

820030 #Doc
copy

EVALUATION REPORT

An Evaluation of a Training Program Component
Entitled

Training Supervisors of Programs for the Severe and Profound

Department of Special Education
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, Minnesota

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Date of Report

9/29/80

Project Evaluator

Dr. Clifford Howe
Chairperson
Department of Special Education
University of Iowa

Evaluation
of
Training Supervisors of Programs for the Severe and Profound
(a Component of the St. Cloud State University Training Grant)

Project Purpose

This 3-year (1978-81) project focused on training and preparing leadership personnel to provide more effective leadership for programs for the severely handicapped. In-service training was provided to special education administrators currently practicing in the field, and a pre-service program was developed for special education administrative students in training. A summary of the project is included in Appendix A.

Time-frame covered by the Evaluation

This training component is now beginning its third year. This evaluation of the process and outcomes to date cover a 28 month period from June 1, 1978 through August 31, 1980. Additional project activities will be accomplished during the third year of the project. Those already scheduled are noted in this evaluation report.

Evaluation Design Overview

The evaluation design addressed formative, outcome, and product evaluation needs. Formative evaluation checkpoints were built in by structuring evaluator-project coordinator meetings at periodic intervals, and through the conduct of at least annual, formal on-site process evaluation meetings with all project staff. Outcome evaluation related primarily to the degree to which the project achieved its outcome oriented goals and did or did not develop the programs/products as specified, and relied on documentation provided by the project for evaluator review. Product evaluation, such as of the training modules developed by the project, was made through a combination of "expert" consultant reaction and rating, and through trainee and/or user reaction and evaluation.

Major Accomplishments to Date

Principal goals of the project as outlined in the original application are reviewed below as to what was accomplished:

Goal I: To improve the knowledge base and program planning competency of Minnesota's currently employed special education administrators in the area of programming for the severely/profoundly handicapped.

Activity 1: Four training modules were developed which focused on orientation and awareness.

Module A - The Severely and Profoundly Handicapped: History,
Definition and Characteristics

Module B - Major Trends and Issues

Module C - Overview of Model Program Characteristics

Module D - Current Public Education Programs and Services

These four modules were written and have been evaluated positively on several occasions by two experts in the field, Dr.'s Robert York and Nancy Dodd (see their letters in Appendix B). Several revisions of the material took place. In addition, these modules were used in a nine-day institute conducted during the Summer of 1980. Twenty-three participants from five states gave both the institute and the modules used very high ratings (see Appendix C for summary of ratings).

Staff members also made site visits to a number of programs for the severely handicapped to obtain input regarding needed competencies. Ten sites were visited in Minnesota and ten additional visits were made to programs throughout the nation. Many travel expenses for these site visits were funded from sources other than the project, but were stimulated by the needs of the project.

Goal I - Activity 2 - Current Director In-Service Training

This in-service goal was scheduled to be accomplished in four major phases. First, a one and one-half day multi-media curriculum sequence was developed and packaged. Second, a one and one-half day Pilot Training Institute for selected Minnesota directors of special education was scheduled and conducted. Third, three other training institutes for the remaining Minnesota directors were scheduled and conducted. Fourth, the training was to be made available to other states on a selected basis.

The first phase--developing the in-service training package--took place during the period December, 1979 - February, 1980. The training content was drawn from the more extensive pre-service training modules, and related primarily to creation of awareness of and perspective on issues and practices relating to contemporary organizational and program standards for programs for the severely handicapped. See Appendix D for a copy of the training agency for the Pilot Training Institute.

The second phase--development and conduct of a Pilot Training Institute--culminated on April 16 and 17, 1980 when the Pilot was conducted for Minnesota directors of special education from geographic Regions 5 and 7. Eleven of the thirteen directors in those regions, as well as the special education regional consultant for Regions 5 and 7 attended the institute.

An evaluation of the Pilot Institute was conducted to (1) rate the quality of the training, and (2) to provide feedback on curriculum organization, pace, content and other matters useful to revision of the training package before presentation to other Minnesota directors. See Appendix E for a summary of this evaluation.

Evaluation data indicated that participants thought the program organization, pacing, and content were well done. Also participants indicated that

the "problem" of providing quality services to the severely handicapped, and the need for more awareness on the part of practicing special education administrators was clear and very important. Other variables rated high were the facilities, the presentors and the length of the institute. A number of concrete suggestions were made which were incorporated into the training sequence for future director-level in-service training.

The third phase--scheduling and conduct of in-service training for the other Minnesota directors--will be accomplished through conduct of three Regional Training Institutes schedules for October through December, 1980. These institutes will be replicas of the Pilot Institute with modification as supported by Pilot Institute participants, and a similar evaluation form will be administered during the three remaining institutes.

The fourth phase--provision of training to special education administrators in other states--has not yet been delivered. The Project Management Team has scheduled the availability of this director-level in-service training to other states for the period January-May, 1981, and intends to offer the training program on a request basis to the neighboring states of North and South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. Plans are for requests from other non-contiguous states to be considered on a resources available basis for this same period of time.

Goals II and III - Pre-Service Program Development

In the proposals for the first and second year of this project two goals were stated which related to development of a pre-service training sequence for training supervisors of programs for the severely handicapped and for provision of orientation for persons training to be directors of special education. During the second year of the project, the Management Team collapsed these goals into one pre-service goal which addressed the need to develop the specialist program sequence.

Originally, Goal II proposed a development of a collateral field option, and Goal III development of a specialist degree option for training supervisors of programs for the severely handicapped. As the specialist degree program was developed, it became clear that the coursework designed for the specialist program would also serve as the core of the collateral field option, depending on how the individual student's program was developed, and what the student's training objective was.

This goal was designed for attainment through six phases. These phases were (1) conduct of a search for other U.S. college or university training programs which provided this special type of supervisor training; (2) conduct of site visits to programs located through phase one activities; (3) development of a coursework sequence and proposal for the specialist degree; (4) university sanction and publication of the new course offerings; (5) piloting the coursework and course content; and (6) offering the necessary coursework on a continuing basis.

The first phase--searching for other similar training programs--was conducted through searches utilizing the resources of the Office of Special Education, the Association for the Severely Handicapped, the Dissem/Action Project, contacts with numerous colleagues of project staff in other IHE training programs, requests for information voiced during conference presentations, and other means. No other supervisor training programs for supervisors of the severely handicapped were located.

Phase Two was not conducted, as there were no supervisory training programs located.

Phase Three and Four were completed and a coursework sequence leading to a specialist degree with emphasis on supervision of programs for the severely handicapped was developed, sanctioned, and published.

Phase Five was conducted through the conduct of two three-credit campus-based courses (Spring, 1980 and Fall, 1980), and through development and conduct of a six-credit nine-day National Summer Institute (June, 1980). See Appendix F for a copy of the summer institute program. Final evaluations were conducted of the Spring, 1980 course on supervision of the severely handicapped, and on the summer institute. The second supervision course is now in progress with nine students and will be evaluated end of Fall Quarter, 1980. A copy of the summer institute evaluation summary is in Appendix C. See Appendix G for a summary of the evaluation of the Spring, 1980 supervision course. Some 23 persons participated in the summer institute and eight in the pilot supervision course, and the evaluations provided by these participants are being used to modify coursework for the specialist sequence in terms of scope, sequence, content, pace, presentation, and related resources.

Phase Six--providing coursework for the specialist sequence on an on-going basis--is scheduled to begin in Spring Quarter, 1981 and to continue through 1981-82. Also scheduled for Summer, 1981 is another six credit National Summer Institute.

Goal IV - Project Management

Goal IV related to the utilization of appropriate management consideration as well as to the use of evaluation in conduct of the project.

For purposes of management of the project, an operational management team composed of the project coordinator and two associated faculty members was created. The management team was expected to meet often enough (an average of once a month) to keep "track" of project activities, to ensure fidelity to overall project direction, to reprogram activities as necessary, and to ensure a prospective approach to planning for future activities.

Analysis of formal "minutes" kept of Management Team meetings revealed that a total of four management team meetings were held during the period of September-December, 1978, fourteen during the twelve month period January-December, 1979, and ten during the 8 1/2 month period January-September 15, 1980. These meetings were fairly evenly distributed throughout the project months, and the minutes reflect a balance between overall planning, specific problem solving, attention to conduct of scheduled tasks, general communication and coordination, and evaluation considerations.

In terms of attention to evaluation considerations, an initial evaluation design was developed, the project coordinator and this evaluator met individually on evaluation matters a total of four times over the 28 months of the project, and this evaluator attended two on-site progress evaluation meetings of project staff, project consultants, and the department chairman.

Dissemination

Objectives for dissemination included information distribution by mail, oral presentations to significant groups, and publication of a journal article. Accomplishments included:

1. Presentations at major conventions
 - The Association for the Severely Handicapped (TASH) at their 1979 National Convention in Chicago
 - Region 8 of AAMD, Minneapolis, 1979
 - Minnesota CEC, 1980
 - Minnesota Developmental Disabilities, 1980
 - Minnesota Developmental Activity Centers State Convention, 1979
2. Presentations submitted or to be given in 1980-81
 - TASH National Conference, Los Angeles, October, 1980
 - CEC-CASE, April, 1980 (submitted)
 - Minnesota CEC, 1981 (submitted)

3. Miscellaneous presentations

- Faculty of the total Department of Special Education at St. Cloud State University
- Minnesota State Department Special Education Administrative Staff

4. Two invited manuscripts from the Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped. One is in press and will appear in the Winter, 1980 issues; the second is scheduled for the Spring, 1981 issue.

5. Mailing of project materials to other IHE's has been delayed and will, pending another three year cycle for the project, be accomplished during the 1981-82 year.

Reasons include delay in having the products in finished form for distribution to other states and IHE institutions with training programs for special education administrators. An offer to present to a sub-group of the Minnesota Administrators of Special Education State Organization has been made but has not been consummated.

Information about the nine-day summer institute held in 1980 was widely distributed to other states and universities. It was also included in the newsletters of NASDSE and TASH.

Unanticipated Outcomes and Additional Benefits of the Project

Several benefits have already accrued from the project which were not anticipated. First was the revision and improvement of the Ed.S. program for general special education administration as a spinoff of developing the Ed.S. program for supervisors of the severely handicapped. Second, it is faculty's impression that the general training program for teachers of the handicapped at St. Cloud has been improved as a result of the products developed from this project. (See Appendix H.) Many of the materials are

used in other classes in the Department of Special Education. A third benefit has been the accumulation of extensive survey data on the current state of the art nationwide in leadership training for supervisors of programs for the severely handicapped. These data point up the need for an organized approach to this neglected area.

Summary

Of the four major goals originally proposed for this project, all have been achieved or are likely to be attained during this third year of the project. It seems clear that there is currently no other organized training effort in the country concentrating on training personnel to supervise programs for the severely handicapped. This project has provided a pioneer effort. Judged from the various sources of evaluation data presented above, experts in the field as well as consumers from the summer institute give high marks to this project.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

- I. Title: Developing Leadership for Programs for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped
- II. Sponsors: St. Cloud State University, Special Education Department, and The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped,
(Division of Personnel Preparation, Dr. Paul Ackerman, Project Officer)
- III. Project Address: Special Education Department, Dr. Stanley Knox, Chairman
Education Building
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
(612) 255-2041
- IV. Project Staff: Dr. Richard Johnson, Project Director
Dr. James Lewis, Professor (Severe and Profound area)
Dr. Eve Gadberry, Asst. Professor (Severe and Profound area)
Mr. Mark Wolak, Research Assistant
Dr. Clifford Howe, Chairperson, Special Education Department,
University of Iowa (External Project Evaluator)
- V. Project Purpose: The purpose of this project is threefold. First, the project will develop and vend an in-service training package for current special education directors and administrators with the purpose of creating an expanded awareness of the multiple and complex needs of the sev/prof population, and of their educational program requirements.
- Secondly, the project will design and develop a graduate-level pre-service training program for training of Supervisors of educational programs for the sev/prof population, and will, through this training program and subsequent replications, begin to expand the available pool of specifically trained supervisors for programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped.
- Thirdly, the project will, given continued University and federal support, develop an outreach component for (a) vending the in-service training curriculum in other states in a planful way, and (b) provision of technical assistance to other college and/or University training programs which attempt to replicate a portion or all of the graduate-level pre-service training program.
- VI. Project Timeline: The project will develop and vend the administrator in-service package in one-three states, and will design, develop, and offer (on a pilot basis), the graduate-level pre-service supervisor training program during the period 9/78-7/81.
- The project will offer the pre-service graduate training program on an expanded basis, will provide administrator in-service to other states on request, and will provide outreach technical assistance to other colleges and universities during the period 1981-84.

APPENDIX B

CONSULTANT EVALUATIONS OF THE PROJECT

September 10, 1980

To Whom It May Concern:

It has been my pleasure to work with Richard Johnson, Eve Gadberry, and Jim Lewis for the last two years on their project entitled "Developing Leadership for Programs for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped." During this time I have participated in the research and evaluation of the project's in-service training modules, the audio-visual materials, and the pre-service training programs. In addition, I was present for part of the 1980 Summer Training Institute and assisted in a portion of the instruction. Thus, I am quite familiar with the project, its staff, and its overall effectiveness. This project is one that has provided an excellent return for the money invested, and, in my opinion, is superior in the following areas:

- 1) The written modules are well done and provide extensive and substantive information for the reader.
- 2) The audio-visual material is exceptional and should be disseminated widely for both content and attention-holding characteristics.
- 3) The training that has been provided in workshops, university courses, and the summer institute has been evaluated excellent by all participants. The progressive inclusion of administrators throughout the State of Minnesota in this training has been impressive and is beautifully planned.
- 4) The dissemination of information to other professionals and related groups has been active, consistent, and continues to expand.

I strongly support the effort to continue this project and have actively encouraged the staff to expand their efforts to states such as Illinois, where we sorely need such a training effort.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robert York

Evaluation from Nancy Dodd
September 12, 1980

On module content

"The content is well suited to the target audience of supervisors of severe/profound programs. It does an exemplary job of clarifying skills necessary for administrators implementing programs for this population."

On the project in general

"Public school severe/profound supervisors are being trained to consult with, provide information to, and general support for on-line staff. They are trained to evaluate services thru both child and total program assessment."

"The project has developed a solid base to expand to national presentations and to give indepth training to program supervisors. It would be valuable to extend and expand this project to other states to help meet the need in training both administrators and supervisors for the severe/profound school programs."

APPENDIX C

SUMMER SESSION NATIONAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE
SUMMER, 1980

INSTITUTE EVALUATION
S/P LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE
JUNE 18-27, 1980

NOTE TO PARTICIPANTS:

During this Institute you have participated in a daily process evaluation session, and these sessions have provided daily evaluation data. This evaluation form is designed to provide a format for you to register your overall opinion regarding the total Institute, and your continued cooperation is requested.

Please rate the following characteristics of the Institute from low to high by circling the appropriate number and, where appropriate, adding written comments (use reverse side if necessary):

1. Organization of the Institute:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
			(2)	(20)

2. Overall Quality of the Staff

a. Resident faculty:

1	2	3	4	5
Low			(4)	(18)
			4	High

b. Guest lecturers:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
		(2)	(13)	(7)

Comments:

3. Appropriateness of the Content:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
		(1)	(4)	(17)

4. Physical Facilities

a. Cavanagh School:

1	2	3	4	5
Low	(2)	(10)	(7)	(3)
	2	3	4	High

b. Sheraton:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
	(1)	(5)	(11)	(5)

Comments:

5. Responsiveness to Participant Needs:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
			(5)	(17)

6. Usefulness of Small Work Groups:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
		(1)	(6)	(15)

7. Usefulness of Process Evaluation Groups:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
			(7)	(15)

8. Quality of Institute Handouts/Materials:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
		(2)	(3)	(17)

9. Overall Quality of the Institute:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
			(1)	(21)

10. Degree to Which the Institute Met Your Expectations:

Comments:

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High
		(1)		(21)

11. Additional Comments/Suggestions:

POSITION:

Teacher, Supervisor, Grad Student, etc.

CIRCLE DAYS NOT ATTENDED:

Week I	Wed	Thur	Fri	Sat	
Week II	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thur	Fri

APPENDIX C
COMMENTS

1. Organization of the Institute:

- Excellent organization
- Very well organized
- One of the most organized institutes I have ever attended
- Not only was it well organized, but it had built in flexibility that meet the participants needs.
- All presentations should be accompanied by overhead
- Time lines got out of control towards the end
- Best I have been involved in
- The pre-institute organization could have been stronger-- relative to out-of-town participants being notified making arrangements
- Excellent--a real model for us as organizers
- Excellent--the most positive experience have had to date with a university planned course/institute!
- Very well organized
- I have attended numerous courses of study presented in institute format and never had such a positive experience with regards to organization
- Extremely well organized and yet very flexible to allow change
- Very well organized
- Very organized--in action, not just professed

2. Overall Quality of the Staff:

a. Resident faculty:

- Clear, concise, relevant information was presented by staff. Excellent use of multi-media.
- Very knowledgeable in their lectures
- All the faculty members are highly qualified, dedicated and sensitive to the needs of the participants
- Initially I was impatient in the beginning of the session with some of the more general information--however, I now feel there was a good balance of practical hand information and the more general background information.
- Was happy to see that university faculty members have not lost contact with good teaching strategies
- Well prepared, open to input and questions, interesting
- It's really hard to give only one mark when you're rating several people
- The total organization and relevance could not have been realized without the high quality of the faculty and lecturers.
- Excellent--enjoyed all staff presentations
- Compliment each other

b. Guest lecturers:

- At times tended to ramble
- All lecturers had information to present and presented it well
- York--not particularly informative
Lentz--more often
Fortschneider--made her point in 1st presentation, too many forms
Anderson--good
- Some information was repetitive by a few of the guests--but overall was helpful
- Nice variety

3. Appropriateness of the Content:

- Very relevant to my leadership position
- Very true to what was promised
- More time given to implementation change (how to use change models?)
- Very appropriate to my present position
- Right on!
- Excellent--for a wide range of educational administrative/supervisory personnel
- At last we are defining sev/prof accurately. How refreshing to have this population recognized.
- Maintained this through the process evaluation procedure.
- Excellent for a 1st try, introduce changes earlier
- The appropriateness was targeted through the willingness to modify the content and process after suggestions were made
- More direct application to what I do than any other class I've taken in the area
- Very relevant
- Some content seemed teacher task related more than suprv.

4. Physical Facilities:

a. Cavanagh School:

b. Sheraton:

- Clean, neat, attractive environments, comfortable chairs
- Move to a LRA school next or to another facility and visit more than one school
- Very convenient
- Could institute be housed on campus/on grounds of a recreational facility and trips organized to the location of the students. The contact/interaction with the students/staff was not crucial to each day.
- Heat, poor modeling set up

- The S/P population and approaches used were readily available, however, the appropriateness of the model (isolated) was lacking. Good for these staff members to have contact with the preferred model. It is always difficult to locate a non-school setting that will function well for such topics. I think the move away from formal large group participation improved the setting.
- Perhaps a resort or more relaxing type place with some access to kids by short car trip would be suitable
- Very warm this time of year
- Cavanagh was fairly comfortable in terms of seating, at times it was hot without the fans
- Not altogether necessary we be housed in this building as student contact was minimal. Could have been in a "model" elementary program in #287

5: Responsiveness to Participant Needs:

- Cold drinks and popcorn got us through heat and long hours
- Very good!
- Very flexible and responsive to our needs
- Maybe a little more on leadership "practice," technology of dealing with various situations
- Very appropriate to where I am at personally and professionally right now
- This is good modeling--you accepted us as decision makers
- Not only my own personal professional needs but awareness of ongoing needs of specific participants as the institute progressed
- Great number of workable ideas for my program
- Reinforcing and informative
- Thank you
- One of the highlights of the institute

6. Usefulness of Small Work Groups:

- Some of small group change statements were unclear and the topic was not helpful
- Very productive and contributing. Keeps the interest alive.
- Would have liked to change half way through
- Great opportunity to share information
- This was not only helpful from standpoint of opportunity to interact but good procedure from lecture model
- Very helpful; could have rearranged participants more frequently
- Excellent techniques
- The institute setting is intensive by nature. To be able to assimilate the material these small groups were necessary

- A lot of learning took place. Different ideas presented by people from various backgrounds and training
- Interesting and enjoyable
- Got to know other participants and hear about other worlds
- Mine told more war stories than constructive task requirements

7. Usefulness of Process Evaluation Groups:

- Liked this as it demonstrated the impact of our input
- Helped facilitate change
- Nice to have a vehicle for change
- To bring about CHANGE!
- Nice to feel included in planning; also good to see this strategy in use as we learn about it
- Opportunity to culminate and get data together
- Excellent idea
- An excellent method of getting the feedback
- Response to evaluation was positive

8. Quality of Institute Handouts/Materials:

- Very useful
- Excellent
- Just super
- Maybe now I'll have time to read them
- Useful and appropriate
- Not enough time yet to peruse them thoroughly; nice to have them
- Will really help when we return to the trenches
- Greatly appreciated
- I haven't had opportunity to read them all, however, perhaps sending them to people ahead of time would allow them to get a head start
- Will be reproducing many of these material for staff use
- All information was useful
- Some got handout heavy, but I generally like it

9. Overall Quality of the Institute:

- Excellent
- Excellent style and personalities of SCSU faculty aided to learning
- Great
- Do it again!
- Definitely high quality, useful, productive and meaningful

- Extremely well ordered and pertinent to needs as evaluated
- Just what I wanted
- Probably the most valuable nine days I have spent in any work or learning situation. The workshop met some basic needs, I have been struggling within my position
- Excellent

10. Degree to Which the Institute Met Your Expectations:

- The institute reenergized myself and helped to organize my perspective in the area of supervision of programs for the S/P.
- Highest
- A perfect "10"
- I need more with technical aspects of implementing change
- Helpful for diverse group of participants
- Only concern was that there were not more people from more geographical areas
- Well worth any change in plans and expenses
- Much more than I expected
- Most helpful
- More than met-exceeded!
- I didn't expect it would be this good

11. Additional Comments/Suggestions:

- Congratulations and thanks for a very good experience
- Very professional presentation. All preliminary planning was evident
- I hope that many supervisors will attend this institute in the future
- I have some concerns with the quality of the TIME presentation, particularly with the 287 staff involved. Because of the lack of consistent support and other political factors, I feel 287 is an inadequate site for demonstration of how to use in the sense of representing a model. Jean Anderson's program is a much better choice. There are some selected persons in 287 that I would recommend, but I think the institute staff should communicate with TIME staff in at least an advisory capacity in making these selections. I feel that if you are intending to show a model, it is best to first of all provide how it should be used in both philosophical and practical aspects. This is not facilitated by having presentors or demonstrators who do not have the necessary expertise. Because someone works in 287, do not assume they know or can explain TIME, please. I think there is some merit in examining the problems with implementing such a system also, but after they know how it should function. Also, please consider that we have developed many new things and made revisions in the last 3-4 years. Some of Kyrklund's materials are quite dated.
- Thank you for everything

- Hope to be able to follow-up on your efforts and where the future institutes lead, etc.
- Thanks
- Have realized we have an ideal situation of low functioning kids in an age appropriate environment in a public school setting using mainstream wherever possible in TRF.
- Follow-up as trends and needs arrive
- More information on specific model programs (Gadberry's presentation-Fri). Towards the end became a little redundant; maybe have overall outline (inc. purple paradigm) so one could see individual topics in relation to the whole.
- Even if it takes a number of years to develop, I would love to see a similar institute developed that focuses on early childhood. This institute concept was excellent!
- Thank you for providing me with a relevant learning experience. I do hope to apply the instruction I've received in my own setting.
- Thanks again for a great program.
- I really enjoyed the institute and truly feel I have grown because of my attendance.
- Thank you again for letting me participate in your institute. It was a great experience and I will be using your information and processes in the future
- Thanks and thanks to you and your entire staff for putting together and presenting a very worthwhile institute. It was definitely time well spent!
- At this time I would like to thank you, Eve Gadberry and Jim Lewis for presenting the finest workshop I have ever attended. I felt you were well organized and very informative. This is what made it possible to last nine days and enjoy it at the same time. You are all to be commended for your efforts.
- Thanks Jim, Eve, Dick and Mark for putting on a very informative class. I hope I can develop many of the good ideas that were presented. Much of it also helped me understand some of the organizations I've worked in; it's good to know where you've been so you have a better idea of where you're going!
- Thanks so much for all the information and materials. The take home test was a good idea (for me); it helped me bring the institute concepts together. I see that I'll need all this information plus more as I pursue my career as a director of special education.
- Once again, thanks for a really great workshop. I have already made use of things I learned and plan to do more.
- I thank you very much for providing me a very valuable learning experience through the institute.
- I do want to again say that I had a tremendous learning experience in attending your institute and I have had the chance to share this with numerous people within the Rochester, NY area.

APPENDIX D

SCHEDULE OF REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE

REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE

EDUCATION OF THE SEVERE & PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED
HISTORY, TRENDS, ISSUES, & PROGRAMS

SPONSOR

St. Cloud State University
Special Education Department

PURPOSE:

To upgrade the knowledge and understanding base of practicing
Special Education Administrators regarding contemporary
programming for the severely handicapped.

Institute Agenda

April 16, 1980

Presentor

5:00	Social Hour	
6:00	Dinner	
7:30	Overview: Purpose - Review of Agenda - handouts	Dick Johnson
8:00	Provision of Leadership - Issues and Needs	Dick Johnson
8:45	Participation Reaction and Discussion	

April 17, 1980

8:30	<u>Module A</u> - History, Definition, & Characteristics	60 min.	Dick Johnson
9:30	Small Group Session	30 min.	
10:00	Group Reports	15 min.	
10:15	<u>Module B</u> Issues and Trends		
	Issues - Introduction		
	1. What is education?	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
	2. Who should be served?		
	Where should services be?	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
	3. Are the costs justified?	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
	4. Obtaining Inter-agency cooperation	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
	5. What happens after public schools?	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
		25 min.	
10:40	Trends (& Coffee)		
	1. Inclusion of parents	10 min.	Jim Lewis
	2. Human - civil rights movement & worth of individual	5 min.	Jim Lewis
	3. Focus on normalization	10 min.	Jim Lewis
	4. Individualization of programs, Data-based programs & Programming specificity	10 min.	Eve Gadberry
	5. Early intervention	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
	6. Teaching vs. custodial care	5 min.	Eve Gadberry
		45 min.	

11:25

Small Groups

12:00

Reports and Discussion

12:30

Lunch

1:30

Module C (120 minutes)

Presenter

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| 1. Introduction | 2 min. | Jim Lewis |
| 2. Minimum philosophical standards | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| 3. Program policies/Legal aspects | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| Administrative procedures | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| 4. Model Program | | |
| A. Assessment | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| B. What to teach | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| C. How to teach | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| D. Evaluation of total system | 5 min. | Jim Lewis |
| 5. Staffing requirements | 10 min. | Eve Gadberry |
| 6. Staffing Models | 30 min. | Jim Lewis |

2:45

Discussion (All) 15 min.

3:00

7. Types of programs 15 min. Jim Lewis

3:15

Discussion over coffee 15 min.

3:45

Module D - Current program services 45 min. Eve Gadberry

4:30

Summary & Evaluation Dick Johnson

5:15

Adjourn

APPENDIX E

PILOT DIRECTORS' TRAINING PROGRAM
EVALUATION SUMMARY
4/80

SEV/PROF LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROJECT

"Developing Leadership for Programs for the Severely Handicapped"

PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM

APRIL 16 and 17, 1980, SUNWOOD INN, ST. CLOUD, MN

EVALUATION

1. Facilities:

Very Good - 4

Excellent - 4

Good - 2

Great - 1

2. Program Organization:

A. General comments:

- Very well organized - 2
- Well organized - 4
- Logical sequence - 2
- Easy to follow
- Basic outline approach
- Well defined
- Excellent
- Good
- On task

B. Some suggestions:

- More information
- Possibly some "brainstorming" or problem solving sessions
- Not sure small group time productive. Want more information given to me.
- Consider changing presentation method, i.e., not all overheads. Videotape on different delivery models.
- Have overhead masters distributed.
- Seemingly well organized. However, still appears that directors are of "profound" while material is for severe. Need exists to be more clear about the severity of the handicap you are talking about so people have the same picture in their mind.

3. Program Content and Pace:

A. General comments:

- Good pace
- Well paced
- Very intense, but bearable because of workshop length.
- Everyone had a chance to question.
- Institute kept moving on schedule. A refreshing change from most educational workshops.
- Pace appropriate for group.
- Small group discussions valuable.
- Visuals easy to understand.
- Very important.
- Rural setting aided in change from self-contained.
- Good job attempting to define population.
- Good "current state of the art".
- Well done. Everyone seemed to be interested.
- Too much in a short time.
- Content appropriate for purpose.
- Some good material being presented.
- Module A - good. Gives a clear background.

B. Some suggestions:

- Less need for Issues and Trends for practicing administrators, In pre-service, this area will take on great importance.
- More group participation - small groups discussion and reporter worksheets.
- Some opportunity for small group interaction on Module C and D.
- More activities to reduce boredom from mere lack of activity.
- Transparencies helpful for organization, but need more information and examples assuming a naive audience.
- Expand of the state of the art.
- Expand on problems inherent with community based activities.
- No specific information on vocational education: what it really is and how to accomplish. Develop this more.
- Short description of exemplary projects should be distributed.
- More time on Issues and Trends.
- Some material a review for in-field people, but excellent for pre-service.
- Legalities do not need to be covered for directors.
- More time on stance for Issues and Trends.
- More on Module D, although it appears many were not providing services for profound. Clearly define which does which.
- On all modules, more ideas on ways to correct basic deficit areas in existing programs.

4. Presentors:

A. General comments:

- Well prepared
- Material concisely presented
- Well organized
- Knowledgable
- Excellent
- Well done

4. A. General comments continued:

- Understood and knew material
- Appeared to have researched area/issue thoroughly
- Presented positions in which they obviously believed and backed up position very well for the most part.
- Content covered very well.
- Found it easy to stay awake with presentors changing often.
- Johnson and Lewis good grasp of material. (They) put information across well, clear and concise. Gadberry - tendency to make value judgements regarding material.

B. Some suggestions:

- A few jokes and music would have helped.
- More critical analysis of 1. B - Reality Factor.
- Perhaps each presenter should consider his/her own "style" and present accordingly.

5. Importance of Problem:

A. General comments:

- Genuinely important problem
- Relevant
- Very important - 2
- Extremely important
- Very timely issue
- Area of extreme importance
- No question that problem is important
- Have to face starting now; we have to jump on it.
- As state of the art is evolving significantly, the need for this type of training is very important.
- It's important for a training facility to zero in on a specific problem or disability area. It is well to keep attention on this subject. For a Director of Special Education among all disability areas, I don't feel it presents a very big problem.

B. Some suggestions:

- Need to remember severity of population being discussed.
- Special education has sort of lost track of this group. I feel they should be our highest priority.
- The impact must be made on communities and professionals in the field in the near future, as priorities in education will be set as a result of reduced available money.

6. Length:

A. General comments:

- No problem
- Good - 2
- Okay
- Given purpose, it was adequate

6. B. Some suggestions:

- Probably take two days to adequately cover modules.
- Long day after a short night. Maybe have long day first.
- Preferred a longer, more intense presentation.
- More activities needed to break up lecture material.
- Possibly more short breaks.

7. Other:

A. General comments:

- Benefited from the day very much. Will ask coordinator a lot of questions, thanks.
- Institute was very valuable for me. Learned a lot of things, reinforced some of the programming things we're currently doing, well worth my time being here.
- I really enjoyed the workshop.
- I enjoyed the opportunity to visit with college staff and sharing ideas in order to deal with a critical problem.
- Overall workshop was well worth the time expended and was well constructed.
- I appreciate the opportunity to be involved and react to the modules that you have developed. They were high quality, well organized and extremely valuable for me. I am sure that others who are in-serviced will profit as much as I did.

B. Some suggestions:

- Some further time for discussion on model program characteristics and organizational model may have been fruitful.
- The need for this in-service is critical. Issues must be brought forth and aired in order to bring about change. I would encourage more of this interaction.
- One of the skills that training agencies should be teaching is communication skills. It is necessary for the special education staff to be able to know how to draw regular education and others into the act. To me, that is being an advocate.
- School community-based administration should also be in-serviced. Often we find it difficult at best to gather the support of mainstream staff and administration to interact with our programs. It is great to know that this level of pre-service activity will be happening in central Minnesota. Thanks.

APPENDIX F

INSTITUTE PROGRAM
6/80 NATIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE

INSTITUTE PROGRAM
NATIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE
ON

SUPERVISION OF PROGRAMS FOR THE SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

June 18-27, 1980

Institute Director

Dr. Richard Johnson
St. Cloud State University

Resident Faculty

Dr. Eva Gadberry
Dr. James Lewis
St. Cloud State University

Resources Coordinator

Mr. Mark Wolak

Sponsoring Agency

Special Education Department
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
Dr. Stanley Knox, Chairman

Host School District

Special School District #287
1820 North Xenium Lane
Minneapolis, MN 55441
Mr. Robert Manning
Director of Special Education

PURPOSE OF INSTITUTE

To provide intensive training and orientation in contemporary programming models, issues, and standards for school personnel serving in a leadership role in educational programs for the severely handicapped, and to provide a forum for sharing programming and leadership problems as well as problem solving approaches with colleagues and with institute faculty.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTE

This nine-day Institute will provide an opportunity to hear and discuss contemporary information and opinion in several topical areas, including the need for Trained Leadership, the problems of definition and classification of this population, major trends and issues affecting programming decisions, characteristics of a model program, the state of the art in the Nation including review of selected model programs, organizing for supervision, and supervisor functions.

During the Institute, participants will be given ample opportunity to interact with institute faculty and with each other, and will also be able to interact with and observe teachers and other staff in the District #287 summer program for the severely handicapped.

In addition, a media lab and various print resources will be available for independent study and viewing as interest dictates.

Six quarter hour graduate credits in Supervision of Programs for the Severely Handicapped will be awarded each Institute participant upon completion of Institute requirements. Full attendance of all Institute Sessions and successful completion of a post-test are the primary requirements for awarding of credits. The Institute will be in session from approximately 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. daily, with several evening sessions scheduled. This Institute is funded in part by a BEH Grant.

LOCATION OF INSTITUTE

The Institute will be conducted at Cavanagh School, 5400 Corvallis Avenue North, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55429. Cavanagh School is a Special School District #287 special education facility for the severely handicapped during the school year, and houses a summer program for this population. This summer program will be in session during the Institute. District #287 is a special district which umbrellas some 13 suburban Minneapolis school districts for the purposes of providing vocational education and special education services.

Date	Brief Content Description	Time	Faculty (See Roster Page)
Tues.	(Sheraton) -Evening "get acquainted" Social	7:00 p.m.	
Wed.	-Orientation to Institute, nature of the problem, the host district and school, and media lab -Procedural matters related to credits, communications, evaluations, etc. -Severe/Profound definitions and classification systems	8:00 a.m. 11:00 a.m. 1:15 p.m.	Knox, Manning, Svaldi Johnson, Gadberry Johnson Johnson
Thurs.	-Population characteristics (observations) -Issues and Trends including Issues: What is education? Who should serve? Where should services be? Are costs justified? Obtaining Interagency Cooperation After public school? Trends: Worth of individual Human & civil rights Creating public awareness Focus on normalization Teaching vs. custodial care Individualization Early intervention Inclusion of parents Extended service continuum -Crackerbarrel with fellow administrators - Issues and trends applies to daily programming (Evening Session - Sheraton)	8:15 a.m. 10:20 a.m. 1:00 p.m. 6:00 p.m.	Gadberry Gadberry, Lentz Fortschneider, Anderson Martinson, Lentz Watkins
Fri.	Overview of Model Program Aspects including: -Program Policies: Legal & Contemporary Professional Standards -Programmatic Philosophy -Defined Administrative Procedures -Defined Administrative Procedures	8:15 a.m. 8:30 a.m. 10:00 a.m. 10:45 a.m. 1:15 p.m.	Lewis Lewis, Fortschneider Lewis, Johnson Fortschneider, Anderson Fortschneider, Anderson
Sat.	Overview of Specific Model Program Elementary -Assessment Considerations & Practices -The TIME Criterion-referenced System -What should be taught? -How to teach -Task Analysis	8:15 a.m. 8:20 a.m. 8:50 a.m. 11:20 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 2:15 p.m.	Lewis Lewis Kyrklund, Anderson Gadberry Lewis Gadberry

Mon.	6/23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assessment Observations/Lab -Program Evaluation Considerations -Staffing for Programs -Teachers 	8:15 a.m. 10:00 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 2:00 p.m.	Lewis Johnson York York
Tues.	6/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Staffing (continued) -Support Personnel-overview & organization for use -Vocational Specialists and Vocational Training Issues -Social Workers -Motor Development Specialists -Instructional Management Aides -Communication Specialists 	8:15 a.m. 9:30 a.m. 11:15 a.m. 1:15 p.m. 2:00 p.m. 2:30 p.m.	York Wehman York Gadberry York
Wed.	6/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Staffing (continued) -Psychologists & Behavior Analysts -Medical Personnel -Ancillary resources -Supervisory Staff -Inter-staff Communication -Team Staffing & Decision Models -Intra & Multi-disciplinary -Interdisciplinary -Transdisciplinary -Crackerbarrel-Inter staff Communication and teaming (Evening session-Sheraton) 	8:15 a.m. 8:45 a.m. 9:15 a.m. 11:15 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 2:00 p.m. 6:00 p.m.	Lewis, Anderson, Knox Anderson Gadberry Johnson Anderson Lewis, Gadberry Anderson, Martinson
Thurs.	6/26	Types of Programs - Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Isolated Programs -Programs in Regular Schools Other Specialized Concerns - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Parent Involvement -Inservice Training -Program Development -Prevention of Burnout -Current Approaches to Organizing for Supervision (Evening Session - Sheraton)	8:15 a.m. 8:45 a.m. 11:30 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 2:00 p.m. 2:30 p.m. 6:30 p.m.	Lewis Fortschneider Fortschneider Gadberry Fortschneider Panel Johnson
Fri.	6/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Model Program Overview -State of the Art - National -Review of Model Programs in the Nation -Program Supervision Requirements and Functions -Supervision requirements brainstorming -Institute Evaluation 	8:15 a.m. 8:30 a.m. 9:15 a.m. 11:15 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 3:15 p.m.	Gadberry Gadberry Gadberry Johnson Johnson Johnson

INSTITUTE FACULTY

Resident Faculty

Dr. Richard Johnson	Institute Director & Instructor	Associate Professor St. Cloud State University
Dr. James Lewis	Staff Instructor	Professor St. Cloud State University
Dr. Eva Gadberry	Staff Instructor	Assistant Professor St. Cloud State University
Mr. Mark Wolak	Resource Coordinator	Graduate Assistant St. Cloud State University

Sponsors

Dr. Stanley Knox	Host & Liason - University Resources	Chairman and Professor Dept. of Special Education St. Cloud State University
Mr. Robert Manning	Host & Liason - District #287	Director of Special Education District #287 Minneapolis, Minnesota
Mr. Vince Svaldi	Host & Liason - Cavanaugh School	Supervisor District #287 Robbinsdale, Minnesota

Visiting Faculty

Ms. Jean Anderson	Guest Lecturer	Program Coordinator T.M.R. Unit Willmar Public Schools District #347 Willmar, Minnesota
Ms. Joan Fortschneider	Guest Lecturer	Program Coordinator East Central Cooperative Urbana, Illinois
Ms. Sarah Kyrklund	Guest Lecturer	Educational Programmer JISD #287 Minneapolis, Minnesota
Ms. Amie Lentz	Guest Lecturer	Coordinator: Special Stations and Classes, LaGrange Dept. of Special Education LaGrange, Illinois

Visiting Faculty - continued

Ms. Gwen Martinson	Guest Lecturer	Program Supervisor JISD #287 Minneapolis, Minnesota
Mr. Ron Watkins	Guest Lecturer	Special Education Coordinator District #742 Community Schools St. Cloud, Minnesota
Dr. Paul Wehman	Guest Lecturer	Associate Professor Division of Educational Services School of Education Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia
Dr. Robert York	Guest Lecturer and Leadership Training Project Consultant	Assistant Professor Coordinator of Moderately and Severely Behavior Handicap Program Dept. of Special Education University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois

APPENDIX G

EVALUATION SUMMARY
SPRING, 1980 SUPERVISION COURSE

-207-

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

SPED 690

Spring, 1980

1. Was the content of this course relevant to contemporary problems and issues as related to supervision of special education?

1	2	3	4	5
not relevant		somewhat relevant		relevant
<u>"COMMENTS"</u>				
				(5.0)

2. Were you allowed and encouraged to participate in class discussion and to register your opinions?

1	2	3	4	5
opportunity seldom available		opportunity sometime available		opportunity frequently available
<u>"COMMENTS"</u>				
				(4.7)

3. Was the course material (visuals) useful and relevant to course content/topics?

1	2	3	4	5
not useful		somewhat useful		useful
<u>"COMMENTS"</u>				
				(4.3)

4. Please rate the course instructor on the following characteristics (place a number from 1 to 10 in the blank space, with a 1 indicating the lowest rating, and a 10 the highest rating).

9.6 Knowledge of subject matter

9.6 Ability to communicate subject matter

8.8 Flexibility in adapting to class interest

8.8 Accessibility/responsiveness to individual student problem/needs

10.0 Apparent interest in teaching

"COMMENTS"

5. Please give this course an overall quality of course rating.

1	2	3	4	5
very low quality		average quality		very high quality

6. Other general comments and/or recommendations.

(4.8)

APPENDIX H

STAFF MEMO ON UNINTENDED BENEFITS

DEPARTMENT Special Education

Office Memorandum

: Stanley C. Knox

DATE: September 12, 1980

FROM : Eve Gadberry
James Lewis

PHONE: _____

SUBJECT:

As we're planning this year's coursework and activities, we're noticing some peripheral/unintended benefits from our work on the leadership project. The curriculum course (SPED 692 - Curriculum for TMR) last spring utilized materials we had pulled together for project presentations. Also, SPED 420/520 and 421/521 have expanded to include more information on issues, trends, LRA, court decisions and state of the art than had previously been presented. The audio-visual aides developed for the project are used in our TMR classes, in introductory courses, and with the resident teachers in their settings.

We have also found we've incorporated information, methods and materials we've gleaned from each other on the team as well as from the outside consultants and participants involved with the project. All in all, we've been very busy, but we're really starting to see the benefits.

EG/JL:jd
cc: R. Johnson

APPENDIX G

ABSTRACTS OF TRAINING MODULES

-212-

PROJECT OVERVIEW

and

ABSTRACTS OF

TRAINING MODULES

Developing Leadership for Programs

for

the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped

An Administrator Training Program

(1978 - 1981)

Sponsoring Agency:

The Special Education Department
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, MN
Dr. Stanley Knox, Chairperson
Dr. Richard Johnson, Project Director

Funding Agency:

The Bureau for Education of the Handicapped
Division of Personnel Preparation
Project Officer: Dr. Paul Ackerman

PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

- I. Title: Developing Leadership for Programs for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped
- II. Sponsors: St. Cloud State University, Special Education Department, and The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped,
(Division of Personnel Preparation, Dr. Paul Ackerman, Project Officer)
- III. Project Address: Special Education Department, Dr. Stanley Knox, Chairman
Education Building
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
(612) 255-2041
- IV. Project Staff: Dr. Richard Johnson, Project Director
Dr. James Lewis, Professor (Severe and Profound area)
Dr. Eve Gadberry, Asst. Professor (Severe and Profound area)
Mr. Mark Wolak, Research Assistant
Dr. Clifford Howe, Chairperson, Special Education Department,
University of Iowa (External Project Evaluator)
- V. Project Purpose: The purpose of this project is threefold. First, the project will develop and vend an in-service training package for current special education directors and administrators with the purpose of creating an expanded awareness of the multiple and complex needs of the sev/prof population, and of their educational program requirements.
- Secondly, the project will design and develop a graduate-level pre-service training program for training of Supervisors of educational programs for the sev/prof population, and will, through this training program and subsequent replications, begin to expand the available pool of specifically trained supervisors for programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped.
- Thirdly, the project will, given continued University and federal support, develop an outreach component for (a) vending the in-service training curriculum in other states in a planful way, and (b) provision of technical assistance to other college and/or University training programs which attempt to replicate a portion or all of the graduate-level pre-service training program.
- VI. Project Timeline: The project will develop and vend the administrator in-service package in one-three states, and will design, develop, and offer (on a pilot basis), the graduate-level pre-service supervisor training program during the period 9/78-7/81.
- The project will offer the pre-service graduate training program on an expanded basis, will provide administrator in-service to other states on request, and will provide outreach technical assistance to other colleges and universities during the period 1981-84.

MODULE ABSTRACTS

COMMENTARY

The training modules which are abstracted in the following pages form the topical and content parameters for in-service training of currently employed special education directors, and also represents the basic content which will be utilized in a pre-service formal training program for students desiring to become supervisors of programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped. These modules will be available first in an instructor-assisted multi-media mode, and later in an auto-instructional mode.

The modules are organized in two basic units; one an overview and orientation unit consisting of four modules, and the second a unit of two modules related to Supervision of Programs for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped. The titles of the modules for both units follow:

UNIT I - Orientation and Awareness

Module A - The Severely and Profoundly Handicapped:
History, Definition, and Characteristics

Module B - Major Trends and Issues

Module C - Overview of Model Program Characteristics

Module D - Overview of Model Program Characteristics

UNIT II - Supervision of Programs

Module A - Current Organizational Models

Module B - Program Supervision Requirements,
Functions and Competencies

MODULE I-A ABSTRACTTHE SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED:
HISTORY, DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS

Module Goal: To provide for each trainee background information on important historical considerations necessary to put today's programs and problems in perspective, on the question of "who are the severely and profoundly handicapped," and on specific characteristics of the population.

Module Content Overview:

This module presents and discusses several historical considerations related to programs for this population, such as the exclusion from schooling mentality and the past and recent advocacy group and other legal efforts. In addition, a discussion of a number of extant definitions of the severely and profoundly handicapped is provided, with emphasis on (functional) mental retardation as a major common denominator in terms of population characteristics. Also, an analysis of state-level education agency adopted definitions is presented, with examples listed of the various types of definitions.

An expected outcome of this module will be greater trainee awareness and understanding of the history, definition, and characteristics of this population as related to current programming developments and problems.

ABSTRACT OF MODULE I-BEDUCATION OF THE SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED:
ISSUES AND TRENDS

Module Goal: This module will assist each trainee to gain an awareness of and information on issues and trends related to education of the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Module Content:

This module will identify and discuss a number of the most important issues and trends related to contemporary programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped, and will serve as the basis for development of a philosophy/tenets statement by each trainee. Issues and trends presented in this module are:

Issues:

What is education?
Who should provide services?
Where should services be provided?
Are costs justified?
Obtaining interagency cooperation
What happens after public school?

Trends:

Worth of the individual	Individualization
Human and civil rights	Early intervention
Creating public awareness	Inclusion of parents
Focus on normalization	Extended service continuum
Teaching vs. custodial care	

The desired outcome is for each trainee to be able to generate an educated posture on major issues and trends as they affect programmatic and policy decisions.

ABSTRACT OF MODULE I-C
EDUCATION OF THE SEVERELY & PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED:
MODEL EDUCATION PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Module Goal: To provide for each trainee a definitive statement of requirements for designing and operating a model program for education of the severely and profoundly handicapped, so that each trainee will gain knowledge of at least one set of model requirements and will become more aware of the need for rigorous program definition.

Module Content Overview:

Module I-C, Model Education Program Characteristics is a discussion of key elements necessary to provide a model education program for severely/profoundly handicapped.

This module is organized into the following five areas:

1. An overview of model program characteristics in terms of philosophical standards, program policies which reflect both legal and contemporary professional standards, and operational procedures to ensure consistent application of staff energies to program goal attainment.
2. Review of four key elements in a model education program in the curricular area:
 - A. Assessment/evaluation of severely/profoundly handicapped.
 - B. What is to be taught.
 - C. How should the severely/profoundly handicapped be taught.
 - D. Evaluation system for a total program.
3. Review of staffing requirements and staffing models.
4. Discussion of where programs should be located and physical plant requirements.
5. Discussion of other specialized considerations.

ABSTRACT OF MODULE I-DEDUCATION OF THE SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED:
CURRENT PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Module Goal: To provide for each trainee information on the current "state of the art" of educational programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped on a state-wide and national basis, and to create an awareness of the fact that there are a rather large number of already developed programs which are considered "model" programs, or which have established specific exemplary practices.

Module Content Overview:

This module discusses the "state of the art" of educational programs on both a state-wide and national basis by summarizing:

1. The types of programs available according to physical setting characteristics, staffing pattern characteristics, and curricular emphasis characteristics.
2. The various program location approaches utilized at this time.

In addition, this module provides information on a selected number of model programs and/or programs which have established specific exemplary practices.

While this section of the module will change over time, current programs discussed are those located at:

Madison, WI

Los Angeles, CA

Minneapolis, MN

Eugene, OR

Urbana, IL

Missoula, MT

DeKalb, IL

Richmond, VA

Monmouth, OR

LaGrange, IL

San Francisco, CA

A desired outcome for this module is improved trainee understanding that others have developed programs that work, and that it is not an impossible task to develop complete, progressive educational programming in the least restrictive environment for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

UNIT II-ABSTRACTS

Unit II Module Scope and Sequence statements are currently being developed, with modules for this unit scheduled for completion during 1980-81. Thus, expanded abstracts are not currently available. A brief description of each Unit II module follows:

Module II-A Current Organizational Models

This module will provide the trainee with an understanding of the various types of models for provision of program supervision which are currently in use, with the advantages and disadvantages of each model discussed. A "state of the art" statement will be included which will help trainees understand the current level and quality of supervision provided by schools for programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Module II-B Program Supervision Requirements, and Functions and Competencies

This module will provide the trainee with a description of what are considered to be minimum requirements for supervision of programs for the severely and profoundly handicapped, and will suggest and discuss a comprehensive list of functions required of program supervisors in a model program.

Also, this module will provide an analysis of these suggested functions in terms of the competencies required for the performance of each function, and will include a self-rating and instructional planning system so that each trainee, with instructor assistance, will be able to develop an individual instructional plan for acquiring minimum competency in each of the functional domains.