

*John E. Fogarty*

8/10/61

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY'S STATEMENT REGARDING H. R. 7175

On May 18 of this year, I introduced H. R. 7175, a bill to amend Public Law 85-926, "to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies," (approved September 6, 1958). This would extend the authorization to encourage expansion of teaching of children who are hard of hearing, speech impaired, visually handicapped, deaf, emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, crippled, and of those who have other health impairments.

(B)  
88 2.

The members of the Committee will recall that I introduced a bill, which became Public Law 85-926, authorizing the fellowship program for preparation of professional personnel in the education of the mentally retarded. This law contains two major provisions relating to the training of professional personnel. Section 1 of the law authorizes grants to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of college instructors in the area of mental retardation. Such instructors, in turn, conduct programs of professional preparation for classroom teachers. Section 2 of the law authorizes grants to State educational agencies to establish and maintain fellowships for supervisors and classroom teachers of the mentally retarded. Such

personnel in turn are in position to improve the quality of the instruction of children and youth.

For many years, as you know, I have had a deep interest in the health, welfare, and education of persons in this Nation who are handicapped. <sup>(B) P</sup> It is a matter of great concern and dismay that a large proportion of the Nation's children in need of special education are not receiving the attention they need, and many of them are being taught by teachers not adequately prepared for the purpose. If children and youth are neglected by the schools, not only will they and their families suffer, but also, in the long run, society in general ~~too~~ will suffer. However, if given suitable educational opportunity and other necessary aid, most handicapped children and youth are capable of becoming useful, contributing citizens and well-adjusted members of their families and communities. To bring this about, however, these children must have opportunity for education that is commensurate with that provided to other children and at the same time incorporates the adjustments that make it possible for them to take advantage of this opportunity.

(B)

The Need

We took a step forward by enacting Public Law 85-926, but its benefits are limited to mentally retarded children and youth. <sup>HR 7175 would</sup> It is <sup>amended</sup> evident, though, that we have left a serious gap in our Federal <sup>that law</sup> contribution to the preparation of professional personnel because <sup>by extending</sup>

the authorization to (B) - from p 51

~~there are even larger numbers of other handicapped children for whom especially qualified educational personnel are not available.~~

On the basis of statistics and estimates, ~~about 200,000~~ special educators are needed to adequately instruct the approximately 5 million school-age children in the various areas of exceptionality included in the bill. Of this number somewhat more than 2 million (about 4 percent of the school-age population) have speech and hearing impairment. Only about one-fourth of these children are currently reported to be receiving speech correction or special instruction. Another 2 percent of our school-age children and youth have such serious social and emotional problems that they need specially trained teachers who will understand them and their behavior, and who can create a climate in which they can live and learn. Thus far, the schools have made special provisions for only about fifty or sixty thousand of these children.

A table\* prepared by the Office of Education on personnel needs sets forth preliminary estimates of teachers needed in all areas of the handicapped by 1963. (Attachment #1.) In referring to these figures, I realize that they are rough estimates, but, in any event, they show something of the magnitude of the problem confronting the Nation. As the child population increases, it is probable that even more children will have problems calling for special attention. If Public Law 85-926 were amended as proposed by H. R. 7175, and implemented with adequate

\* Attachment #1 - Table 1.--Preliminary Estimates of the Number of Special Education Teachers Needed in 1963 in the Areas of Exceptionality Included in the Proposed Fellowship Program. (Public Law 85-926, with proposed amendment)

resources, it is my understanding that the Office of Education would plan to grant sufficient fellowships to prepare approximately 3,500 special educators by the end of the first five years of the expanded program.

You will recognize, as I do, that this shortage of educational personnel is a problem of such magnitude that State and local efforts will continue to fall short as they have in the past unless substantial Federal assistance is provided. If we fail to take action, many children and youth will suffer a loss which can never be repaid to them. With Federal aid, programs of professional preparation could be stimulated and professional personnel would more rapidly become available to the States and local school systems and thus hasten the time when suitable educational opportunities would become available to all exceptional children in need of it.

*pick up on pg 5*

Achievements under the Provisions of P. L. 85-926

The effects of the Office of Education fellowship program in the education of the mentally retarded have been immediate and favorable. The Congress made its first appropriation for the implementation of Public Law 85-926 in fiscal year 1960. This program has therefore just completed its second full year of operation. Altogether, 180 fellows were in school in academic years 1959-60 and 1960-61, and funds have been obligated for additional fellows to enroll in the fall of 1961. Full use was made of the \$1 million appropriation in each

of the fiscal years 1960 and 1961, and it is my understanding that other promising candidates could have used fellowships if they had been available. The impetus given by this Federal assistance is not only increasing manpower, but also improving the quality of professional preparation and arousing a vast amount of interest in this realm of human need.

The Office of Education reports that, under Section 1 of the law, 21 institutions of higher learning have received grants for fellowships. (Attachment #2.) At the end of the first year of this program, it became evident that there was no institution participating in the program west of Colorado which offered a degree at the doctoral level. To assist in solving this geographic inequity, stimulation grants were given to the University of Southern California, the University of Washington, the University of Kansas, and the University of Oregon.

The Office of Education further reports that participation in the program has been especially extensive under Section 2 of the Act, through which grants are made to State educational agencies. According to the administrative plan, two graduate fellowships are allocated to each State educational agency to be used by promising persons engaged or preparing to engage in employment as supervisors or directors of programs in the education of the mentally retarded. You will be pleased to hear that, thus far, fellowship grants to States have been used by all but

three of the States. Many of the States have asked for additional fellowships and have indicated that they have qualified candidates in excess of the number of fellowships available to them.

The Office of Education has forwarded statements to me which illustrate some of the positive effects of this program and the welcome spirit with which it is being received. I will quote from some of these and also attach a few full statements.

San Francisco State College reports: (Attachment #3.)

"The fellowship and supporting funds derived from P.L. 85-926 have had great impact upon the college program in mental retardation, the students enrolled in this program, all other part-time and full-time students in special education, and all types of professional programs and personnel in mental retardation in the Far West.

"As a result of the enactment of P. L. 85-926, mature, experienced students have had the opportunity of returning to graduate school to pursue study and field experiences which will suit them to assume leadership roles in college teaching and administration. This is a special importance at a time of extreme shortage of this type of personnel.

"All students in special education and in particular the field of mental retardation have profited from the additional staff and extension of the college program. In the past, one professor taught all courses in the field of mental retardation and in addition supervised field work, student teaching and advisement. Since the development of the Leadership Training Program, the additional staff have provided myriad opportunities for varied theoretical approaches and for a much higher degree of supervision of non-classroom activities."

Teachers College, Columbia University, reports: (Attachment #4.)

"Public Law 85-926 has provided the opportunity for selected special educators to return to college or university for advanced education which would never have been possible without unencumbered financial assistance. Students have reported that the Federal legislation has afforded them the opportunity to associate with other educators in somewhat similar positions and to share with them their thinking on major problems and issues. Further, when one leaves his position it is possible to look at his previous decisions and responsibilities with greater objectivity. It is anticipated that the experience of additional education will prove beneficial to the student upon his return to his position and in turn make the education of the mentally retarded more effective.

"The education program stimulated and expanded by P.L. 85-926 has proved to be beneficial to full-time students not under the Public Act. An increased student body with a variety of backgrounds cannot but help to benefit all of its enrollees whether being subsidized or not."

In his letter (Attachment #5.) the Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Special Education of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction writes:

"The fellowship program authorized by Section 2 of this act has generated great interest in the field of special education supervision and administration in our State. .... All in all, we feel there has been the greatest stimulation we have had to the development of more adequate supervisory and administrative services in this field from any source -- federal, state, or local."

The Office of Education reports that other States have also expressed satisfaction with this program. To quote from a few others, the Texas State Education Agency described its activities as follows:

"In the beginning an announcement from the Commissioner of Education was mailed to all local school administrators describing the intent of P.L. 85-926 and requesting applications from interested and qualified personnel working with mentally retarded children in local systems. Interest was generated to the extent we had thirty-five applications for the two fellowships allocated to our Agency."

The Hawaiian State Department of Public Instruction in communication with the Office of Education stated:

"We are very grateful for the help we are getting under this Act (Public Law 85-926). We have made full use of our allotment of scholarships.

"As your records will show, the Director of our Mentally Retarded Program will be returning to Hawaii this month after a year and a half at Columbia University. We have good report of his work there and I know that he will bring new enthusiasm and "know-how" to our program here in Hawaii.

"You will see from our present participation in the program that we are due to get a lot of help if these people return to our system. We are enthusiastic about what this law is doing for us and hope that the benefits will continue."

The Kansas State Department of Public Instruction tersely stated:

"It is our hope that Public Law 85-926 can be extended in the area of mental retardation as well as other areas of exceptionality."

#### What H. R. 7175 Would Do

*pick up here* → The proposed amendment H. R. 7175 is designed to alleviate the shortage of qualified special educators - to give leadership and to work directly with all children in the Nation's schools. Instead of piecemeal enactment for each separate area of the handicapped, my amendment provides for one single comprehensive, flexible, piece of legislation which would benefit all handicapped children and youth. This is the kind of legislation that has wide support in the country.

*pick up on pg 9*



The National Association of State Directors of Special Education, (made up of representatives responsible for statewide programs for exceptional children and youth,) recommended in the spring of 1960 -and reaffirmed in subsequent statements- that:

"....Public Law 85-926 be amended, with adequate budget, to provide fellowships for leadership personnel in all other areas of exceptionality."

"We further recommend that Public Law 85-926 be amended, with adequate budget, to provide fellowships for teachers in all areas of exceptionality."

Another major organization, the Council for Exceptional Children, a division of the National Education Association, which is concerned with the various areas of special education made a similar statement. In this it says:

"We ask that this legislation authorize training of personnel in all areas of exceptionality, including the preparation of classroom and itinerant teachers; consultants, coordinators, supervisors, and administrators; and college instructors and research workers. We further request legislation that will provide scholarships and fellowships to colleges, universities, and State departments of education, with supporting grants for colleges and universities."

~~Before bringing my remarks to a close, I should like to mention~~  
 two questions ~~which~~ have been raised in connection with the <sup>language of the</sup> proposed amendment. *and I would like to take this opportunity to clarify my position in relation to them.*

The first concerns the use and possible interpretation of the term "visually handicapped" instead of the more specific terms "blind and partially seeing." It was my intention that the phrase "visually handicapped" would include both the blind and the partially seeing.

Do you think that there is a possibility of misinterpretation? If you so desire, it would be acceptable to me to use the more specific term "blind and partially seeing."

The second question brought to my attention is the suggestion that speech and hearing services are provided in hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and other settings, as well as in the elementary and secondary schools. Because of this, there has been some question concerning the terminology used in this amendment which included such specialists under the term "teaching." In connection with this comment, I have sought further information concerning practices in the Nation.

I find that the State education agencies do have specific requirements for persons who are to work in the schools with children who have speech and hearing impairments. On the basis of preliminary data in the Office of Education, I learn that 45 State education agencies have official certification requirements for such persons. Certification does not seem to rest upon whether the personnel employed are called "teachers" or "specialists." As a matter of fact, persons certified by State education agencies are serving under various terms, the most frequent of which are: "speech correctionists," "teachers of children with speech and hearing disabilities," and "speech therapists."

As you, my colleagues, know, there are some specialists in speech and hearing who function in clinics and hospitals exclusively. The Federal Government is currently underwriting professional preparation of persons to work in such programs. You also know that most services to children with impaired speech and hearing are conducted in the schools as an integral part of the schools' broad program of special education. The Federal Government is not now contributing to the professional education of persons to work with these children in the schools.

We, therefore, find a large and serious gap in our Federal provision in that it is not aiding the field of education in this attempt to provide for children with speech and hearing impairments in the schools. It was my intention that such a program, contemplated by H.R. 7175, would be geared to the needs of the schools. In this way, the Federal Government would follow the pattern of organization and administration already established in the State and local school systems.

#### Conclusion

Under my proposed amendment, H.R. 7175, a program would be developed not only to prepare persons for leadership positions, but also for direct work in the schools with the children. It provides, instead of piecemeal legislation on various individual areas of the handicapped, one comprehensive, flexible, piece of legislation which

would benefit all types of handicapped children. This is very desirable from the point of view of efficient administration. It is also desirable because it reflects the patterns of organization found in State and local schools.

The Office of Education has already had favorable experience with the program developed under the provisions of Public Law 85-926, upon which this would be built. My amendment would continue to place responsibility for recruitment of candidates on State educational agencies and on colleges and universities, thereby providing the means for nationwide recruitment of personnel. Public Law 85-926 if amended by H.R. 7175 would authorize a program which would be flexible enough to allow for adjustments in administration as experience accumulates.

It is my understanding that, if the bill were enacted, the Office of Education would work cooperatively with leaders in the various areas of exceptionality, with public and private agencies and with representatives of day and residential schools in developing administrative procedures for the extension of this program. Such was the case in the planning and development of the program which now exists under Public Law 85-926.

Under this broadened legislation the Office of Education could immediately move forward toward more equitable aid to all types of exceptional children and youth. This expanded legislation, in my opinion, would be the most effective step which the Congress could currently take in its efforts to improve the welfare of the Nation's exceptional children.

end (B)