DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 722 SP 024 188

AUTHOR Reed, Patricia L., Ed.
TITLE Mainstreaming in Secondary Schools: A Shared Professional Responsibility. OATE-OACTE Monograph Series No. 7.
INSTITUTION Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.; Ohio Association of Teacher Educators.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE 83
GRANT G008301687
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Cooperative Planning; Counselor Role; Disabilities; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Individualized Instruction; *Mainstreaming; Program Implementation; *School Responsibility; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Students; Secondary School Teachers; *Special Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Schools have fostered a strong tradition of separatism in services, personnel, and settings between regular and special education. This tradition of separatism cannot easily or quickly be displaced, nor can one of shared professional responsibility be easily established. This volume contains papers dealing with the problem of building such a tradition. In "Teaching the Handicapped in Secondary Schools: An Historical Perspective," Thomas M. Stephens and Vikki F. Howard discuss the tradition of separatism in the schools and societal attitudes toward the handicapped. Specific ways in which secondary schools can move toward a tradition of shared responsibility are considered. Patricia L. Reed, in "Preparing Regular Secondary Personnel to Help Make Mainstreaming Work," proposes that shared responsibility can be promoted through the use of a congruent set of special education concepts and practices in the preparation of secondary school teachers, administrators, and supervisors. The role of counselors in building the new tradition is examined by Mary Ann Stibbe, Loviah Aldinger, and Reemt R. Baumann in "The Role of Counselors in Implementing P.L. 94-142." In "The Irony of Modern School Reform," Joseph Watras suggests that the new tradition may only reinforce a more dangerous type of separatism unless sufficient thought is given to what makes up good education. (JD)

MAINSTREAMING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A SHARED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

OATE-OACTE MONOGRAPH SERIES NO. 7

2

MAINSTREAMING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A SHARED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

OATE-OACTE
Monograph Series Number 7
Fall 1983

Editor	Patricia Reed Bowling Green State University
Editorial Advisory Board	Jerry Hopfengardner University of Dayton Sally Wertheim John Carroll University
Cover Design	Isabel Hansen Bowling Green State University
Production and Design	Barbara Suderman Instructional Media Center Bowling Green State University

MAINSTREAMING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A SHARED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Editor

Patricia L. Reed

Production and dissemination of this issue of the OATE-OACTE Monograph was, in part, supported by Grant No. G008301687 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Education. However, the points of view expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

Bowling Green, Ohio
1983

MAINSTREAMING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A SHARED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Editor's Comments

Prior to passage of the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, instruction of handicapped students was commonly considered to be the responsibility of special educators. However, P.L. 94-142 clearly placed expectations relative to educating the handicapped upon all educators.

Needless to say, many "regular" educators are still reluctant to share this responsibility. Likewise, many special educators are finding it difficult to understand the parameters of their responsibility under this new rubric of expectations.

None of this is surprising. For, in attempting to meet the educational needs of school-age youth, schools have over the last forty years fostered a strong tradition of separatism in services, personnel, and settings between regular and special education. Emphasis has been placed upon creating environments which provide alternatives to regular settings rather than recreating regular settings which accommodate for a broader range of individual differences. This tradition of separatism cannot easily or quickly be displaced and one of shared professional responsibility established. Nonetheless, that is the challenge involved in providing education in the least restrictive environment.

This issue of the OATE-OACTE Monograph deals with the problem of building such a tradition. Stephens and Howard show how the tradition of separatism in the schools has its roots in societal attitudes toward the handicapped but is now weakening as society demonstrates more acceptance of differences. Secondary schools, however, still maintain strong separatist tendencies. Specific ways in which secondary schools can move toward a tradition of shared responsibility are discussed.

Next, Reed proposes that a tradition of shared professional responsibility can be promoted through transmitting a congruent set of concepts and practices relating to education of the handicapped in programs for the preparation of secondary teachers, administrators, and supervisors. The role of counselors in building the new tradition is then examined by Stibbe, Aldinger, and Baumann.

Finally, the issue closes with a provocative thesis. Watras suggests that the new tradition may only reinforce a more dangerous type of separatism than presently exists unless sufficient thought is given to what comprises good education.

Building a tradition of shared responsibility will not be accomplished quickly or easily. Only when educators recognize that the education of all children is shaped by the actions of all educators will the necessity for building this tradition be understood. Only then will there be a possibility of affording equality of educational opportunity to all the children of all the people.

OATE·OACTE

Monograph Series Number 7
Fall 1983

MAINSTREAMING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A SHARED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

CONTENTS

Teaching the Handicapped in Secondary Schools: An Historical Perspective

Thomas M. Stephens and Vikki F. Howard

Throughout the struggle for free and appropriate education, the handicapped were often rejected or segregated because, in order to meet their needs, the educational system required radical changes. However, as society became more accepting of differences, school programs for the handicapped were developed within public school settings. Today regular secondary teachers have important tasks to perform as members of the mainstreaming team in providing a new freedom for many handicapped students.

As the two older special educators spoke, the younger person listened and tried to interpret into her belief system what was being said. She thought, *they are saying that mainstreaming isn't working. Perhaps, the old way of special classes, special schools and special programs was better. Why do they believe it is failing? But, can they ignore how society has changed, how people are more accepting of human variations, of exceptionalities? Why not give the new way a chance before condeming it, before rejecting?*

The listener and the speakers, while only years apart in ages, were an eon apart in beliefs. For in only a few years, our society has attained a more compassionate and accepting view of those who are called *handicapped*. How did we arrive at this point? And how can secondary teachers adapt to the needs of mainstreamed students? These are the questions addressed in this paper.

ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION[1]

A revolution occurred in Britian during the mid 1700's and eventually spread to the rest of the civilized world. The Industrial Revolution was fueled by machines and mechanical sources of power. With the rise of laissez-faire capitalism in the late 18th and 19th centuries freedom was believed to be critical for a successful industrial economy.

Laissez-faire capitalism was based upon the mistaken assumption that with freedom came equality and that the major barrier to freedom was governmental intrusion. Thus, it was assumed, by eliminating legal restrictions on activities of people and industry, freedom would result. It did for some, but for others, freedom without equality led to economic and social servitude.

Unbridled economic freedom during the Industrial Revolution destroyed the relative equality of artisans and peasants, shaping a society of rich and poor — haves and have

[1]Portions of this section are adopted from: Stephens, Thomas M. Education of exceptional children in perspective. *Theory Into Practice*, 1982, *21*, 71-76.

nots. The haves continued to press for freedoms, particularly those leading to more economic gains, while the have nots were left with freedom but not equality.

In the United States, economic freedom expanded the distance between the rich and the poor, requiring labor groups and child advocates to press for child labor laws, compulsory school attendance, and other means for assuring equality. By the early 20th century, all states had adopted compulsory school attendance laws. But free public education for one class of children — the handicapped — would not be realized fully until 1975.

Throughout the struggle for free and appropriate education, the handicapped were often arbitrarily rejected or segregated, not because their educational needs could not be met, but because in order to meet their needs, the educational system required radical changes. In other instances, ignorance about the nature of handicapping conditions served to suggest that many of these students were not educable.

Social Darwinism also contributed to the lack of attention to the handicapped. Its proponents argued that natural selection should act freely on the human species and that government should do nothing to save the poor, weak, and helpless (Leahey, 1980)

Of course, the principles of Social Darwinism had great appeal in our laissez-faire capitalistic society (Hofstadter, 1955). The eugenics movement, growing out of Social Darwinism influenced education and social practices. Francis Galton, a prominent 19th century biologist, argued that evolution should not be left solely to natural selection, suggesting that heredity was the most important factor for both economic and educational success (Pickens, 1968).

Some authorities advocated castration of institutionalized people (Wool and Stephens, 1978). With selective breeding of humans for improving the species widely accepted; states passed laws allowing judges to order sterilization of people who supposedly possessed heritable antisocial traits (Haller, 1963). From the 1920's to about 1970, more than 70 thousand people across our country were sterlized for the "good of society".

Today, environmentalists and hereditarians still debate the nature-nurture issue with extreme positions often held by both sides. Many tend to ignore the well-established fact that seeking a one-to-one correspondence between genetic and cultural traits is fruitless and that equality of opportunity adds to the genetic potential of the human species (Dobzhansky, 1962).

Educational History. Special education in the United States started with deaf, blind, crippled, and mentally retarded children. Jack W. Birch, an early advocate of mainstreaming, describes that earlier era.

Birch (Stephens, 1979) noted that handicapped children were aggregated into institutions. Specialists were assigned to provide training in basic academic skills, work experiences, and self care preparation. Just prior and during World War I, public day schools for the handicapped were started in the United States. Schools for the mentally retarded existed in Chicago in 1900 and for "contumacious aggressors" in Hartford, Connecticut in 1871. This group probably constituted what is presently referred to as learning disabled and children with social and emotional problems.

At that time, children with social and emotional problems and those who were mildly mentally retarded were considered overly aggressive and troublemakers. Birch (Stephens, 1979) described the situation of the early 1900's in these terms:

> They had a high nuisance value and...(they) didn't seem to get along very well in terms of school learning...They had been left to run around in the streets...So the school system had to do something about bringing them together. I know that in 1915, some classes for retarded children were started in my home city of Pittsburgh, and they had been started

somewhat earlier than that in some other public schools, probably around the turn of the century...Some people became interested in the children themselves during that time, concerned people who believed that these different bothersome or disruptive children had a right to an education and could become very useful and desirable citizens. These were youngsters who, for one reason or another, were either being left out of school or being separated off from school in special settings. Most people felt that they were some breed apart. It was hard to get professional people to think positively about such youngsters, much less state legislators. But by the 1920's, there was a change of heart in America. It was, at that time, that the Council for Exceptional Children was started. By the mid 1930's most states had special education legislation (pp. 1 and 21).

History of Mainstreaming. Separating children on the basis of handicapping condition is an idea that has been with us for a long time. The first "separate" school for the handicapped was established in 1859 in Germany (Wallin, 1924). Germany had a system of separate schools where normal, slow, and moderately and severely handicapped were each contained within separate school structures. In America, the first separate public school for the handicapped was created in 1896 in Providence, R.I.

With the development of Binet's intelligence scale in the late 19th century, educators began to look at individual differences as a means of separating students for differential instruction (Wallin, 1924). The theory of differential instruction is based on two assumptions: 1) individual differences exist among children's abilities and, 2) because of these differences, specialized instruction is required. Special needs of "defective" children, it was believed, could not be met in a normal classroom. For example, in 1916, Young wrote, "The Board of Education do (sic) not care for special classes to be held at existing schools, where there is a possibility of defective children mixing with the normal ones." (p. 96)

In the 40's and 50's, separate classrooms or facilities were the major form of delivery of education to handicapped children (Stephens, Blackhurst, & Magliocca, 1982). But even then, Loewy (1951) noted that normalization should be a goal in educating retarded learners. Weber, in 1962 described integration as the existence of special classrooms within the public school structure, where handicapped children would have an opportunity to benefit from the available resources.

Beginning in the 1950's, a great deal of research was conducted to determine the relative effects of separate and integrated classrooms on handicapped children (Stephens, Blackhurst, & Magliocca, 1982). As a result of this research, many scholars concluded that the benefit of special classrooms for mildly handicapped children was, at best, questionable. With the help of legislation, parent advocacy, and litigation, mainstreaming has been accelerated since these efficacy studies.

Legislative History. Public Law 94 142 and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act culminated this century's drive for educational equality. These acts grew from deep historical roots extending back to the first World War. During that era, governmental harrassment of pacifists and conscientious objectors resulted in imprisonment and, in some instances, deportation. In an effort to counter such actions Roger Baldwin, a unique American, invented what was to become the single most important civil rights organization. He founded the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

Along with other groups, the ACLU won numerous court decisions in favor of citizen's rights. One of these was significant for the future of public education — *Brown v. the Board of Education*. This landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision struck down,

equal but separate racially segregated schools in 1954, requiring states and school districts to desegregate public schools.

As a result of the Brown decision, legislation for other minority groups, such as the handicapped, was accelerated. Thus, basic liberty — a free and appropriate education for all children grew out of the many early actions of the ACLU and its founder Roger Baldwin. A pattern of federal appropriations for funding began with the passage of the Cooperative Research Act in 1954 (a response to the Soviet's *Sputnik*). However, it was not until 1965 that Federal support for the handicapped became established, when Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Also in 1965, P.L. 89-313 passed amending Title I of ESEA and establishing grants to states for providing free education to the handicapped. ESEA was again amended in 1966, 1967 1968, and 1969 to increase the scope of services for programs for the handicapped which were supported through Federal funds (LaVor, 1976).

In 1973, Congress passed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 93-112). Section 504 of that Act prohibits any agency that receives Federal funds from discriminating against persons on the basis of mental or physical disabilities. (Martin, 1976)

ESEA was again amended in 1974 when the Federal Congress passed P.L. 93-380. This new amendment was remarkable in its provision for due process rights for handicapped children and their families, and the first legislative assurance of education for handicapped children in the least restrictive environment. In addition, P.L. 93-380 required each state to develop a plan for educational services for all handicapped children.

P.L. 94-142 was a refinement of previous legislative acts. Termed *The Education for All Handicapped Childrens' Act*, it is notable because of the financial commitment made by Congress with an indefinite timeline, evidence that Congress intended for the mandates to be permanent.

Mainstreaming is an outcome of the phrase "least restrictive environment." As stated in both P.L. 93-380 and 94-142, "handicapped students should be educated to the maximum extent possible with nonhandicapped students." However, even with legislation, achieving least restrictive environments for handicapped children has been frustrated. Extensive litigation has occurred in an attempt to interpret Congress' intent. But the outcome of such court cases has failed to provide educators and parents with a definite solution to the required "appropriate placement."

Norris v. Massachusetts Board of Education and *Colin K. v. Schmidt* were two court cases involving mainstreaming. As a result of the litigation, three severe learning disabled students were sent to private schools after deciding in both cases that the regular classrooms were to restrictive.

In another case, *Springdale School District #50 of Washington County v. Grace*, a decision was made in favor of mainstreaming. The parents of a deaf child successfully challenged the school district's decision to place Sherry Grace in a residential school. In a similar case, *Harrell v. Wilson County Schools* (1982), the parents of a hearing impaired child wanted placement of their son in a private school. Again, the court ruled in favor of placement in the regular classroom with support services for the student.

Ohio's Regulations. Ohio's rules are in compliance with the regulations of 94-142, providing for a continuum of services to meet the mandate for "least restrictive environment." School services range from regular classrooms placement to home instruction.

The State of Ohio's rules require educational personnel to consider mainstreaming in view of potentially harmful effects on the child and the quality of education that will be provided. Each placement is reviewed and determined annually, with the decision verified on the student's individualized education program (IEP). When a handicapped

student is placed in a regular classroom, the regular classroom teacher is required to provide that student with modified instruction similar to that provided to a nonhandicapped student.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL MAINSTREAMING

> For, with all of his troubles, he was a very pleasant, honest, open child. Had the school and state together taken any proper thought or care for his well-being, I am convinced that he would not today be caught up on the trap of fear and sickness but that he would be able to share, no matter with how many reservations, in the blessings that are taken for granted by most children. (Kozol, 1967, p. 122)

Jonathan Kozol, in *Death At An Early Age*, was describing Stephen, a black fourth grader, who had been placed in various foster homes and who was, from Kozol's description of his behavior, probably emotionally disturbed. Without proper support services, a regular class placement for Stephen seemed inappropriate. Certainly, by high school, his continued placement in regular classes without special services would be problematic.

Academic casualties among handicapped students are common at the high school levels when there are inadequate special education services, or where the elementary schools provide poor early identification services. By contrast, when a continuum of special education services is available through the early school years, handicapped students in high schools with supplementary services are more likely to be successful learners.

A continuum of services is represented by a range of placement and special instruction. These provisions are administratively developed. At the secondary school levels, the placement options for mildly handicapped students should consist of regular classes with some provisions for special services — such as tutoring, resource room instructions, and work/school opportunities.

Placement of handicapped students in regular classes should take into consideration students' performances in that subject. As a rule, we recommend that their daily achievement should be at least average in the mainstreamed subject. In addition, placement should be considered in light of the students' educational goals. Brandis and Halliwell (1980) found that many mainstreamed students had study hall assignments. Such schedules for handicapped students are inconsistent with their educational goals. They should not be placed in college preparatory programs where independent study habits are required. Instead, their study time should be in conjunction with resource room instruction or in other supportive instructional arrangements.

Regular class teachers and special teachers should have frequent communications about mainstreamed students' daily progress. In this way, they can anticipate learning difficulties and provide needed assistance rather than waiting until students are mired in learning problems.

Teachers' Attitudes. Teaching is a mixture of scientific knowledge and human understanding. Sometimes, those teachers who care about students develop jaded attitudes from their overcaring. As a result, their attitudes become negative. In a 1979 study (Stephens & Braun), 865 regular classroom teachers were asked about integrating handicapped students into classes. Sixty-two per cent of the primary grade teachers, 66 per cent of intermediate grade teachers, and 51 per cent of junior high teachers indicated that they would help integrate handicapped students into their classes. Their favorable attitudes were related to five factors: Self confidence in teaching the handicapped; their belief that such students are capable of becoming

useful members of society; their beliefs that public schools should educate the handicapped; their present grade level of teaching; and the number of special education courses they had taken.

In another study of 32 primary grade teachers in New Zealand (Smart, Wilton and Keeling, 1980), half of them were willing to maintain handicapped children in their classes because they *believed* they could teach low-ability children.

Published studies have not addressed senior high school teachers' attitudes towards the handicapped. It is likely that less than 50 per cent would report favorable attitudes about mainstreaming handicapped students for several reasons. First, high school teachers tend to be oriented toward content subjects. Second, grading practices take on significant value at that level. Third, as students learn, their range of individual performance within groups become greater, creating significant instructional problems. For example, a range of 12 or more years is often found among 15 or 16 year olds. That variance is less likely to be found among younger children.

Problems of individual differences cannot be dismissed lightly. While teachers may recognize significant differences within their classes, they are often uncertain as to how to address these differences. School administrators must recognize this problem of individualizing instruction at secondary grade levels through their allocation of funds recognizing that differentiated programs are costly. Supportive instructional services for teachers and students are always necessary for effective mainstreaming programs.

Social Adjustment Needs. Supplementary services to mainstreamed high school school students generally focus on helping students meet academic criteria with less effort on preparing students for the social environment in regular classes (Lipson & Alden, 1983). Because mainstreamed students are often unable to cope within the social context of the regular class, they may end up back in the self-contained classroom, despite academic competence.

Lipson and Alden suggest a two facet approach. First, the regular classroom teacher should receive information regarding the behavioral characteristics of the incoming student. A second component requires the resource room teacher to take the responsibility for social and behavioral instruction before mainstreaming occurs.

Others have also suggested techniques which may help the mainstreamed student adjust socially. Brandis and Halliwell (1980) recommend greater emphasis on extracurricular activities such as clubs and sports. A "buddy system" pairing mainstreamed students with more competent students, has been used effectively by Scott (1977). Scott also established behavioral contracts between students and classroom teachers. He recommends that the mainstreamed secondary student be placed in a regular homeroom so that the student can develop a sense of belonging.

The regular classroom teacher is central to the success of mainstreaming. Wheeler and Finley (1980) suggest that the resource room teacher make a "match" between the mainstreamed student and the regular education teacher before the student is placed. Once the student is installed in the regular classroom, however, it is up to the teacher to make adjustments. The teacher can start by giving the new student responsibilities similar to other students (Scott, 1977). But care must be exercised so that the mainstreamed student not be set up for failure and humilitation. For example, activities such as word games or chalkboard exercises are likely to spell failure for the new student.

Other Suggestions. Swanson (1981) also provides some ideas for classroom teachers. These include high interest-low reading level texts, providing directions both aurally and written, audio visual supplements, individual pacing, minimal written work, and extra credit for promptness. Riegel (1983) suggests: study guides; take home exams; presentations in small groups, as opposed to class presentations; extra practice; extended due dates; and grading on individual progress and effort, rather than grading on a fixed norm. Of course, each of these suggestions must be matched

to the individual mainstreamed student's needs, always providing the least restrictive opportunities.

In their book, Stephens, Blackhurst and Magliocca (1982) suggest that mainstreaming teachers can be most effective if they have a knowledge of the history and philosophy of mainstreaming. The background should include an understanding of least restrictive environment, Federal legislation, role of parents, a working definition of mainstreaming and its research base, and finally, the legal rights of mainstreamed students.

Resource room teachers have a huge investment in the success of mainstreamed students. As already mentioned, they must prepare students to meet minimal academic and behavioral standards. Additionally, the resource teacher must work cooperatively with the classroom teacher to assure a receptive environment for the new student (Lipson & Alden, 1983; Riegel, 1983; Scott, 1977; and Wheeler and Finley, 1980). Wheeler and Finley (1980) suggest that the special education teacher provide all necessary information (e.g. evaluations, IEP) prior to placement, familiarize the classroom teacher with the resources available, and initiate communications on an individual basis. Scott (1977) further recommends that resource teachers provide backup services for the student — the two teachers must share the responsibility.

The mainstreaming process must include the parents of the student to be integrated (Stephens, Blackhurst & Magliocca, 1982). Parental participation must occur, not simply in the legally required planning process of IEP development, but also in the implementation phase. Scott (1977) used a unique approach to facilitate parental involvement. Initially, a school representative made a home visit to discuss the process with the parents. Later, community cluster meetings were held in a designated parent's home. Community meetings provided a medium for parent training in order to facilitate the mainstreaming process at home. Finally, parents were encouraged to attend school activities, to attend individual conferences with either or both teachers, and to observe their children in classrooms.

SUMMARY

In secondary schools, regular class teachers have important tasks to perform as members of the mainstreaming team. Their dedication to principles of equal opportunity for all people coupled with specific cooperative activities can help provide a new freedom for many handicapped students. The education and economic history of the United States contributed to the movement towards equal educational opportunities for handicapped people. As our society became more accepting of differences, school programs for the handicapped were developed within public school settings.

Recent legislation and judicial decisions brought mainstreaming efforts to their present status. Now, secondary teachers have opportunities to fulfill long sought goals of special educators. In order to be successful, cooperation from both special and regular classroom teachers along with parents and administrators, is essential.

REFERENCES

Brandis, Margaret & Hathwell, Richard (1982). *Verification of procedures to serve handicapped students. Final Report: Secondary Component.* (Report No. BBB18510 Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education (ED). (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 201115).

Colin K. v. Schmidt, 536. F. Supp. 1375, D. C. R. I., 1982.

Dobzhansky, T. *Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Haller, M. *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1963.

Harrell v. Wilson Co. Schools, 293. S. E. 2d. 686, N.C. App. 1982.

Hofstadter, R. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Kozol, J. *Death At An Early Age*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

LaVor, Martin. Federal legislation for exceptional persons: A history. In Weintraub, F. J., Abeson, A., Ballard, J., and LaVor, M. L. (Eds.) *Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children*. Reston, Va.: CEC, 1976.

Leahey, T. H. *A History of Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Lipson, Alice & Alden, Lee. Mainstreaming: Unwanted side effects. *Academic Therapy*, 1983, *18*, 267-274.

Loewy, Herta. *More About The Backward Child*. N. Y., N. Y.: Philosophical Library, 1951.

Martin, Edwin. Integration of the handicapped child into regular schools. *Minnesota Education*, 1976, *2*, 5-14.

Norris v. Massachusetts Board of Education, 529 F. Supp. 759. D.C., Mass., 1981.

Pickens, D. *Eugenics and the Progressives*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968.

Riegel, P. Hunt. Mainstreaming equals cooperative plan. *Academic Therapy*. 1983, *18*, 285-299.

Scott, Walter H. (1977) *Development and Implementation of A Plan for Mainstreaming Retarded Educable Students Into Regular Classrooms in the Comprehensive High School: Introductory Practicum*, (ERIC) Document No. ED 157216).

Smart, R., Wilton, K., & Keeling, B. Teacher factors and special class placement. *Journal of Special Education*, 1980, *14*, 217-229.

Springdale School District v. Grace, Civ. No. 80-5017, W. D. Ark., July 23, 1980.

Stephens, T. M. An interview with Jack Birch. *The Directive Teacher*, 1979, *2*, 1, 26.

Stephens, T. M. Education of exceptional children in perspective. *Theory Into Practice*, 1982, *21*, 71-76.

Stephens, T. M. Blackhurst, A. E., and Magliocca, L. A. *Teaching mainstreamed students*. New York: John Wiley, 1982.

Stephens, T. M. & Braun, B. L. Measures of teacher attitudes towards handicapped children. *Exceptional Children*, 1980, *46*, 292-294.

Swanson, Libby F. Handicapped students in my classroom. *Momentum*, 1981, 212, 25-26.

Wallin, J. E. Wallace. *Education of Handicapped Children*. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924.

Weber, Elmer W. *Educable and Trainable Mentally Retarded Children*. Springfield, Mass.: Charles C. Thomas, 1962.

Wheeler, Linda & Finley, Mary Jane (1980). *Hearing resource program*, (Report No. 33:10.79/80:003) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Ed/National Institute of Health (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199948)

Wool, D. I. and Stephens, T. M. Twenty-five years of caring for and treating "feeble-minded" persons in the United States: A review of the literature from 1974 to 1900. *Journal of Special Education*, 1978, *12*, 219-229.

Young, Meredith. *The Mentally Defective Child*. London, England: M. K. Lewis & Co., Ltd, 1916, p. 96.

Thomas M. Stephens is Chair and Professor in the Department of Human Services Education at The Ohio State University.

Vikki F. Howard is a Research Associate in the Department of Human Services Education at The Ohio State University.

Preparing Regular Secondary Personnel To Help Make Mainstreaming Work

Patricia L. Reed

Contextual characteristics of secondary schools typically make them less supportive than elementary schools of the inclusion of handicapped students in regular classes. One major impediment continues to be the unwillingness and inability of regular educators to work with students whose characteristics and behavior deviate from generalized norms. Attempts to alleviate this problem through improving personnel preparation have as yet resulted in minimal changes in the training of regular secondary teachers and even less in the preparation of secondary administrators and supervisors. Collaborative efforts on the part of teacher educators to bring about concurrent modifications in the preparation of all secondary personnel are essential to mediate certain of the conditions that prevent mainstreaming from working at the secondary level.

Nearly a decade has passed since the U.S. Congress through enactment of Public Law 94-142 clearly and firmly established a preference for regular classroom placement of handicapped children. Throughout that decade there were repeated attempts by various constituencies to revoke or substantially modify the national posture of educational integration of the handicapped. However, the federal statutory language remains in tact and the U.S. Department of Education has indicated it will not pursue any further revisions of the regulations (*Administration now plans to retain special education rules, Will says*, 1983). By law, handicapped children have the right to full educational opportunity through a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment.

Inclusion of handicapped students in regular classrooms on a part- or full-time basis is by no means a new concept in education (Birch, 1974). However, since passage of the federal legislation more and more schools across the nation are demonstrating that such integration can be accomplished so that both the handicapped and their peers benefit academically and socially. In many schools, the inclusion of handicapped children within the mainstream of public education is *not*, as its critics decry, an unrealistic demand beyond the power of schools to meet. In these schools, integration of the handicapped has *not* further eroded the quality of schooling. As one writer observed, it is meaningless to continue asking the question, Does mainstreaming work? It is time to concentrate upon the conditions that prevent mainstreaming from working and how they can be overcome (Bogdan, 1983).

THE CONDITIONS

One of the major impediments to the integration of handicapped students within regular classrooms continues to be the unwillingness and/or inability of many regular teachers to work with students whose characteristics or behavior deviate from generalized norms. Typically this problem is more evident in secondary than

elementary schools (Corder, 1981; Jones et. al., 1981). In secondary schools particularly, traditional concepts of staff roles and responsibilities, organizational patterns, curricular structure, and differences of goal emphasis pose major barriers to the implementation of effective mainstreaming practices. At the secondary level interventions designed to address individual needs decrease significantly in comparison to lower levels. Students are more firmly locked into predetermined ability groups as they progress through successive levels of schooling. And at higher levels there is a steady decline in the use of teacher praise and support for learning, use of corrective guidance, range and variety of pedagogical techniques, and participation by students in determining the daily conduct of their education (Goodlad, 1984).

Compounding these contextual characteristics are current issues of school funding, teacher salaries, declining enrollments, reductions in program and staff, and general public dissatisfaction with the quality of schooling in general.

Secondary schools are thus complex ecosystems which adapt yet maintain strong regularities. That major restructuring may be necessary to change many of the conditions which now characterize schooling has thus been argued and supported with a substantial body of evidence (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; National Commission on Excellence, 1983; Sizer, 1984). But there is also evidence to indicate that some of the conditions that prevent mainstreaming from working in many secondary schools can be mediated without waiting for widespread educational reform.

A considerable body of research shows a predictive relationship between the behavior of school personnel and students' educational progress (Soar and Soar, 1983; Walberg and Waxman, 1983). Admittedly, a less substantial research base points to a similar relationship between the preparation of school personnel and their subsequent professional practices. However, the absence of definitive evidence to the contrary makes it inappropriate to absolve those engaged in preparing school practitioners of all responsibility for the conditions that prevent mainstreaming from working. Rather, there is reason to continue to believe that changes in the preparation of school personnel can mediate certain of these conditions.

MEDIATING THE CONDITIONS NATIONALLY

Improving the Preparation of Regular Educators. That translation of the national policy of including handicapped children in the mainstream of public education would require attention to the preparation of school personnel was an assumption made early on by framers of the federal legislation. To provide incentives for colleges and universities to address this concern, a substantial amount of federal dollars were made available to support personnel preparation programs. Although funding policies initially were aimed almost entirely toward increasing the quantity and quality of special educators, passage of P.L. 94-142 led to the inclusion of regular education in funding initiatives.

States also used funding incentives to facilitate improvement in the preparation of regular educators. Most adopted standards requiring training for working with handicapped as a condition of certification in regular teaching fields and/or mandated that colleges and universities give attention to such concerns to maintain approval to prepare teachers.

Professional organizations concerned with school personnel preparation attempted to stimulate thinking and action which would result in curricular modifications within teacher education institutions. In 1978 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education urged schools, colleges, and departments of education to adopt new perspectives toward education of the handicapped (AACTE, 1978). Two years later ACCTE supported the publication of a second paper which identified ten

common competency clusters considered essential to the preparation of regular teachers for working with the handicapped (Reynolds, et. al., 1980). That same year the *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education* were modified to include the requirement that "professional education programs...prepare all school personnel to contribute to the education of exceptional learners (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1980, p. 15).

Secondary Personnel Preparation. Following passage of Public Law 94-142, both governmental agencies and professional organizations used their authority and influence to effect changes in the preparation of all regular educators. However, in resultant policies and practices, much more emphasis was placed upon the training of elementary than secondary teachers. Preparation programs for administrative and supervisory personnel were relatively unaffected.

For example, most of the Deans' Grants Projects funded under regular education grants awarded by the U.S. Department of Education emphasized concerns relating to teaching handicapped elementary-age students (National Support Systems Project, 1980; 1981; 1982). As of 1982 only fourteen states specified courses/competencies in exceptionally/mainstreaming as a requirement for secondary teacher certification (Weible and Dumas, 1982). A study of a random sample of individuals who began teaching in Virginia in the 1979-1981 school years indicated that a higher proportion of elementary teachers reported attention to topics relating to teaching the handicapped in their preservice program than did secondary teachers (Blair, 1983). Even research relating to mainstreaming typically focused upon populations of elementary pupils, programs, and/or teachers (See, for example, Corman and Gottlieb, 1979).

Modifications relating to programs of preparation for secondary administrators and supervisors were even less evident. Although guidelines for federal grants encouraged "the infusion of special education content into traditional undergraduate or graduate curricula" (U.S.D.E., 1981, p. 23), projects typically focused upon undergraduate programs, i.e., teacher preparation (NSSP, 1980; 1981; 1982). Revisions in state certification requirements almost without exception applied to instructional personnel. The revised NCATE *Standards* omitted any reference to the need for attention to education of exceptional learners in requirements for advanced programs (NCATE, 1980).

Delivery of services to handicapped children and youth as specified in federal regulations clearly calls for broad-based involvement and shared decision-making among school personnel as well as parents and students (when appropriate). Findings of researchers who have examined the training of administrative and supervisory personnel indicate that improved preparation in these fields is crucial to attainment of quality education for the handicapped. For example, Herda concluded that if placement in a regular class is to be the best available alternative for certain handicapped children, school administrators' and supervisors' training must be given serious attention (1980). Crisi's comprehensive review of research relating to competencies necessary for successfully mainstreaming handicapped students led to a similar conclusion (1980). To assume that it is possible to mediate certain of the contextual conditions that inhibit effective mainstreaming by modifying the preparation of those seeking to become teachers without concurrently modifying the preparation of those seeking to become administrators and supervisors thus appears to be a serious fallacy.

Essential Knowledge and Practices. As governmental agencies, professional organizations, and colleges and universities concerned themselves with the problem of preparing regular school personnel who could facilitate appropriate inclusion of handicapped children in regular classes, no common answer emerged to a most

fundamental question. What concepts, beliefs and preferred behaviors are essential to preparing regular educators for their roles and associated responsibilities in educating the handicapped? In fact, it appears that in many instances the question was not addressed. Rather, another concern seemed uppermost. What changes will meet requirements of the federal mandate?

As mentioned previously, guidelines established for federal grants pointed to the need for "infusion of special education content" into both undergraduate and graduate curricula. However, these guidelines gave no clue as to the specific nature of that content or of the knowledge or competencies to be acquired. Analysis of expectations inherent in Public Law 94-142 did lead some teacher educators to propose that ten "competency clusters" serve as the basis for redesigning all teacher education curricula (Reynolds, et. al., 1980). Resultantly, program developers in some institutions used or adapted this model in selecting and organizing content and activities to be included in the preservice training of regular teachers. Likewise, some states followed a similar approach in formulating requirements for teacher certification. For example, in 1980 the Pennsylvania Department of Education mandated that all persons applying for teaching and instructional certificates in any area of education (including counselors and supervisors) demonstrate ten generic competencies dealing with education of the handicapped (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1980).

In general, however, it was more common for programs and/or state requirements to indicate broad topics to be addressed through professional education coursework (e.g., P.L. 94-142, characteristics of handicapped children, due process, etc.) than to identify any body of professional knowledge or set of capabilities considered essential to promoting effective school practices in educating handicapped children in regular settings.

Progress and Limitations. Efforts to translate the national policy of educational inclusion of the handicapped into effective educational practice have demonstrated that personnel preparation is regarded as a key variable in mediating the conditions that inhibit mainstreaming. Furthermore, the preparation of regular educators has been recognized as being crucial to successful mainstreaming.

Nonetheless, during the past decade limited progress has been made in modifying the preparation of regular secondary school personnel and even less in the preparation of administrators and supervisors. Also lacking is any commonly held understanding as to the body of knowledge, beliefs, and preferred behaviors which, when transmitted to regular secondary personnel, will foster development of the conditions necessary to make mainstreaming work.

MEDIATING THE CONDITIONS IN OHIO

Improving the Preparation of Regular Educators. In Ohio, as across the nation, preparation of school personnel is considered instrumental to effecting appropriate integration of handicapped and nonhandicapped students within the schools.

That regular educators are instrumental to providing least restrictive environments for handicapped students in Ohio schools is evident from needs identified in the 1981-1983 revisions of Ohio's Comprehensive System for Personnel Development. These included:

- Developing and maintaining cooperative teaching between regular and special teachers;
- Strategies for general education and resource teachers in working together;

- Identification of characteristics of handicapped children for regular teachers (Ohio Department of Education, 1981).

That developing regular educators' will and skill to make mainstreaming work continues to be a major priority in Ohio is clearly indicated from the 1984 "Initiatives in Special Education" formulated through broad-based input by educators and parents throughout the state. These initiatives are directed toward five goals, one of which is to "improve the effectiveness of regular education personnel who are serving handicapped children by providing systematic educational opportunities at the pre- and inservice levels." They specify educational needs of principals and supervisors as well as regular teachers. Additionally they call for the need to "coordinate with preservice institutions the provision of effective educational opportunities based upon demonstrated competency need" and to "foster the development of a common language among educators" (New, 1983).

In Ohio, development of programs and curricula relating to education of the handicapped is a cooperative function of teacher training institutions and the Ohio Division of Special Education (Ohio Department of Education, 1981). In 1977, a Deans' Task Force for Personnel Preparation for the Handicapped was established to facilitate planning between the State and colleges and universities. This Task Force immediately began to address the need for modifications in personnel preparation called for by federal and state legislation. Among other activities, the Task Force encouraged and assisted teacher education institutions in modifying their program for regular educators by providing funds to support faculty and curriculum development. Projects carried out with these funds, like those supported by federal agencies, tended to focus upon the preparation of elementary teachers with less attention given to the training of secondary teachers and relatively none given to the preparation of administrative or supervisory personnel.

Additionally, the Ohio Department of Education, in cooperation with the Deans' Task Force, developed guidelines to be used in determining if teacher education institutions are in compliance with the mandates of P.L. 94-142 and Chapter 3323 of the Ohio Revised Code. Determination of each institution's compliance was made part of the on-site evaluation conducted once during each five-year period. These guidelines require that programs for preservice teachers provide opportunity for students to:

- Become aware of school and community resource and service delivery systems;
- Know characteristics of students with handicaps and the needs of those students in the least restrictive environments;
- Know how to participate in educational assessments, how to specify goals and objectives, and how to use education support services; and
- Know the process of consultation with parents at each step of the identification, evaluation, placement in an appropriate setting, and educational planning (Lasley and Levstik, 1980).

Other than the requirement that the teacher education curriculum reflect human relations concerns related to "working effectively with students regardless of...exceptionally not requiring a full-time specialized environment," *Ohio Standards for Approving Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers* made no mention of preparation for working with the handicapped (Ohio Department of Education, 1975).

However, to maintain their eligibility for supplemental funds provided by the State to assist teacher education, Ohio teacher education institutions were expected to have on file with the Department descriptions of how their teacher education programs address education of the handicapped.

Unlike many states, Ohio standards for certification in regular teaching or supervisory fields have not been revised to include any specific requirement pertaining to education of handicapped students. Nor do the newly adopted requirements for administrative certification contain any such references.

No funding incentives have been provided to encourage revisions in administrative/supervisory programs; no guidelines exist for determining if institution's programs in these areas address concerns relating to education of the handicapped; and State standards for approving advanced programs (administrative, supervisory, and pupil personnel) include no stipulation regarding such matters.

Results of a recent study of "Efforts Within Ohio's Teacher Preparation Institutions to Incorporate P.L. 94-142 Provisions Within Pre-Service Programs" did verify that substantial curricular revisions had been made in preparing regular teachers for working with handicapped students. However, the report cited several deficiencies relating to the types of opportunities provided students:

- A sizable number of colleges (15-20%) did not teach regular teacher education students about community resources and services for the handicapped;
- There tended to be a lack of formal arrangements to insure that teacher education students would encounter handicapped students in their field experiences;
- Overall, regular teacher education students tended to be informed about IEPs but there was little experience in writing IEPs or preparing them in cooperation with other staff members;
- Typical college delivery systems of lecture and discussion, and assessment through testing, were predominant in preparing teacher education students for instructing exceptional children (Rogus, et. al., 1982).

Furthermore, of twenty institutions reviewed during the first two years of the current five-year cycle of evaluations of teacher education institutions, one-fourth did not satisfactorily meet the guidelines relating to preparing preservice teachers (Heintschel, 1983).

No comparable evaluations of programs for administrators and supervisors are available.

Secondary Personnel Preparation. That many regular secondary personnel in Ohio yet lack the will and skill to make mainstreaming work is indicated by results of a recent survey of Ohio secondary school administrators. Of fifty-three respondents (representing 23 high schools, 26 junior high and middle schools, and 4 joint vocational schools), 51% considered their faculty unable to meet the needs of handicapped students in their buildings. Furthermore, 30% viewed their staffs as opposed to mainstreaming students; that same percent attributed this opposition to staff being "unqualified" to work with handicapped students (Chambers, 1983). Unfortunately this study was not designed to elicit data regarding administrators' will and skill to make mainstreaming work. However, if a significant proportion of secondary school faculty are opposed or unable to meet handicapped students' needs,

it follows that administrators also may not have the commitment or capabilities necessary to mediate certain of the organizational, scheduling, human relations, and curricular problems which contribute to faculty's opposition and lack of ability to work with handicapped students.

Since findings from the "Effects" study and the on-site evaluations are not program-specific, they do not indicate to what extent deficiencies exist in secondary as compared to other teacher preparation fields. However, many Ohio teacher educators seem to recognize that their programs do not yet adequately prepare regular secondary school personnel to share responsibility for educating the handicapped. A recent survey of needs and practices in twenty institutions preparing secondary personnel indicated that heads of teacher education and/or their designates generally viewed their own secondary programs as "marginal" in preparing graduates to contribute to the education of handicapped students. On a nine-point scale (1-3 The program is deficient...; 4-6 The program is marginal...; 7-9 The program is effective...); respondents' mean scores were 5.8 for secondary teacher education programs and 5.2 for administrative/supervisory programs. Rankings ranged from 3 to 8 for teacher preparation and from 2 to 7 for administrative/supervisory programs (Reed, 1983).

In terms of needs relating to the improvement of secondary personnel preparation, responses for secondary teacher preparation differed significantly from those for administrator and supervisory preparation. (See Table 1.)

As was expected, high-level needs for advanced programs reflected types of concerns which typically precede program modification while those identified for teacher preparation are more representative of needs that gain in importance once the commitment to change is made and specific revisions are being formulated (Reed, 1983).

Defining Essential Knowledge and Practices. In Ohio, as across the nation there has been no common answer to the question, What concepts, beliefs and preferred behaviors are essential to preparing regular educators for their roles and responsibilities in educating the handicapped?

State guidelines pertaining to compliance with P.L. 94-142 delineate four types of opportunities which must be provided in teacher training. They do not require that institutions state specific program objectives or that graduates demonstrate a specified body of knowledge or set of competencies relating to education of the handicapped. Nor do certification standards give attention to this concern. Thus institutions have considerable latitude with respect to the selection and organization of curricular content within teacher education programs and even more within advanced programs.

Program formats on file in the Division of Teacher Education and Certification office provide little information regarding desired program outcomes or the nature of course content and activities relating to education of the handicapped. They do indicate that a large majority of institutions integrate attention to education of the handicapped within a sequence of regular education coursework required in the secondary teacher training program. Two institutions reported using special education coursework only. Ten reported requiring special education courses but also infusing attention to the handicapped in other coursework. The remainder used integration of content in regular education coursework exclusively.

Types of courses most frequently listed as including objectives and content relating to the handicapped were introductory seminars and field experiences; educational psychology or human growth and development; social and philosophical foundations or education, and methods or curriculum. Less frequently mentioned were reading courses and only infrequently assessment/evaluation courses or student teaching.

That course integration is the most common curricular approach used in Ohio's teacher education programs was verified by the "Effects" study. Findings of this study indicated that approximately 30% of the colleges used a direct structures format (i.e.,

had separate courses specifically dealing with the handicapped and their instruction) and the remainder used indirect structure (i.e., courses that contained specific subcomponents focused on instruction of the handicapped) (Rogus, et. al., 1983).

TABLE 1

Needs Relating to Improving the Effectiveness of Secondary Personnel Programs in Preparing Graduates to Contribute to Education of Handicapped Students

Need	Rank[a] Programs for Teachers[b]	Programs for Supervisors[c]	Programs for Principals[c]
Administrative support/ leadership	10	8	7
Collaboration between regular and special education faculty	7	5	5.5
Curricular design presently used	6	7	5.5
Delineation of the knowledge based relating to education of handicapped secondary students	1	3	8
Departmental, school/college priorities	8	2	2
Faculty attitude	4.5	1	1
Faculty knowledge/skill	2	4	4
Field/practicum experience	4.5	9	9
Requirements for certification	9	6	3
Resources (computer programs, modules, video tapes, etc.) to support program implementation	3	10	10

[a]Highest need = 1
[b]Based on responses from twenty institutions preparing secondary teachers
[c]Based on responses from eight institutions preparing secondary supervisors and administrators

No descriptions of how programs for administrators and supervisors address concerns relating to inclusion of the handicapped in regular settings are filed in the Division office. Nor did the "Effects" study examine these programs. However, results of the study of institutional needs and practices in secondary preparation cited earlier indicated that programs for administrators and supervisors also re upon the course integration approach. Of the institutions sampled, not one reported requiring a special education course in the preparation of administrators or regular secondary supervisors (Reed, 1983).

When course infusion is used as a curricular model, omissions or insufficient attention to certain concepts or capabilities often results. For example, the study of Virginia regular elementary and secondary teachers indicated that those who had completed courses in special education reported the inclusion of certain topics relating to education of the handicapped more often than those who had completed only regular education courses which contained particular subcomponents relating to education of the handicapped. However, this study also revealed that certain topics tended to be emphasized and others less emphasized regardless of curricular design. Topics more frequently included were the rationale for mainstreaming, characteristics of handicapped learners, Public Law 94-142, and IEPs. Those less frequently reported as being included were developing learning activities for the handicapped, selecting instructional materials, identification procedures, and working with parents (Blair, 1983). Results of the evaluation of Ohio's teacher education programs points to similar types of omissions (Rogus, et. al., 1982). Findings of both studies suggest a lack of clear delineation of desired overall program outcomes.

Without identification of the essential knowledge or competency to be furthered by coursework, selection and sequencing of course objectives, content, and activities becomes more random than systematic. Omissions or inadequate emphasis upon certain content such as that described above thus may characterize program effects. Lack of delineation of any agreed upon set of concepts, beliefs, and preferred behaviors considered fundamental to preparing secondary personnel for their roles in educating handicapping students makes it even more difficult to obtain consistent effects in the performance of those individuals in school settings.

Again, it appears that this problem is recognized by persons responsible for preparing secondary teachers. As can be noted in Table 1, the need given highest priority in secondary teacher preparation was "delineation of the knowledge base relating to education of handicapped students." This need was ranked lower, however, for supervisor preparation and significantly lower for administrator preparation. Again, these differences suggest that programs for supervisors and administrators have as yet been less affected by concerns relating to educational integration of the handicapped.

Progress and Limitations. As is the case nationally, Ohio's efforts to prepare regular educators to mediate the conditions that prevent mainstreaming from working have brought about substantial revisions in teacher preparation curricula. However, there is considerable evidence to indicate that programs for preparing secondary teachers do not yet adequately promote graduates' will and skill to make mainstreaming work. Furthermore, there has been very minimal attention to this concern in preparing secondary administrators and supervisors. And, as at the national level, there is a lack of consensus with respect to essential program outcomes relating to education of the handicapped.

SUMMARY

The problems of providing handicapped students an appropriate education in the

least restrictive environment are even more complex at the secondary than at the elementary level. In both settings, however, regular educators may inhibit the effective inclusion of handicapped students in regular settings if they lack either the will or skill to make mainstreaming work.

Over the decade since adoption of *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act*, considerable progress has been made in preparing regular teachers to share responsibility for education of the handicapped. However, less progress has been made in secondary teacher preparation and very little attention has been directed toward the preparation of secondary administrators and supervisors. Additionally, there has been insufficient attention to identifying any common body of knowledge or preferred behaviors which are deemed essential to prepare secondary personnel to act collectively in promoting progress of handicapped students. Such is both the state of the nation and the state of the State.

If personnel preparation is to be a significant variable in mediating the conditions which prevent mainstreaming from working in secondary schools, those responsible for programs of preparation for teachers, administrators, and supervisors must work collaboratively to:

(1) Identify the essential and congruent professional concepts and practices relating to education of handicapped secondary students which are deemed instrumental to promoting regular educators' collective will and skill to make mainstreaming work; and

(2) Plan and carry out strategies to effect concurrent revisions in the preparation of regular secondary teachers, administrators and supervisors to assure transmission of these essential and congruent and practices

Consider the implications for the State of Ohio alone. For the 1983-86 years the annual productivity of teachers certificated in grades 7-12 is estimated to be 1,509 (Ohio Department of Education, 1982). In 1982 the State issued or renewed 1,427 high school principal and 870 standard secondary supervisor certificates (Lasley, 1983).

What if professional coursework required for issuing or renewing these certificates truly fostered the will and skill of 3,826 secondary educators to make mainstreaming work? Would that make a difference?

REFERENCES

Administration now plans to retain special education rules, Will says. *Education Week*, November 9, 1983, 12.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Beyond the Mandate: The Professional Imperative*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1978.

Birch, J. W. *Mainstreaming Educable Retarded Children in Regular Classes*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Blair, C. W. Classroom teachers' perceptions of preservice education related to teaching the handicapped. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34, 2, 52-54.

Bogdan, R. 'Does mainstreaming work?' is a silly question. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64, 6, 427-428.

Boyer, E. R. *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Chambers, F. Beyond the mandate: Mainstreaming in secondary schools. *Mainstreaming in Secondary Schools: Focus on Research*. OATE/OACTE Monograph Series No. 6, 1983, 15-23.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Education. *Guidelines for the preparation of teachers in compliance with U.S. Public Law 94-142 requiring the education of students with handicaps in the least restrictive environment.* Harrisburg, Pa.: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1980.

Corman L. and Gottlieb, J. Mainstreaming mentally retarded children: A review of research. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), *International Review of Research in Mental Retardation* (Vol. 9). New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Crisi, P. E. *Problems and issues in developing competencies for mainstreaming*, 1980 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. SP 017 600).

Goodlad, J. I. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Heintschel, R., Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Ohio Department of Education. Telephone interview January 5, 1983.

Herda, E. A. Aspects of general education governance and P.L. 94-142 implementations. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 1980 *12*, 5.

Lasley, T. J., Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Ohio Department of Education. Telephone interview, January 14, 1983.

Lasley, T. J. and Levstik, L. S. *Procedures for approval of colleges/universities preparing teachers*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1980 Revised.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Stock No. 065-000-11011-2). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Eduction. *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1982.

National Support Systems Project. *Directory and Abstracts for Deans' Grant Projects 1979-80*. University of Minnesota: NSSP, 1980.

National Support Systems Project. *Directory and Abstracts for Deans' Grant Projects 1980-81*. University of Minnesota: NSSP, 1981.

National Support Systems Project. *Directory and Abstracts for Deans' Grant Projects 1981-82*. University of Minnesota: NSSP, 1982.

New, F. *Year of educational excellence for all: Initiatives in special education*. Working document, October, 1983.

Ohio Department of Education. *Amended program plan for fiscal years 1981-83*, Division of Special Education, February, 1981.

Ohio Department of Education. *Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1975.

Reed, P. L. *Status and needs of Ohio's secondary personnel preparation programs relating to implementation of P.L. 94-142* (U.S. Department of Education Project No. 029SH30012). Unpublished manuscript, Bowling Green State University, 1983.

Rogus, J., Torge, H., Jurs, S.G., and Wiersma, W. *Efforts within Ohio teacher preparation institutions to incorporate P.L. 94-142 provisions within preservice programs: Activities and learner effects*. Report presented to Ohio Deans' Task Force for Personnel Preparation for the Handicapped, April, 1983.

Sizer, T.R. *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School* Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Soar, R. J. and Soar, R. M. Context effects in the teaching learning process. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and ERIC Clearninghouse on Teacher Education, 1983, 65-75.

U.S. Department of Education. *Application for grants under handicapped personnel preparation programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S.D.E., 1981.

Walberg, H. J. and Waxman, H. C. *Teaching, learning and the management of instruction*. In D. Smith (Ed.) Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1983, 38-54.

Weible, T. and Dumas, W. Secondary teacher certification standards in fifty states. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1982, *32*, 22-23.

Patricia L. Reed is Professor in the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction at Bowling Green State University.

The Role of Counselors in Implementing P.L. 94-142

Mary Ann Stibbe, Loviah E. Aldinger and Reemt R. Baumann

Although P.L. 94-142 does not mandate a specific role for counselors, certain responsibilities of counselors may have implications relative to meeting the intent of that legislation. Therefore, the study reported here was carried out to determine the extent of Ohio counselor involvement in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to every school in Ohio that employed a counselor. According to an analysis of survey results (72% return rate), elementary school counselors were most involved and high school/vocational counselors were least involved in working with handicapped students, their parents, regular educators, and principals to facilitate mainstreaming and due process. Respondents identified three areas which would enhance a beginning counselor's ability to implement P.L. 94-142: an overview of special education, information about the law, and knowledge of handicapping conditions.

As a result of P.L. 94-142, many students who previously had been segregated because of their disability are now integrated into regular education environments (Schipper, 1981). The success of their instructional and social integration has depended in large measure on a combination of parental support, preparation of both handicapped and nonhandicapped students for adjustment to mainstreamed classrooms, the accommodative power of regular education, and organization of the instructional delivery system (Zigmond & Sansone, 1981). Despite the P.L. 94-142 mandate for an interdisciplinary approach to educational planning, instruction, and evaluation and for collaboration between parents and professionals in developing the handicapped student's educational plan, the interactions among professionals and parents, if they occur, are not always successful (Allen-Meares & Pugach, 1982; Schipper, 1981).

COUNSELORS AND P.L. 94-142

Although P.L. 94-142 does not mandate a specific role for counselors, some of the responsibilities which counselors could, and probably do, perform in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 are directly related to their normal responsibilities in the regular education environment. These include 1) assisting students and their parents with academic and vocational decisions, 2) consulting with students about social adjustment problems, and 3) communicating with parents, faculty, and administrators about students (Ohio Dept. of Educ., 1976, Ranbom, 1983).

Along with their usual duties, counselors, because of their specialized training, can also encourage collaboration among professionals and parents in the development of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). Because counselors are trained in group process, they can promote group effectiveness and group decision making, flexible communication patterns, cooperative problem solving, and the sharing of

responsibilities among those who are charged with IEP development (Wheaton & Vandergriff, 1978). They can train professionals to involve parents in the construction of the IEP and can train parents to participate (Goldstein et al., 1980). Finally, if serving as a permanent member of the IEP team, the counselor can advocate for the child in the social and emotional areas (Filer, 1981) and can encourage parent participation through directed questions and comments and through positive reinforcement (Polifka, 1981).

As a consequence of their training and of their concern for the social, emotional, and academic welfare of the students in their building, counselors could also be involved with aspects of due process as mandated by P.L. 94-142. In addition to recording counseling contacts with handicapped students, they might also explain diagnostic results to professionals and parents, evaluate IEP accomplishments, and maintain student records (Humes, 1982).

While counselor contributions to the implementation of P.L. 94-142 are potentially quite extensive and varied, the extent of their involvement has not been documented. Thus, a survey research study was carried out for the purpose of providing information about the kinds of responsibilities Ohio counselors have assumed in this area, the amount of their time spent on such duties, and the kinds of training that would enhance the ability of beginning counselors to implement P.L. 94-142. It was anticipated that results would be of assistance to counselor trainers when making decisions about both the preservice and inservice needs of counselors.

METHOD

The survey was designed to establish profiles of counselor involvement, if any, in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. It was believed that patterns of involvement might vary according to such variables as district type, school type, school size, and availability of a special education supervisor or case manager.

A questionnaire, "Counseling Responsibilities in Implementing P.L. 94-142," was mailed to every public school in Ohio which employed a counselor. In March, 1983, the first mailing of 1,573 questionnaires was sent to 720 high schools, 513 junior high/middle schools, 247 elementary schools, and 93 vocational/joint vocational schools. A second mailing of 523 questionnaires followed in April, 1983.

The final questionnaire was the result of a development process consisting of in-depth interviews and a pilot questionnaire. First, using the review of literature as a foundation for questioning, in-depth interviews were conducted with five counselors who were actively involved with the implementation of P.L. 94-142. The information obtained from the interviews was then used as the basis for the development of a pilot questionnaire. This questionnaire was sent to the counselors previously interviewed and five additional counselors. The counselors who participated in the pilot represented a variety of school and district types.

The final form of the questionnaire was divided into three major sections: demographic variables, present counselor roles and responsibilities in the implementation of P.L. 94-142, and a ranking of information and skills important to the implementation of P.L. 94-142.

Counselors were asked to describe themselves and their school district by answering questions related to:

1. Type of school district (i.e., central city; small city; suburban city or town; rural town or consolidated district.
2. Size of school district (i.e., K-12 ADM).

3. Level of primary counseling responsibility (i.e., high school (HS), junior high/middle school (JH/MS), elementary school (ES), vocational/joint vocational school (V/JVS), and high school and junior high/middle school (HS and JH/MS).

4. Availability of a special education supervisor or case manager for the school(s) they served.

5. Date of their counselor certification (i.e., before or after 1978).

6. Degree of responsibility in implementing P.L. 94-142 (i.e., none of their time, up to a fifth of their time, more than a fifth of their time).

The second section of the questionnaire was divided into six subsections. The first four subsections required counselors to respond to statements about their responsibilities in the following areas: 1) counseling parents of handicapped students, 2) working with regular education faculty to facilitate mainstreaming, 3) assisting building principals in the implementation of P.L. 94-142, and 4) helping handicapped students adjust to the mainstream. The remaining two subsections required counselors to respond to statements about 1) their contributions to the Multidisciplinary Team (placement and evaluation) and IEP meetings and 2) their role as a collaborator with Multidisciplinary team (MDT) members.

The third section listed eleven information and skill areas which could enhance a beginning counselor's ability to implement P.L. 94-142. Responding counselors were instructed to rank the eleven areas from "1", the most important; to "11", the least important.

RESULTS

Of the 1,573 questionnaires mailed to Ohio schools with counselors, 1,140 (72%) were returned. Those returned included questionnaires which had not been completed because of changes within the system or because of budget cutbacks which had eliminated counselor positions. Ultimately, the analysis was built on 1,135 surveys. The responses were transferred to IBM scan sheets and were analyzed by a descriptive Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer program. The 150 (13%) surveys from counselors who indicated that they had no responsibility in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 were eliminated from further analysis. Only the 985 (87%) surveys from counselors who did assist in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 were used to determine the profiles of involvement and the ranking of skill and information areas.

In establishing the profiles, the following criteria were set. If 34% or more of the counselors checked a particular function, that function was considered a counselor responsibility. If 33% or fewer of the counselors indicated that they performed a particular function, that counselor responsibility was considered not to be a part of the counselor repertoire.

Demographic Variables. Information about the characteristics of counselors and their schools was collected in order to determine whether or not different profiles of responsibilities and ratings could be distinguished at different levels of these variables. The analysis identified only one of these variables as important, level of responsibility (i.e, elementary, high school, junior high/middle school, vocational/joint vocational school, high school and junior high/middle school). Relationships between profiles of responsibilities and level of responsibility to three of the demographic variables (time spent, availability of special education supervisor or case manager, and date of

certification) may be of some interest and are, therefore, summarized briefly in this section. The number of respondents differ because not all counselors marked every variable.

Seven hundred thirty-five (82%) of the counselors spent 20% or less of their time and 159 (18%) spent more than 20% of their time in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. Notably, the large majority of HS counselors (86%) and V/JVS counselors (87%) spent, at most, only 20% of their time in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. In contrast, 54% of the ES counselors spent more than 20% of their time in the implementation of P.L. 94-142.

Of the 895 counselors who responded to this question, 813 (91%) did have special education supervisors or case managers available and 82 (9%) did not. Contrary to expectations, counselors with no special education supervisory personnel available to them did not generally assume more mainstreaming responsibilities or spend more time in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 than counselors who did.

Eight hundred forty-four (91%) counselors were certified in 1978 or before. Eighty-two (9%) of the respondents were certified after 1978.

As a group, counselors are involved in a wide range of activities associated with P.L. 94-142. However, their duties vary somewhat according to their level of responsibility.

Counselors assisted the parents of handicapped students in a variety of ways. They helped parents find educational assistance or placement for their children. They also provided information about adjustment to the mainstream, placement, and academic progress. However, ES counselors did not provide parents with career information; nor did V/JVS counselors discuss multifactored assessment information with parents.

Counselors indicated that they did assist regular education teachers in their adjustment to the demands of P.L. 94-142. They helped teachers modify the curriculum to accommodate the educational needs of handicapped students. They explained and discussed the multifactored assessments. They initiated and coordinated contacts between regular and special education teachers and shared counseling techniques that regular teachers could use with mainstreamed students. If appropriate, they facilitated communication between teachers of different schools when transfers and grade advances were made. In addition to these activities, ES counselors provided inservice education in the area of handicapping conditions and demonstrated classroom management techniques for regular teachers.

In assisting the building principal in the implementation of P.L. 94-142, counselors served as the administration representative at IEP meetings; spoke as the "designee" of the administration when meeting with parents of the handicapped, and verified appropriate placement when a student transferred or was promoted to another building. Only V/JVS counselors did not speak as the "designee" of the administration when meeting with a handicapped student or when meeting with regular education faculty concerning a handicapped student.

Responses by counselors in this section of the questionnaire revealed that as a group they provided academic counseling to handicapped students; and they held group counseling sessions which included both handicapped and nonhandicapped. Elementary school counselors also designed counseling sessions specifically for handicapped students. As might be expected, the ES counselors did not focus on career counseling, a responsibility peformed by HS and V/JVS counselors. As a reverse of this patten of involvement, ES counselors did provide information about handicapping conditions to the nonhandicapped peer group; and HS and V/JVS counselors did not.

Although all counselors attended both MDT and IEP meetings and all but V/JVS counselors encouraged parent contributions at the IEP meetings, only ES counselors and HS and JH/MS counselors chaired the MDT and IEP meetings. Interestingly, no

counselors of any school type acted as spokesperson for the parents at the MDT meeting.

For counselors in all school types, collaboration consisted of identifying and referring mildly handicapped students for evaluation and conferring with the school psychologist. It did not include the provision of group process training to team members.

Ranking of Information and Skills. In ranking the skills which would enhance a beginning counselor's ability to implement P.L. 94-142, practicing counselors identified the following (in descending order) as the most important: 1) an overview of special education, 2) information about P.L. 94-142, and 3) a knowledge of handicapping conditions. The skills which they identified as least important were 1) use of the computer to keep track of due process, 2) classroom management for specific learning problems, 3) career information for the handicapped, and 4) group process training to promote participation skills in placement and IEP decisions. Skills ranked in the middle (not in rank order) were 1) knowledge about the tests most frequently encountered in multifactored assessments, 2) techniques for working with the parents of the handicapped, 3) techniques for counseling handicapped students, and 4) consulting skills in working with professionals.

Although the rank order varied in some cases by school type, the counselors did agree across school type on the three most important and the four least important (classroom management and career information were almost identical in rankings) skills necessary to enhance a beginning counselor's ability to implement P.L. 94-142.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The high rate of return for the questionnaire suggests that the issue of P.L. 94-142 is important to Ohio counselors. In particular, the range of differences among counselors by school types is important. In most instances, a continuum of involvement, determined by the percentage of counselors responding positively, could be discerned. That continuum, ranging from heavy involvement to little involvement, generally followed this pattern; ES, HS and JH/MS, HS, V/JVS. The pattern was reversed only in the instances of providing career information to parents or handicapped students. That responding counselors also ranked an overview of special education, information about P.L. 94-142 and knowledge of handicapping conditions as areas important to a beginning counselor indicates a definite need for preservice, and perhaps inservice training. The inservice training is particularly vital because so many counselors were trained in or before 1978.

The results of this research study certainly provide support for the inclusion of content related to P.L. 94-142 in counselor preparation programs. The results also indicate a need for further research in several areas.

First, it would be interesting to find out whether the counselor duties selected for inclusion in the questionnaire for this study, while derived from the literature, are all actually relevant. For example, as the analysis showed, counselors did not speak for parents at MDT meetings nor provide group process training to IEP or multidisciplinary team members.

Second, since a vast majority of the elementary schools in Ohio (and perhaps in other states) do not have counselors, it would be important to find out which personnel in schools with no counselors are performing the functions listed on the questionnaire. Elementary school principals could be surveyed in order to determine whether the implementation of P.L. 94-142 is (or could be) facilitated by the presence of a school counselor.

Finally, since Ohio elementary school counselors were more involved than other

types of counselor in the various duties required for successful implementation of P.L. 94-142; future research might try to determine the factors which prevent counselors in secondary or vocational schools from performing these functions. In the case of the vocational schools, it may be that duties related to P.L. 94-142 have low priority because the numbers of mainstreamed students in these schools are low or because certain responsibilities in this area are handled in the home high school. In the case of secondary schools, it may be that counselors do not have the time to take on the additional duties associated with due process; or, because of a lack of familiarity with handicapping conditions and P.L. 94-142, they do not feel comfortable working with handicapped students and their parents.

Answers to these questions must be found to ensure that P.L. 94-142 is successfully implemented at the secondary, as well as the elementary level.

REFERENCES

Allen-Meares, P. & Pugach, M. Facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration on behalf of handicapped children and youth. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 5, 30-36, 1982.

Filer, P.D. Preparing for IEP conferences. *The School Counselor*, 29, 46-50, 1981.

Goldstein, S., Strickland, B., Turnbull, A.P., Curry, L. An observational analysis of the IEP conference. *Exceptional Children*, 46, 278-285, 1980.

Humes, C.W. Counselor role and responsibilities in special education hearings. *The School Counselor*, 30, 32-36, 1982.

Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing. *Guidance Services for Ohio Schools*, 1976.

Polifka, J.D. Compliance with Public Law 94-142 and consumer satisfaction. *Exceptional Children*, 48, 250-253, 1981.

Ranbom, S. School Counseling: New demands on a diverse profession. *Education Week*, 11-12, 14, March 23, 1983.

Schipper, W.V. An overview of special education personnel: development. In B.P. Turner (ed.), *Preparing regular educators for new responsibilities in educating handicapped children: A guide to implementation strategies for policy-makers*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED. 207 959.)

Schipper, W. & Wilson, W. IEP implementation: A problem or an opportunity. In B.B. Weiner (ed.) *Periscope: Views of the Individualized Education Program*. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Zigmond, N. & Sansone, J. What we know about mainstreaming from experience in P. Bates (ed.) *Mainstreaming: Our Current Knowledge Base*. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, 1981.

The research project reported here was developed with the support of grants from: The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Education (Grant No. G008000881) and the Ohio Education Deans' Task Force for Personnel Preparation for the Handicapped.

Mary Ann Stibbe is a Research Assistant in the Division of Curriculum and Instruction at The University of Toledo.

Loviah E. Aldinger is Assistant Professor in the Department of Secondary Education at The University of Toledo.

Reemt R. Baumann is Professor in the Department of Educational Research and Measurement at The University of Toledo.

The Irony of Modern School Reform

Joseph Watras

Although designed to rectify wrongs long-suffered by handicapped children, P.L. 94-142 may have also increased the mechanical and authoritarian nature of school life. Four factors are cited as contributing to this effect: the image of school life the law called forth; the emphasis the law placed on remedial instruction; the effort the law makes to open the curriculum to all interested parties; and the mind set the law reinforced among educators. It is this author's contention that these effects could have been avoided had those who supported and drafted the legislation thought deeply about what comprises good education.

In 1975, Gerald Ford signed into law, *The Education for all Handicapped Children Act*, Public Law 94-142. This is the first law that clearly defines an instructional planning process. It may be the strongest example of the federal government's intrusion into education. But the law is rarely discussed in this context. Such acceptance of federal control may illustrate how quickly we are drifting towards a centralized system of education. If this is the case, this law serves as an example to demonstrate that the drift towards George Orwell's *1984* is propelled by good reasons not bad ones.

P.L. 94-142 is a model whereby effects of reformers' zeal can be analyzed. The law is aimed at redressing wrongs that supporters say long existed. But the law not only increased the federal government's control of education, it also increased the authorization and mechanical nature of school life. This is ironic because the law was supposed to reduce the barriers handicapped people experienced and make schools responsive to the special needs of these children. These problems occurred because those who pushed for the legislation, as well as those who drafted it, had a limited set of objectives. Had they paused to think deeply about the nature of a good education, the reforms they enacted may have been more beneficial.

THE NATURE OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT

Some writers have called *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act* the culmination of a quiet revolution (Abeson & Zettel, 1977). They applied this name in recognition of the pressure which, they say, a minority of parents and special educators exerted to get the law. Other authors have noted that the model of educational planning underlying the law is the product of several legal decisions (Sarason & Doris, 1978). This model, they note, was made popular by a growing body of literature published by educators.

The reforms these parents and special educators wanted were simple and fair. They wanted to end excessive segregation of handicapped children. Special education classes, they said, were often rooms to which administrators sent children who caused problems. Parents contended that the children were never expected to leave this setting and never received adequate training. In place of this callous treatment, parents and special educators asked for considered identification and evaluation of handicapped children. In the past, one test, such as an I.Q. test, may have been all

that was necessary to qualify a child for a program. Unfortunately, the test may not have helped anyone understand why the child was not doing well in school. What was needed, said the parents and special educators, were multiple tests administered and evaluated by teams of professionals. Instead of isolation, the parents and educators wanted remedial education designed to reduce the child's handicap.

A part of this reform movement, which should have raised more controversy than it did, called for similar attention to those children that did not have obvious disabilities as for those who clearly suffered impairment. That is, ostensibly normal children who seem to have trouble in school might also be classified as handicapped. However, their conditions were described with vague terms such as dyslexia, minimal brain dysfunction or learning disability. These terms imply that the child in question has a brain disorder although there is no evidence that such is the case.

The rapid rise in popular use of these terms led some to conclude they were witnessing a fad. Critics argued that people seemed attracted to these words more strongly than was warranted by the success of the programs designed to cure these ills. Furthermore, the critics often asserted that complex language disguised simplistic answers to difficult problems (Schrag & Divoky, 1975).

Simplistic or not, the parents and special educators who pushed for Public Law 94-142 seemed to think it was better to do something to help these apparently normal children in an orderly rational way than it was to do nothing at all. This is the attitude that was cast into the law. (U.S. Congress, 1975).

THE NATURE OF THE ACT

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act requires that an individual education plan be formulated for each child identified as having an educationally handicapping condition. The law asks that, when a parent or teacher suspects a child may be suffering from a handicap that impairs his or her school progress, the school district send the child to qualified diagnosticians to help determine the cause of the child's problems. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that no one test will be the basis of a diagnosis or educational prescription. Though the law is interpreted somewhat differently in different states, in general the process goes as follows: Once the tests are completed, the teacher or special teacher, the parents, some school administrators such as school psychologist or curriculum supervisor or principal, sit down together and agree upon an educational plan for the child. The child may, in some cases, attend this meeting. This plan specifies the remedial work that the team believes the child needs to develop his abilities and, possibly, to catch up to his age mates. The plan states the yearly goals and short term objectives for the child in words that suggest how to measure achievement.

The law, then, spells out what process school people should follow to determine how to help handicapped children. It tried to institute fairness by asking that the meeting be conducted in language all participants understand. And it set up quasi-legal procedures for appeal if anyone attending the conference felt their ideas were not adequately represented in the final plan.

In some ways the strength of the law is that it avoids the thorny issue of what should be taught to children and how that should be taught. These decisions are to be made by the team for each individual child. The law does say that curriculum decisions are not to be made solely by the professionals. Parents are to have more direct control than they had through the election of school board members. Nonetheless, this apparent democratization of school decisions disguised a tendency of the law to make school life more authoritarian and mechancial.

THE NATURE OF THE ACT'S EFFECT

This authoritarian and mechanistic tendency becomes evident in the image the law calls forth. Some educators say the Act mandates mainstreaming of all handicapped children. This is a misconception. Rather the law asks that the child receive special instruction or remediation in such a way that he may return to normal classes as soon as possible. The image that such a plea calls to mind is therefore one of the school as a factory in which the child is removed from the normal progression of classes in the same way that a quality controller may remove a component from an assembly line in order to make some adjustments on it before the component proceeds down the conveyor belt.

The tendency towards authoritarian and mechanical instruction also comes out in the emphasis the law places on remediation. A danger of any program of remedial instruction is that the subject matter will appear to be something fixed and separate from the interests of the child. For example, remedial reading can easily devolve into a program of drill and instruction in which the child receives training in skills he has not mastered. But in such a setting, the child may come to see reading as something one does under direction or achieve certain prescribed ends. A program of remedial instruction could lead a child to read only to do those chores people do every day. It may not lead him to think things could be organized differently.

The tendency for authoritarian and mechanical instruction also comes out in the attempt of the law to allow all interested parties an equal voice in planning a program appropriate for the child. This means the educational program that comes from a placement team could be a patchwork of concerns rather than an integrated plan based on the child's interests. For example, the team may decide a child needs to learn to sound out initial consonants, to tie his shoes, to tell time more accurately, and to avoid violent confrontations. Though these are important skills to master, they are not the basis for the development of an independent yet human individual. Since they may be imposed on the child rather than allowed to arise out of the careful pursuit of a series of activities the child wants to pursue, the student may never learn why these activities are important. Consequently, the child may not develop what we call responsible independence.

The irony behind this method of planning is that while it appears to fit the needs of the individual, it may direct the child to learn those things the different team members think the child needs to fit into society. This can be a sort of tyranny of the majority. If the child is to learn to be self-reliant, he or she should learn to follow his interests to where they lead him or her. The trick is to remain cooperative and sensitive of other people's needs. This is no small task. The law sidesteps this dilemma. Unfortunately, by not addressing the problem, the law may make it harder for educators to distinguish between teaching a child to be submissive or teaching one to be cooperative.

A colleague of mine says the problems could be remedied by asking for a philosopher of education to be included as one of the team members. He feels that such a professional could ensure that whatever plan comes from the conference is integrated around the interests of the child. My friend thinks that this philosopher will take care the plan avoids excessive drill and repetition. He also believes that a philosopher of education will remind everyone to allow all the teachers to integrate the objectives around activities that interest the child. My colleague also says that a philosopher will show how many of the dilemmas can be avoided by focusing on generic abilities like problem solving rather than specific skills like number facts. My friend may be right. But I fear the problem is wider than who is included and who is left off the team.

The problem with the law is the orientation it encourages school people to take. It reinforces what I call the pathological mind-set. That is, the law asks us to look at what

is wrong and to try to cure it in the same way a physician may cure a disease. Such an outlook is dangerous for three reasons.

First, when applied to children, it seems to make one think that the cause of school failures is exclusively in the child. Such an outlook prevents teachers from thinking of ways to organize the curriculum around the child's interest. Instead, they seek ways to make the information accessible to the child. This represents a mechanical and authoritarian view of teaching.

Second, the pathological mind-set prevents a teacher from adopting a democratic perspective because it leads the teacher to focus on the weaknesses of the child. In order to construct a curriculum that is democratic, the teacher must focus on the strengths of the children. Children seem to have a natural desire to share things. Cooperation is the basic principle of any democratic order. If teachers try to build on that instinct, they can construct a harmonious community in their classrooms that the students may imitate later in life. The students may learn to cooperate because each will do as he or she wishes and thereby help the class achieve a common goal. At the same time, they will learn how academic subjects have practical derivations and applications. Classrooms that use extended projects combined with field trips and culminate in some series of events may follow this idea. However, when teachers look at school problems pathologically, they tend to focus on trying to rectify weaknesses they see the child as having. Such a focus encourages them to divide and separate the curriculum rather than integrate it.

The third reason the pathological mind-set is dangerous is that it prevents teachers from making needed institutional changes. In this regard, *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act* represents a missed opportunity. The fact that schools historically have not met the needs of these children could have been seen as a symptom of excessive separation and control in school life. Here was a chance for educators and parents to say how a good education could be formed around the activities that interest a child. Instead, the law furthered the tendency of schools to separate academic subjects from each other and from any practical application. The individual educational plans the placement team makes are used by special teachers to prepare the child for entrance into the regular progression of subjects. As a result, the law seems to extend the artifical division of academic performance that drains classrooms of vitality and interest.

It is here that our arguments come full circle. Social critics have long complained that modern life is alienating. By this they mean that people are separated from each other and their work. Few people today seem to be able to carry a process through to its conclusion as craftspeople or farmers once did. They work in offices or factories in which they have only a sketchy idea of the aim of the institution. They are responsible for one small part. They ignore the rest of the work. Consequently, they do not seem to understand, except in a rudimentary way, how people doing a variety of jobs help each other. Their jobs seem boring. They feel bereft of purpose. They yearn for directions. Social psychologists tell us that these are the conditions that breed prejudice and mass movements that culminate in totalitarianism. If it is true that fragmentation of work and social life breeds attitudes that cause prejudice and discrimination, the greatest irony of all may be that the Public Law 94-142 could increase the obstacles handicapped people face. They may happen if the law encourages school people to perpetuate those conditions of life that lead to prejudice.

THE CHALLENGE FOR THE FUTURE

Despite all this, we cannot call for the repeal of Public Law 94-142. It is popular. The Reagan administration recently announced that it wanted to change some aspects of

the law. This suggestion was met with such furor that the U.S. Department of Education withdrew the proposed amendments. Perhaps this is good. It means we cannot forget the needs of handicapped children. But let us use this sympathy for the good of all.

We should think more deeply about what education should be. If we approach schools trying to correct minor flaws, we will never have a good curriculum. We will be doing the same things we have always done in a quicker and easier fashion. The task of discovering what schools should do is not as complicated as it sounds. One step in this direction is simple and easy. We should go back to the writings of people who thought about the problems of democracy and a good life. These people include John Dewey, W.E.B. Dubois, and Martin Buber. These people can give us the insights necessary to face the intricasies of the problem.

Most important, if we read the books these people have left us, we need not worry about including the advice of a philosopher along with that of other experts on a placement team. We will be able to make decisions for ourselves. That is what the aim of a good education should be.

REFERENCES

Abeson, Alan & Zettel, Jeffrey. The end of the quiet revolution: Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975. *Exceptional Children*, 1977, 44, 115-127.

Sarason, Seymour & Doris, John. Mainstreaming: dilemmas, opposition and opportunities. In Reynolds, Maynard (ed.), *Future of Education for Exceptional Children*. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Schrag, Peter & Divoky, Diane. *The Myth of the Hyperactive Child*, New York: Random House, 1975.

U.S. Congress S6, 94th Congress. Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. 29 November, 1975, 89 STAT 773-796.

Joseph Watras is Associate Professor of Education in the Department of Teacher Education, School of Education, University of Dayton.