- Other (specify):

Check (✓) the appropriate box next to the statement or statements as to the advantages of Third Party Evaluation.

- Accountability for the use of federal funds is requested by the Third Party Evaluators, thereby providing a higher quality of service for handicapped children.
- Children were more adequately served because objectives and evaluation strategies were clarified and agreed upon.
- On-site visits by the third party evaluators provided feedback which ultimately improved the quality of service to children served in the project.
- Dissemination of the results of your project was improved by the Third Party Evaluation comments in *Impact* and their preparation of the final report.
- Others (specify):

Check (✓) the appropriate box next to the statement or statements as to the disadvantages of third party evaluation.

- Evaluators are not sufficiently familiar with handicapped children and their problems to adequately evaluate the procedures used by the project staff.
- An inordinate amount of time is spent in meeting with the third party evaluators in Salem, preparing for on-site visits and for on-site visits.
- Monies expended for third party evaluators could be better spent if it were disseminated to school districts for projects.
- Other (specify):

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter

6

TEACHING RESEARCH

A Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education

MONMOUTH, OREGON 97361

Telephone (503)838-1220

The Coordinator of Federal Programs for Handicapped Children at the Oregon Board of Education has asked Teaching Research to gather and summarize data from past and existing Title VI projects.

The information to be contained in that report will reflect the impact of Title VI monies on handicapped children in the State of Oregon since 1968. This will provide the basis for the Oregon Board of Education and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in Washington, D.C., to make decisions about the future of Title VI programs.

Since its inception in 1968, Title VI funds have been awarded to 58 school districts and other agencies who provide services to handicapped children. Seven Impact reports have been prepared by third party evaluators which describe the success or failure of projects each year. The purpose of this current report is to summarize the progress of all funded projects over the past seven years to determine how many are still operational and to what extent programs have grown without the benefit of federal funds.

In order to secure this information, it will be necessary to ask staff from each of those districts who have received Title VI funds to respond to certain questions regarding the current status of these projects. Enclosed is a copy of a questionnaire, which we would like you to fill out for each Title VI project which you have had in past years. Those sections which seek your evaluation of the third party evaluators, technical assistance from Oregon Board of Education and the advantages or disadvantages of third party evaluation need only be answered once. These sections should be responded to by each agency, even though the Title VI project is no longer operational.

Within seven days of receipt of this letter, a staff member from Teaching Research will call you to either arrange to meet with you personally (if your agency has been funded several times) or to get your responses to the questionnaire over the telephone (if your agency has been funded one or two times).

A stipend of twenty-five dollars has been set aside for each individual who responds to this questionnaire. We realize that we are asking each of you to spend "extra" time to secure this information. Perhaps this money will partially compensate you for it.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire or this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

John J. McDonnell/Am

John J. McDonnell
Assistant Research Professor

JJM/cr1

Enclosures