

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 773

EC 151 619

AUTHOR Lilly, M. Stephen; Thomas, M. Angele, Ed.
TITLE Divestiture in Special Education--A Personal Point of View: The 1982 Statespersons' Roundtable.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Reston, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-86586-143-9
PUB DATE Nov 82
CONTRACT 400-81-0031
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Council for Exceptional Children, Publication Sales, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA (Publication No. 618, \$2.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accessibility (for Disabled); *Disabilities; *Labeling (of Persons); *Mainstreaming; Resource Room Programs; *Special Education; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS Council for Exceptional Children

ABSTRACT

The view that regular education should be returned the responsibility for many services currently provided by special education is argued by M. Stephen Lilly, as part of the 1982 Statespersons' Roundtable of the Council for Exceptional Children. In addition, criticism of this view is expressed by John W. Kidd, along with comments from the 13 statespersons at the roundtable. Mr. Lilly suggests that special education may have overstepped its appropriate bounds and become too separate from regular education. He claims that some special services (e.g., learning disabilities services) have supplanted rather than supplemented existing regular education support services (e.g., remedial reading). He questions whether it is appropriate to serve general societal needs through development and provision of special education services (e.g., the educable mentally retarded population has been predominantly poor, minority children). He also addresses other issues, including: the confusion between special education "resource" programs and "pull-out" programs for minority and disadvantaged students; and the practice of labeling a child as having a handicapping condition. In the response to this address, Mr. Kidd states that exceptional children's education is finally breaking through resistances but is still far from achieving equity for all children with special needs. Additional perspectives and issues are voiced by participants, including the training of special educators and mainstreaming. (SEW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED228773

DIVESTITURE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION—
A PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW:
THE 1982 STATESPERSONS' ROUNDTABLE

M. Stephen Lilly
Associate Dean for Graduate Programs
College of Education
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

M. Angele Thomas, Editor

November 1982

A Product of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

FC151619

A publication of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. Publication Date, 1982:

The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive,
Reston, Virginia 22091



The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to contract no. 400-81-0031 with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was critically reviewed for determination of professional quality. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the clearinghouse's parent organization or the National Institute of Education.

ISBN 0-86586-143-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface M. Angele Thomas	1
Divestiture in Special Education—A Personal Point of View M. Stephen Lilly	3
A Response John W. Kidd	10
Discussion	13

PREFACE

On April 14, 1982, The Council for Exceptional Children hosted its 4th statespersons' roundtable at the 60th annual convention in Houston. The roundtable speaker brings urgent issues to a body of past CEC presidents and J. E. Wallace Wallin Award recipients for their thoughtful discussion. This unique forum provides an opportunity for individuals with wide experience, professional competence, outstanding commitment to CEC, and a willingness to serve its interests to continue their impact on the direction of special education.

The 1982 address was delivered by M. Stephen Lilly, associate dean for graduate programs, College of Education, University of Illinois. In his paper, Dr. Lilly calls for returning to regular education the responsibility for many services previously considered within the jurisdiction of special education.

This publication contains Dr. Lilly's complete address as well as edited comments from the responses of the 13 statespersons at the roundtable. They include:

William Johnson, Elizabeth Kelly, John Kidd, Maynard Reynolds, Jean Hebler, Romaine Mackie, Edwin Martin, Parthenia Smith, Philip Jones, Merle Karnes, Kenneth Wyatt, Raphael Simches, and Leo Cain.

M. Angela Thomas

DIVESTITURE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION— A PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW

M. Stephen Lilly
Associate Dean for Graduate Programs
College of Education
University of Illinois

A special educator since the mid-1960's, I have had direct experience with the long growth period of special education. I have witnessed the birth of two special areas of special education: learning disabilities (LD) and severe/multiple handicaps; the former has not worked nearly as well as the latter. I have witnessed unceasing expansion of special education services and supporting legislation during an era when the majority of legislators and public policy makers would not think of opposing aid for "handicapped" children. I have also witnessed an era when special educators have been supporting this continual growth, in terms of both the types and the numbers of children served, while at the same time sounding a warning signal on our own limitations through widespread support of "mainstreaming."

The growth of special education has not been rational or planned but occurred in response to perceived societal and school needs. This is true in terms of both numbers of students served and areas, or categories, of special education. In the past 20 years, we have seen opportunities for almost unlimited growth and have seized these opportunities without questioning the broad societal and educational implications of our actions. Not unlike children passing through a cafeteria line, our eyes have been bigger than our stomachs.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Let me begin with a brief look at the history of special education services. This very limited analysis is designed to make a simple point: Special education serves broad societal needs. At the beginning of the 20th century, special education was a very narrow field. The primary categories of exceptionality were sensory impairment, physical impairment, severe emotional disturbance, and profound mental deficiency. There were two categories of mentally deficient individuals: Idiots and imbeciles. Individuals labeled mentally deficient were "obviously" handicapped.

In the early 1900's, a new category of mental deficiency was developed, consisting of children with less severe problems than those labeled idiots and imbeciles. Children in this new category were called morons, the forerunner of the current term educable mentally retarded (EMR).

While many reasons can be cited for the emergence of this new area of special education, there are three major factors: child labor laws, the movement toward universal schooling (including compulsory school attendance laws), and the development and translation of so-called tests of intelligence. Parents were encouraged to send their children to school and were prohibited from having them work in factories to help support the family. Once in school, children experienced a system and a curriculum designed for the elite of society. They encountered teachers and other school personnel who were not prepared for everything implied in "schooling for the masses." When the inevitable school problems occurred, a diagnostic system pinpointed the problem in the child with a label of moron, based on results of an intelligence test with a striking resemblance to the same school curriculum implicated in the original problem. This process established the basic tenet upon which special education is based: We serve children whose problems lie within themselves, who have "conditions" that are precursors to the manifest problems of school performance. Thus, also, began the tendency of special education to serve larger societal and educational needs, most often through removal of children from regular educational settings.

This brief excursion into history is sufficient to illustrate two points: (1) Diverse societal needs have been a primary determinant of growth and expansion in special education and (2) Without exception, special education expansion has focused on children's problems rather than viewing classrooms as incredibly diverse and complex settings in which any number or combination of factors can produce difficulties in learning or behavior.

Accordingly, special education has been based largely on five tenets, sometimes recognized, at other times implicit but nonetheless operative.

1. The standard school program is not appropriate for significant numbers of students, for whom quite different expectations and curricular experiences must be developed.
2. It is appropriate to serve general societal needs through development and provision of special education services.
3. For students receiving special education services, the primary problem resides "within the child" and can be discovered through child-centered diagnostic activities.
4. Offering services that cannot be provided or arranged through the regular education system; special education is beneficial for children.
5. Bigger is better; if we are doing something good for children, we should do it for as many children as possible.

EXPANSION OF SPECIAL SERVICES

Following these beliefs and teaching them to legislators, teachers, school administrators, parents, and the lay public have resulted in a phenomenal growth in special education over the last 20 years--growth in the number and categories of children served and in the types of services offered. By and large, this growth is seen as positive, since more children are receiving the benefits of more personalized instruction. However, if we can step back from our role as special educators and view this growth phenomenon from a broader perspective, we find cause for concern. The following six points lead many educators to question whether the regular and special education systems have grown too separate and whether, in striving to grow and to serve children in schools, special education might not have overstepped its appropriate bounds.

1. Earlier, I traced the beginning of the category of educable mental retardation, citing societal factors leading to its emergence. To finish that story, this area of special education grew slowly and consistently through the late 1950's. Starting then, and continuing for approximately 10 years, the growth of EMR services was phenomenal. Many special educators trace this growth to federal involvement in special education, pointing to Dwight Eisenhower's association with Pearl Buck and John Kennedy's retarded sister as factors in producing a major national effort in MR. Without doubt, the federal role was a major factor, but there is another, less positive, factor that is often overlooked, a factor that again highlights the extent to which special education has served larger societal needs.

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court triggered major efforts at school desegregation through its ruling on *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. While the effects of this ruling eventually changed the face of American education, the changes were not apparent on any widespread basis for a few years following the ruling. The real changes in racial and socioeconomic composition of the schools started to emerge in the late 1950's, followed closely by the rapid expansion of EMR classes. Not coincidentally, the majority of students labeled EMR and placed in these classes were from minority cultures and were poor. During this period, special education met some less-than-noble needs of the American education system. Furthermore, current figures on racial composition of programs for educables and behavior disordered (BD) students indicate that we have not yet disassociated ourselves from this practice.

2. In the mid-1960's, learning disabilities appeared on the scene, and a new area of special education emerged. While some people would have us believe that LD emerged from an overdue recognition of an ignored condition in children, I lay no credence in such an

analysis. The field of LD emerged as much as a political movement as an educational movement. Whereas it is clear that the EMR population has been composed of predominantly poor, minority children, LD children tend to be from white, middle- or upper-income families. When the field of LD emerged, there was considerable discussion in special education circles as to whether it should be a category of children or a category of services. Is there a condition of children to be called LD, or are there needed services that are not tied to a specific disability but nonetheless should be provided?

The first conceptualization of LD fits neatly with the pattern of special education services in place in the schools, while the latter implied major rethinking and restructuring of the special education system. Not surprisingly, the former won; LD was added as another category of children in state and federal legislation, with largely categorical service delivery systems developing in local school districts. The seemingly endless debate and controversy over LD definitions are lasting testimony to the lack of wisdom in this initial decision.

3. Of even greater consequence in the development of LD services has been the lack of attention to cooperative efforts between regular and special education. By and large, we have assumed that LD services have added to the availability of individualized instruction. Given this view, it is easy to argue that the controversies surrounding LD are minimal in relation to the additional services provided for children.

A careful analysis of the situation raises serious questions. In many school districts, the case can be made that LD services have supplanted, not supplemented, existing regular education support services. In some states, passage of LD legislation meant that state funds were available for partial support of these programs, whereas regular education remedial reading and math programs were funded totally at the local level.

Not surprisingly, in the late 1960's and early 1970's, many remedial programs became LD programs and were subsumed under special education. In the early 1970's, I was a faculty member at the University of Minnesota-Duluth for three years; my primary role was working with in-service LD teachers who were not certified for their positions. Of this group, 70 to 80% were ex-remedial reading teachers who "became" LD teachers soon after the term was added to the state special education legislation. This nationwide switch was little more than "annexation" that enlarged the special education empire more than it broadened the array of services available for children.

4. The expansion of special education into new and different, usually "less handicapped," populations has had other implications. A prime example is the confusion and lack of differentiation between special education "resource" programs and "pull-out" programs for minority and disadvantaged students. The lack of coordination and continuity between these programs in many schools is an embarrassment to those responsible for both sets of programs.

Another example of lack of coordination is the area of preschool education, in which it is virtually impossible to differentiate between most students enrolled in preschool special education programs for mildly handicapped or high-risk children, and students enrolled in Head Start programs. However, the similarities in children served is usually matched by the independence and lack of cooperation between the school programs themselves. In both examples, the primary difference is not in the instructional program offered but in the diagnostic procedures necessary to declare children eligible for the programs. In both cases, the special education diagnostic procedures are more cumbersome, complex, and time-consuming; they result in a label of a handicapping condition that is of questionable educational utility and carries negative social connotations.

5. As implied, the issues of duplication of service and annexation of regular education programs by special education are not without practical consequences. Let me give one example of how offering support services under the rubric of special education can be disadvantageous. In virtually all states, a child's ticket to special education is a categorical label certifying that the child is handicapped. I will not deal here with possible harmful effects of such a label; I have covered this ground elsewhere, as have other people.

I will describe one very practical drawback of the labeling process. Because a handicapping condition is within the child and because such labeling is seen as serious business, considerable individualized diagnostic work is usually prescribed. This diagnostic work takes time and resources. In Illinois, state regulations allow 60 school days from referral to the staffing for special education placement. This is a reasonable time, given the diagnostic work required. However, is it a reasonable time given the nature of numerous referrals? Those 60 school days can be 3 to 4 months of real time, during which the teacher is receiving no assistance. Might we better serve most children (and their teachers) through a regular-education-based support service that does not require such extensive up-front diagnostic work and allows more efficient delivery of services? Such efficiency is precluded because, in many school districts these regular education support systems have been supplanted by special education, particularly LD, services.

6. In some school districts, as many as 20 to 25% of elementary age students are receiving some type of special education service. In most school districts over the past 3 years, the vast majority of new staff additions have been for LD resource teachers. In many districts, resource services have "grown like Topsy," with no real planning as to the most efficient and effective service delivery model. Instead, special education has grown by .50 FTE here and .33 FTE there, to the point that in some school districts, as many as one-third of all certified personnel are not teaching students in regular classrooms.

Such growth has led increasing numbers of regular education teachers and administrators to ask the following questions:

- a. When does special education become regular education and what are the essential differences between the two?
- b. Would the capability of regular classroom teachers to handle diverse problems in the classroom be increased if the considerable resources invested in "pull-out" services were used to reduce class size?

These are legitimate questions and deserve special educators' serious (and nonpossessive) consideration.

A NEED FOR DIVESTITURE

All six points have led me to consider some issues that a few years ago would have been considered heresy in special education. My first work in the profession dealt with inappropriate distinctions among categories, particularly LD, BD, and EMR. Within the last few years, I began to broach the possibilities of returning to regular education the responsibility for many services considered firmly within the jurisdiction of special education--thus the title of this paper, "Divestiture in Special Education."

Perhaps the rules under which we operate--which are correct and are designed to protect children from wrongful classification and improper separation from the mainstream of education--prevent fast and effective attention to mild problems of academic learning and social behavior. Perhaps we have overreached our bounds in special education and have delved into areas that should be the domain of regular educators. Perhaps we should consider letting go of some of our territory and work toward increased general education responsibility for services that are essentially remedial or supportive in nature.

I am compelled by several factors in making this argument. First and foremost, the mainstream of education is a healthy, flowing river, not

the cesspool that it is often called. Some of today's most exciting work currently happening in special education deals with a "rediscovery" of the regular curriculum. Curriculum-based assessment, which focuses on the analysis of student skills as they relate to the regular classroom curriculum, is being offered as a viable alternative to some of our rather esoteric and not especially relevant special education diagnostic procedures. Direct instruction of important specific skills, as opposed to basic abilities once or twice removed from the problems that led to the referral of a child, is becoming the standard and preferred practice among a growing number of special educators. In essence, we are becoming more relevant, through recognition of the richness and importance of the regular curriculum. Furthermore, we have evidence that children previously labeled handicapped can make amazing progress, in the neighborhood of 2 to 4 months of academic gain per month of instruction, as a result of direct intervention with regular curricular materials. I do not apologize for the content and processes of regular education; rather, we as special educators have a great deal to learn from them.

A second factor that impels me to return significant portions of our responsibility to regular education is a positive outcome of the mainstreaming movement. Namely, there is a confidence on the part of regular educators that many problems of learning and social behavior can indeed be solved in the regular classroom. While such confidence does not abound in all teachers, increasing numbers of teachers believe that children are more alike than different and that supportive services should seek to help teachers in their work with children, not relieve them of their responsibilities. Teachers with whom I dealt in professional activities and in-service sessions are, by and large, ready to accept the responsibility for teaching a broader array of students and are frustrated that the special education system does not provide more help. Sometimes it seems that we as special educators assume that teachers want relief rather than help; when all we offer is relief, we interpret acceptance of our services as approval. The majority of teachers with whom I interact want only to teach the children they have and welcome help in doing so.

A CALL FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Our days of wine and roses in special education are ending. For 15 years, state legislatures passed special education statutes with no serious concern as to how they would be funded; school boards have added special education positions with little or no regard for the bottom line. This is no longer the case. Special education is due the same scrutiny as all other areas of education, and this is as it should be. We will be held accountable for our utility, our practicality, and our efficiency. We will have considerable difficulty answering many of the questions that will be asked. Platitudes and appeals to sympathy will no longer do; we must expect to compete if we want to keep special education as a high priority.

In some areas, we should choose not to compete but to cooperate with regular educators in building a system to serve children efficiently and effectively. For many students labeled high risk, mildly handicapped, LD, BU, and EMR, such a system should be offered through regular, not special, education. We must have the foresight to anticipate this need and cooperate in a shift of programs and priorities. If we do so, we will have the active support of regular educators in assuring sufficient resources for special education programs for obviously handicapped children, preschool through age 21.

I have not outlined methods for implementing these ideas. I have only skeletal notions of how it should be done. It will be politically sensitive and procedurally challenging to accomplish this task. However, we have always been and continue to be excellent politicians. We can be successful in introducing system changes in the best interests of children. Our greatest problem in the orderly transfer of responsibilities from special to regular education is in our own ranks. As special educators, we have become very protective of our territory, which we have painstakingly built through the years. It will not be easy for many to let go, but we must. We have long professed the cliché that, as special educators, we are committed to "working ourselves out of a job." It is time for many of us to become regular educators again and test the true meaning behind our words.

A RESPONSE

John W. Kidd, Executive Director
CEC Division on Mental Retardation
Springfield, Missouri

It is difficult to be sharply critical of a speech without seeming to denounce the speaker or of a paper without appearing to castigate the writer. Since I find myself in sharp disagreement with Dean Lilly, I am compelled to clarify at the outset that I think of him as an esteemed colleague who deserves his share of A's. He is articulate, alert, astute, and academically apt. To render my remarks less denunciatory, I shall simply refer to him not as Dean Lilly, nor as Steve but as our critic since he himself styled his presentation as a "challenging, critical view."

I see the same theme in this paper as in Lilly's earlier "Teapot in a Tempest" (1970).^{*} It causes me to question his long held and not particularly concealed desire to get out of the business of special education and to get special education out of business. With his deanship, he may be moving closer to getting out of special education, but to realize the other dream will take a more convincing case than we have heard today.

* Lilly, S. "Special education: A teapot in a tempest." Exceptional Children, 37(1), 1970, pp. 43-48.

Our critic bases much of his argument for divestiture on the claim that regular education is ready to individualize instruction. Therefore no special education is needed. One can scarcely quarrel with the conclusion, were the assumption true. But to proclaim that this millennium has arrived smacks of the ivy-tower syndrome.

A healthy skepticism is indispensable to progress, but such cynicism as expressed by our critic is disheartening. He sees special education in the last 20 years "seizing opportunities for growth without questioning the broad societal and educational implications of our actions" —like, as he puts it, "children passing through a cafeteria line; our eyes have been bigger than our stomachs." Without such cynicism, the same phenomenon may be more accurately identified as special educators and other advocates for exceptional children's education finally breaking through the walls of resistance manned by regular educators and others but still far from achieving equity for all children with special needs. How can our critic overlook the unserved and the underserved individuals? How can he proclaim that there really are only overserved populations?

Of five tenets announced by our critic as the base of special education, the first four are common beliefs, as he contends. However, Number 5, "bigger is better," is an unbecoming excursion into pure sophistry. While the paper has no documentation, and for the most part none, one would expect some cited support for such assertions as "the majority of students labeled EMR were from minority cultures and were poor." Our critic may be on his weakest ground when, by a circuitous, if not specious, route, he denigrates the value of individualized diagnostic work for children with special needs. He contends that only by omitting such work-ups can the needed service be more quickly provided. He concludes that it is not proper to call such a service special education; that it is a regular support service; hence, no special education is needed for these children since regular support service is provided without individualized diagnostic work.

"Special education," our critic holds, "has grown by .50 FTE here and .33 FTE there, to the point that in some school districts as many as one-third of all certified personnel are not teaching students in regular classrooms." Whether or not this condition is widespread, the question should be: Are all the children involved being served more effectively by this arrangement?

Our critic's conclusion refers to our commitment of "working ourselves out of a job."

Yes, that is our goal by:

1. Prevention of the permanently damaging effects of poverty, of language deprivation, of the absence of needed care and support, and appropriate role models in the early lives of children.

2. Prevention of the loss of sensory adequacy through unrestricted environmental contaminants.
3. Improved and increasingly available perinatal and child health care.

However, that is not our goal if it is to be achieved by:

1. Simply declaring that more than one-half of the mentally retarded are no longer retarded and hence are ineligible for special education since their Binet IQs are above 67.
2. Maintaining that the mildly handicapped, irrespective of the disability, must survive if not prosper in the mainstream--if they don't drown.
3. Claiming that we are being given entirely too much money to provide services to children with special needs. At least our critic has been rather consistent over the years--if only he could have been more constructive.

DISCUSSION

Maynard Reynolds: We have a problem with history. I would like to underline one point that Steve made. When we do try to face up to our problems, it does not mean that we are going to castigate ourselves or those who have made so many contributions over the years. We have always done the best we could in light of our resources. Now we must be ready to face up to some real problems. The number of children set aside in special programs in the period from the end of the Second World War to 1970 has increased 700%. In my state of Minnesota, we have reached the point where one teacher in five works in special ed.

I tend to agree with Steve that we are facing a real crisis in classification and in diagnosis. The classifications and diagnoses that we make, especially with the mildly handicapped, are not reliable. We have let too many narrowly categorical programs develop with separate bureaucracies and timelines, pretending that these programs do not interact. I would go beyond special ed to Title I, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, etc., pretending that special education and programs for the disadvantaged do not interact. How long can we continue with that friction? In New Jersey, as recently as last year, it was four times more likely that you would be classified mentally retarded if you were black than if you were white. We have been getting our money from identification and categorization of children, and it simply is not going to hold up. We are in for a major restructuring if we must provide data on achievement outcome as we look for funding.

Very briefly, one problem worries me about your paper, Steve. I agreed with most of it; it is a starting point. But I do not like your word divestiture. It too easily suggests that we practice holding back, giving way, perceiving the world in two parts--regular education and special education--while we go away.

That would be a terrible mistake. Instead of divesting, we need to invest. That is a better way. I use the word renegotiate a lot. Special education and regular education are already renegotiating a relationship that will serve mildly handicapped children. That suggests the value in both special education and regular education, that both of us are willing to come up with something new. The term divest suggests that we are giving way, pulling away, and that it is acceptable to define special education in 19th century terms. Go back to the blind, the deaf, the severely handicapped, and forget the mildly handicapped? No way! We are already renegotiating relationships with regular education. We must bring more vigor, energy, and creativity to that problem and not simply give way. It is possible to construct systems in which there is a definite response to children who are not progressing well and to do so without labeling or categorizing them.

Jean Hebler: I too am frankly horrified when I look at training programs that are so narrow and turn out categorical special educators. It does not match what happens in the schools and regions. How can we train people as narrow special educators and put them in a noncategorical setting when they have no general education experience? We need to look at what students need and then assess where we as specialists can contribute in terms of providing services that cannot be provided in other settings. In a meeting yesterday afternoon, someone coined a term that I had not thought of: regular needs children. Maybe if we look at regular needs children and some of their special needs, we might be a little more in tune with reality and talk about a generic program rather than special education and regular education separately.

Romaine Mackie: I urge pulling together general educators, special educators and all levels of administration for a discussion of the needs of both special children and regular children and how these needs can be met. I urge CEC to provide the leadership in this venture.

Parthenia Smith: It is important to work cooperatively and help develop strategies that will ensure that the children who need services can get them through some type of a total educational package involving mental health and all the social services. It is crucial that we begin to look at our society as a whole and begin to deal with reality. We are not going to change humans who discriminate because of handicapping conditions, because of race, religion, or whatever. But we need to face the fact and begin to plan to deal with this. We need to involve the legislature in that. That is the bottom line.

Another point is the distinction between support services and diagnostic services. Standardized testing is not the only means of evaluation. I would like to challenge higher education to begin to help our educators, our teachers, our administrators, to be able to conduct diagnostic evaluations in schools, using observation techniques and informal evaluations that will help deal with behavior prior to the use of a standardized measurement.

Philip Jones: Steve and Maynard, we have battled over labeling many times, and I still contend that you can not go to funding groups and say, "I've got an empty paper sack. Fill it up with money so I can do good things for children." Unfortunately, it does not work that way in the legislative halls. Jean, you are right. We are guilty in the training programs. At the universities, we are training for very narrow fields. Students are trained one way and hired another way:

Steve, when you suggest that deans have become more accepting of special education, we need to look at their motives. Did they accept dean's grants to improve general education and integrate some special

education components into the general education programs, or did they accept dean's grants as travel money for themselves and a few other select folks? Have they accepted special education because that is where the jobs are more plentiful? With declining enrollments and cut-backs, they need to build additional student credit hours in order not to lose as many positions. We would be remiss in not looking at the motivation of some deans around the country. There are a few exemplary projects. I am just not sure the majority of deans got into the field of special education because of a commitment to exceptional children.

Merle Karnes: We may have moved too fast in our field before we had sufficient knowledge of what works with students. Still, I would hate to see us retrench. If we could roll back the years at the federal, state, and local levels, we would prefer what the federal government has done in early childhood programs. Early childhood educators do not label children. We are more precise in our screening, identification, and ongoing assessment of these children than with any other group. We could not get federal funds if we did not have a plan delineating how we make parents and families an integral part of the program. We would not be funded if we did not have a full-blown evaluation plan. As young as the program is, early childhood education has more evidence of success than any other. All special educators ought to take a look at that model. States have been involved, as well as local school systems, and a wide array of private agencies. More coordination of effort exists in this program than in any other branch of our profession.

We should be proud of the good things that we have accomplished. We have many good models. It would behoove us to look at all the problems that we are discussing today and approach the next few years in the most positive way possible. We should not condemn ourselves but rather talk about all the things that need to be done and try to get more hard data. Even though the federal government is not funding full appropriations, we should band together and work toward making progress, getting more federal funds to carry on the good work that we have been doing and would like to continue.

Kenneth Wyatt: When I started in special education during the early 1950's, it seemed that there were five advocate groups. The first group was the parents, who unfortunately had very little information and no resources. The second group consisted of little old ladies with gray hair and tennis shoes who were do-gooders. They loved any type of child who looked different and could go into vocational training. Other advocates were the researchers who viewed students as rather interesting organisms with whom they might be able to deal in controlled situations. Then there were the private entrepreneurs, who established exclusive schools and made a living off them. The fifth group, health personnel, dealt with special students over a long period in less than ideal situations. They had

convinced themselves that the denial of educational opportunities was in many ways more critical than the physical conditions of the children.

My main concern in special education continues to be the question of the advocate. Given the least restrictive environment concept of P.L. 94-142 and the resulting placement of many special needs students in public schools, we should have created a whole generation of people who are as firm advocates of the handicapped child as we are. That has not happened. I am going to feel great when we see huge numbers of regular educators joining CEC because they feel that this is how they can prepare themselves to do a fantastic job with the children being mainstreamed into regular education. As of yet, they are not doing it. Is it because they do not have the same level of commitment as most of us in this room?

The other issue that concerns me is what I call the hyperpendulum. We not only let the pendulum go backward, we kicked it hard. I can remember the Lloyd Dunn era in 1968 when all of a sudden we were going to eliminate all kinds of special classes and rushed to abandon what had occurred to that point. Then the pendulum started the other way; people predicted that we would soon be putting cribs in the back of regular classrooms for severely multiple handicapped children so they could benefit from the wonderful things going on in a regular program. If only you could get regular educators to say, "Yes, we gave to special education children that we should have kept ourselves." They would take their resources and provide for the mildly handicapped. We could, in turn, take our resources and use them with the severely involved and the more seriously affected children.

Ray Simches: Special education may have an identity problem. Perhaps we need to cope with the identity of special education in the 1980's as opposed to the 1920's, 1930's, 1940's. Some of the forces that historically have impinged upon us include economic forces and civil rights issues. Special education grew from the problem of "pushouts." The driving force was a desire for equity.

The public school system, which is a major institution established to serve all children, is not providing the equity that parents so desire. Equity, equal educational accessibility for all students, remains the critical need in the 1980's. It is related to the whole business of labels. What is the advantage of labels? Advantage is a key question. To whose advantage is it to use labels? The child's? The bureaucracy's? The parents'? It is healthy to look at the issue of who is being advantaged.

We are dealing with the public schools and regular educators. There is the issue of compatible cultures in our schools. We have had an industrial model in the public school, where we move through

a system and produce a standard end product. The special educator, on the other hand, focuses on the child and develops a highly individualized program. These are two subcultures in our schools. Are they compatible? We can make them compatible. But we need to reaffirm what is and what we would like to see happening.

Leo Cain: I read Steve's paper from several different perspectives. I have been a teacher, head of a special education program, a dean; I have had to deal with deans. When I heard Phil Jones say certain things about the motivation of deans, he stole a good part of my thunder. Schools of education and deans are under great pressure. They are the whipping boys of academia. As a result, we are getting many interesting kinds of interface thrown together.

There is a certain embracing of special education by people who never embraced it before.

The issues of the paper are valid. I look at the six discussion points and I am concerned about procedures. We must do these things. We must divest. Then on the final page, we read one little sentence in which the author says he does not have much of an idea about how to implement his theories. This is always one of our grave problems. We can talk about the issues and what should be done; when it comes to the bottom line of implementation, the chips are down. If we are going to divest ourselves of certain aspects of special education, what are the basic issues in doing so?

I would hate to have this notion go before a state legislature. California has a huge budget for special education, something like \$72 million. The chairman of the education committee of the California Assembly is proposing a way to make up part of this deficit. He says that there are far too many LD children in special programs in the state, so that the number of those who should not be in there will be automatically determined. Appropriations will be reduced by that number; the children will return to regular education because they do not need special services anyway. That is a pragmatic way of solving a problem; if I were a legislator, I would say, "Now, that is not a bad idea, because we are really short of funds." But is that going to be the best solution for the youngsters? When we look at these issues, we need to say, "Yes, we should have more collaboration." We must use more generic resources. We cannot continue duplicating here and there the same sort of services because we must have the money to pay for them; therefore we must cooperate. How are we going to get together? That is the issue.

One point made by Ken Wyatt is that we are only talking to ourselves. We are all special educators around this table. How many persons from regular education are hearing us? We are saying what they should do and what they are going to do. But there has been no offer to check the

feasibility of these ideas with them. We must do more of this. California is reorganizing our teacher certification. Every 10 years we reorganize the credentials; we propose all sorts of new ideas and pass new legislation. One thing in the new proposal is very interesting. It says that an individual could get a type of preliminary credential after 4 years. To obtain a permanent credential, the person must teach 2 years in a regular classroom and take so many units during this time to improve his or her direct teaching skills. Then the teacher can specialize and work with special education students. I am not sure that is the best way to do it. But there has not been much collaboration in the discussion of this basic issue with regular educators. This illustrates the point that unless we are able to dialogue, none of our proposals will succeed simply because the last thing we want is for any of these children to fall through the cracks or to be left out.

In terms of our special education programs, we have perpetrated unnecessary separation many times. We have been on one side, regular educators on the other side, and we have not communicated with one another. An antagonistic attitude permeates the air. At present, there is no such acceptance from the general education field to take on the responsibilities of children who need special help. It is imperative to work on a positive attitude.

Steve Lilly: I would like to make several points, not in response, but taking first things first. I do not consider what has happened here this morning to be anything but wholesome, constructive, and growth-producing. The discussion is a very positive occurrence. The day that we as special educators consider the kind of self-analysis of this morning as something negative, then it will be a different field than the one you and I know.

I relate to these ideas with affection and concern, not only for the children whom we serve but also for my colleagues in special education. Anyone who read my paper and thought that I was saying that our motives were bad has misinterpreted what I intended. What I said was that some of our outcomes are less than what we would expect or should accept. I tried to say very sincerely that our motives were good but we have to monitor outcomes that have resulted from our interventions and programs. Something misfired somewhere. In pursuing some of our values and some of our goals, we have reached an outcome that is not what we want; we need to attempt to rectify the situation.

I am seriously concerned about the extent to which we often question motives of other people like regular educators and deans. The deans are not interested in special education because they see money there. That is not what I hear from them. The people whom I talk to as members of the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the Illinois Education Association are not interested in special education only because they see

a base of power that they would like to take over. I deal with people who, by and large, are seriously considering what is best for children, what is best for teachers whom we are preparing. Does that mean that they all are? No, but let's not be naive and say that all special educators have the purest of motives either. The range of focus is as wide and as varied in regular education as it is in special education.

I am not saying that we do not need to differentiate instruction in our education system. Neither am I saying that we have the territorial imperative that has led us to seek out children, although we can all name individual cases in which that has happened. That has not been our motive for developing special education services. I agree with Ken's point that we are dealing with a long history of isolation and discrimination against people with handicaps. My point was that over the past 80 years we have added new groups of people to the group that we call handicapped and have broadened significantly the number of people whom we are willing to consider under that umbrella. I do not view that as producing negative outcomes with the children. Neither do I see it always producing identifiable, significantly positive outcomes with the children.

Some special education programs and some special education systems are outstanding. Some are not very good. Regular education has some programs that are outstanding, and others that are not very good. We cannot any longer carry the notion that the faults lie outside of us and that we do not have the same kind of variable quality in what we do as all others in education. Contending that we have no bad motives, but other people do, will lead us nowhere. We cannot continue that kind of thinking if we hope to be part of the education community.

I want to respond to one comment regarding the fact that 52% of all children are in some kind of separate program. Does that mean there is something wrong with regular education? Yes, it probably does. But that is not all that it means. Children in cooperative programs are there also because of the availability of those programs. If we have the resources to serve 50% of the school population outside regular classrooms for part of the school day, I promise that we will. If we have the resources to serve only 2%, that is what we will serve. We must look not only at the regular education system and how it produces but also at the special education system and how it produces.

Much of what I said this morning was intended to stimulate us to look at both sides of that record, not just one. I consider my mission accomplished. Thank you.