


2006

An Historical Descriptive Analysis of the Federal Education Policies that Influenced the Education of Students with Disabilities, 1950-2005

Catherine Quinn
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), and the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Quinn, Catherine, "An Historical Descriptive Analysis of the Federal Education Policies that Influenced the Education of Students with Disabilities, 1950-2005" (2006). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 211.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/211>

AN HISTORICAL DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL EDUCATION
POLICIES THAT INFLUENCED THE EDUCATION OF
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, 1950–2005

BY

CATHERINE QUINN

Dissertation Committee

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph.D.
James M. Caulfield, Ph.D.
Patricia Berezny, Ph.D.
Joseph V. Doria, Jr., Ed.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2006

© Copyright by Catherine Quinn, Ed.D., 2006
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

An Historical Descriptive Analysis of the Federal Education Policies that Influenced the Education of Students with Disabilities, 1950–2005

In 1950, not every student with a disability was allowed entry into a public school. Many students with disabilities either remained at home, were placed in residential asylums, or were brought to day centers, usually at the expense of their parents. Those who were admitted into the public schools were educated in segregated classes along with other students with disabilities.

The landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) completely changed ideas about how students with disabilities should be educated. Advocacy groups began to organize on the national level and lobby legislators for equitable services for their constituents. As the advocacy groups grew stronger, more legislation on behalf of students with disabilities was enacted. Laws were passed, and litigation to further define and clarify these laws followed. In 2005, students with disabilities were educated side-by-side with their nondisabled peers, participated in regular education classrooms with regular education curriculum, and were held accountable for educational progress and performance. Explaining how this happened is at the heart of this dissertation.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the federal policies that influenced the education of students with disabilities over a 56-year period in light of the social, political, and economic conditions specific to each decade. This analysis utilizes a framework consisting of the five educational philosophies that were prevalent in the 20th

century: progressivism, essentialism, existentialism, behaviorism, and perennialism. This study analyzes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and pertinent federal reports that impacted the education of students with disabilities.

The findings of this study reveal that the education of students with disabilities, during the years 1950–2005, underwent a dramatic change, moving from isolation to integration. Federal education policies and legislation greatly impacted the education of students with disabilities. All five educational philosophies were employed. In addition, while parents have had the upper hand in the majority of court decisions, a change in the direction of the courts is beginning to emerge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have been supportive during my doctoral journey, providing time, encouragement, guidance, and inspiration. I would like to recognize and thank them.

I am eternally grateful to my mentor, Dr. Mary F. Ruzicka, who has been consistently encouraging and supportive and whose scholarly focus made my final product stronger. I thank Dr. Caulfield whose reservations about my ambitious project were softened with encouraging remarks and whose criticisms improved my work. I thank Dr. Patricia Berezny, who spent many hours listening to me and giving me invaluable intellectual feedback and who helped me greatly with editing. I also thank State Senator and Mayor, Dr. Joseph V. Doria, Jr., for providing me with opportunities, with encouragement, and with recommendations that served to enhance the quality of my dissertation. I am grateful to Dr. Dennis Degnan for traveling this road with me and for the many insightful hours we spent studying together. I want to recognize every member of Cohort VIII for providing a nurturing and challenging atmosphere where learning and caring were evident at all times. I applaud the faculty at Seton Hall University for their willingness to teach in a cohort arrangement and for the extra time they so unselfishly gave when any of us was in need. I would also like to recognize another superb faculty, the teachers at the Woodrow Wilson School, who were 100% behind me all of the way. Their encouragement and good wishes are always with me. And, lastly, I would like to thank my family, all of whom were a source of support on a daily basis.

DEDICATION

It is with pleasure that I dedicate this work to the persons who have unconditionally been at my side throughout my educational journey:

My parents, Marie and James Quinn

My husband, John S. Grywalski, Jr.

My sister and her husband, Julie and Charles Glock

My nephew, Keith Glock

My niece and her husband, Christy and Stephen Trowbridge

My grandniece, Reese Marie Trowbridge

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| I INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Background of the Problem | 1 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—Historical Perspective to 1949 | 3 |
| Purpose of the Study | 6 |
| Importance of the Study | 7 |
| Significance of the Study | 16 |
| Methodology | 17 |
| Main Research Question | 17 |
| Subsidiary Questions | 17 |
| Organization of the Study | 18 |
| Statement of Bias | 18 |
| II HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE 1950s | 20 |
| Purpose of the Chapter | 20 |
| Introduction to the Decade of the 1950s | 20 |
| Education Policy During the Truman Presidency, the Final Years— 1950–1953 | 21 |
| Education Policy During the Eisenhower Presidency—1953–1961 | 21 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 22 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities – 1950–1959 | 23 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 26 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 35 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 37 |
| III HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE 1960s | 40 |
| Purpose of the Chapter | 40 |
| Introduction to the Decade of the 1960s | 40 |
| Education Policy During the Kennedy Presidency—1960–1963 | 42 |
| Education Policy During the Johnson Presidency—1963–1969 | 42 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 43 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—1960–1969 | 47 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 53 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 60 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 62 |
| IV HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE 1970s | 65 |
| Purpose of the Chapter | 65 |
| Introduction to the Decade of the 1970s | 65 |
| Education Policy During the Nixon Presidency—1969–1974 | 67 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| Education Policy During the Ford Presidency—1974–1977..... | 67 |
| Education Policy During the Carter Presidency—1977–1981 | 68 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 68 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—1970–1979 | 71 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 77 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 83 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 86 |
| V HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE 1980s..... | 90 |
| Purpose of the Chapter..... | 90 |
| Introduction to the Decade of the 1980s..... | 90 |
| Education Policy During the Reagan Presidency—1982–1988 | 91 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 92 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—1980–1989..... | 94 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 103 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 108 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 109 |
| VI HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE 1990s..... | 111 |
| Purpose of the Chapter..... | 111 |
| Introduction to the Decade of the 1990s..... | 111 |
| Education Policy During the George H. W. Bush Presidency— 1989–1993..... | 113 |
| Education Policy During the Clinton Presidency—1993–2000 | 113 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 114 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—1990–1999 | 117 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 127 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 133 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 135 |
| VII HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE YEARS 2000–2005..... | 137 |
| Purpose of the Chapter..... | 137 |
| Introduction to the Years 2000–2005 | 137 |
| Education Policy During the George W. Bush Presidency— 2001–2005..... | 138 |
| Federal Education Legislation | 139 |
| Education of Students With Disabilities—2000–2005 | 140 |
| Analysis Question 1 | 140 |
| Analysis Question 2 | 144 |
| Analysis Question 3 | 144 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 146 |
| Summary of Findings..... | 146 |
| Conclusions..... | 150 |
| Recommendations for Further Research..... | 153 |
| References..... | 156 |
| Appendix A: Presidents of the United States, 1950–2005..... | 176 |
| Appendix B: Students With Disabilities Served in Federally Funded Programs, 1976–2004 | 178 |

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, references are from peer-reviewed, scholarly works or government publications.

Background of the Problem

From 1950 to 2005, a myriad of changes in public school education took place, especially with regard to students with disabilities. As McCune (2003) noted in her newsletter, “There was a time when students with disabilities received no education at all” (p. 27). Children who did not fit into the mainstream of public education because they were unable to control their behaviors, were mentally challenged, or were physically unable to maneuver in a school building, were either kept at home or institutionalized. “Because of the limited opportunities offered by the public schools, families were often forced to secure education and related services elsewhere, often at great distance from their homes and at their own expense” (Katsiyannis, Yell, & Bradley, 2001, p. 325). From our contemporary perspective, it is almost inconceivable that any child was ever denied a free, public education.

The turning point in the education of children with disabilities occurred in 1954 with the landmark Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. While this case primarily dealt with the constitutionality of segregation in public education, it eventually opened doors for disabled students, since it addressed the legal issue of separate but equal. “In many ways, the movement to include students with

disabilities in general education and the continued struggle to racially integrate America's schools share similar paths" (Smith & Kozleski, 2005, p. 271). In delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Earl Warren stated:

In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. (*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, 1954, p. 4-5)

This wording not only targeted the inclusion of students of all races, but specifically stated that all children are entitled to a public education. Thus, advocates of children with disabilities used this law as an initial stepping stone to gain right of entry to public schools and to eventually make them accessible to students, no matter what their disability.

After *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954), moving students who were mentally and/or physically challenged into the mainstream of education became a concern as well. However, the placements for nonclassified students, as well as the type of curriculum and delivery systems developed for them, may not be appropriate for students classified as disabled. "Special education placements must be individually tailored to meet students with disabilities' unique educational needs and to provide meaningful educational benefits" (Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004, p. 34).

Education of Students With Disabilities—Historical Perspective to 1949

Since the founding of the United States, our country has always had a disabled population. As Winzer (1993) pointed out in her book, the way in which this population was schooled was initially, during the mid-18th century, influenced by the Europeans. “Anyone who was not able to attain the minimum educational level (about today’s third-grade education) was stigmatized with the label feebleminded” (Pfeiffer, 1993, p. 724). The belief that disabled persons were morally and biologically inferior to nondisabled persons persisted throughout the 19th century. “Given the lack of an existing framework and given the increasing emphasis on a medical model, special children were simply excluded from the public schools, which had neither the desire nor the trained personnel to handle these youngsters” (Winzer, 1993, p. 94). It was customary for disabled youth to be enrolled in special schools, segregated by their disability. Institutions for the deaf, dumb, blind, and physically handicapped were in existence, as were asylums for the mentally retarded and the insane.

As written in a topic paper for The National Council on Disability, Sergen (2005) noted, that at the time, the mentally retarded in these institutions were provided with a minimal amount of education, if any. These institutions were usually funded and governed by charitable organizations like foundations or religious orders. The curriculum that was delivered in these settings was developed to fit the disability and generally had an emphasis on vocational training so that these persons could be incorporated into the workplace and could become productive. As the United States moved from an agrarian society to an industrial society, more emphasis was placed on the skills necessary to work in urban environments where assembly line production and factories prevailed.

“During the final three decades of the nineteenth century institutional superintendents began to move away from the belief that disabled students would best attain their industrial training and moral development in segregated institutions founded on philanthropic commitment” (Winzer, 1993, p. 315). Gradually, these institutions and asylums changed their names to *schools* in an effort to change the perception of these facilities to places that constituted educational environments. These schools also left behind charitable, humanitarian governance as they switched over to the public domain.

With the compulsory attendance laws enacted in many states in the early 20th century, which required that *all* children go to school, the meaningful education of students with disabilities became an issue in the public sphere.

By bringing in a great number of children with varied abilities and diverse learning problems, the laws alone might have stimulated the development of special classes, but other social developments also spurred their growth. Special classes were part of the larger movement for curriculum differentiation associated with progressive educational reform. (Winzer, 1993, p. 324)

The diversity of students was further broadened by the influx of immigrants that swelled schools with children who did not speak English and who had customs and cultures that were different from the typical American. The needs of this student population were great, and educators realized that steps needed to be taken so that all students could have the opportunity to succeed. Tracking according to ability level was used to make schools more productive and special classes that segregated “exceptional” students were formed. Many professionals thought that this arrangement would benefit students with disabilities, because the smaller class size would allow for more

individualization, the closeness of abilities would make teaching easier, and the self-esteem of these youngsters would be fostered, since they were not competing with their nondisabled counterparts (Yell, Rogers, & Lodge Rodgers, 1998).

“From 1910 to 1930,” as Winzer (1993) noted, “there was a huge spurt both in enrollment in the public schools and in the number and type of special classes that were formed” (p. 331). The curriculum for these special classes often mirrored that of the regular classes with some modifications and variations. Vocational training was emphasized in order to help these students enter the work force. In chronicling special classes in Atlanta, Georgia at this time, Franklin (1989) reported that teachers worked with students on assignments that were concrete and practical, on things that they liked and could accomplish successfully. He further stated that students were engaged in integrated units in social studies, English, and spelling, which helped them to solve everyday problems associated with shelter, conservation, transportation, and vocations. “As we might expect from a program supposedly driven by the goals of social efficiency, the mission of the special class was to keep these children in school in hopes of enhancing whatever social contributions they might ultimately make” (Franklin, p. 585).

During the 1930s and 1940s, the emphasis on special education in schools declined. The Great Depression, which ran from 1929 through 1941, so consumed the American public with the daily task of acquiring food and shelter that nothing else was important. Himmelberg (2001), in his book on the depression, wrote, “Signs of destitution and the utter disruption of ordinary life patterns afflicted the lives of countless people, old and young” (p. 10). The end of the Great Depression came about in 1941 with the United States’ involvement in World War II, as able-bodied men went into the

military and jobs for defense purposes were plentiful. During this period, once again, education was secondary to the need for economic growth and stability.

Throughout the history of public education, economics has always taken precedence over children. It still does. At the turn of the century, and even up to the start of World War II, it was not uncommon in the rural Midwest for young people to end their formal education at the seventh or eighth grade. (Hicks, 2000, p. 398)

These were harsh times for the American people, and it wasn't until the end of World War II that a sense of cautious optimism for future peace and prosperity arose. Emphasis was once again placed on families and education and special education slowly came to the fore. This was due, in part, to disabled veterans who were returning from the war and trying to find a place in the workforce. Writing for *The Saturday Evening Post*, Hill (1960) noted that training for the disabled was accepted as a way of life because so many veterans were injured during combat and had returned home with severe physical and/or sensory disabilities. The *Digest of Educational Statistics* reported that in 1943 the federal government passed PL 78-16, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which was designed to provide assistance to disabled veterans (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This was followed by the passing of the GI Bill, PL 78-346, in 1944, which was designed to assist veterans in acquiring an education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the federal government's influence on education policymaking and its impact on the curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities over the last 56 years. This analysis will be accomplished using

a framework consisting of the five educational philosophies prevalent in the 20th century.

The main sources consulted for each of the educational philosophies are as follows:

Bagley (1941) and Kandel (1961) for essentialism, Morris (1961) and Hutchins and Adler (1963) for perennialism, Dewey (1950) for progressivism, Brameld (1955) for existentialism, and Skinner (1974) and Watson (2005) for behaviorism.

Importance of the Study

During the 20th century, a number of different educational philosophies influenced the public debate concerning education. In many cases, these philosophies founded a type of curriculum and educational practice that was then utilized in schools.

In modern times there are opposing views about the practice of education. There is no general agreement about what the young should learn either in relation to virtue or in relation to the best life; nor is it clear whether their education ought to be directed more towards the intellect than towards the character of the soul. . .

And it is not certain whether training should be directed at things useful in life, or at those conducive to virtue, or at non-essentials. And there is no agreement as to what in fact does tend towards virtue. Men do not all prize most highly the same virtue, so naturally they differ also about the proper training for it (Aristotle, 370 B.C. as cited in Shaw's handout to students, 2005)

The degree to which Aristotle's words are still valid today is surprising. During the 20th century, five major philosophies of education were predominant: essentialism, progressivism, perennialism, existentialism, and behaviorism. These schools of thought, although very different, created frameworks within which curriculum choices and delivery systems were articulated.

The most traditional of the five philosophies is the essentialist philosophy, because it promotes a very basic approach to education where the essentials of academic knowledge and skills, coupled with character development, are taught. As discussed by Parkay and Hass (2000) in their book, Bagley, a champion of the essentialist philosophy, believed that our society has a basic core of common knowledge and that it should be transmitted to students systematically using a disciplined approach. The *essentials* refer to basic core curriculum subjects, such as history, math, natural science, foreign language, art, music, and literature.

In an essentialist approach, the teacher is the focus in the classroom and acts as a model both morally and intellectually. The teacher must make sure that the essential parts of the coursework are presented in consecutive order so that the students see the relevance of what the teacher is trying to teach (Kandel, 1961). “Gripping and enduring interests frequently, and in respect of higher interests almost always, grow out of initial learning efforts that are not intrinsically appealing and attractive” (Bagley, 1941, p. 201–202). Accountability is emphasized and students must master all the skills of a grade level before promotion to the next grade is considered. The objective of an essentialist style of schooling is to produce morally upright, productive, and knowledgeable citizens.

While essentialism became very popular and held a great deal of sway in the early 20th century, other educational philosophies began to emerge that viewed the child, rather than the teacher, as the central focus of the educational process. However, in 1983, the U.S. Department of Education published a report, *A Nation at Risk*, which brought about renewed support for the essentialist philosophy of education. The report was quite harsh in its criticism of the educational system:

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5)

Despite *A Nation at Risk*'s promotion of essentialism, this philosophy, especially in the technological age of the 21st century, remains much-criticized. "The volume of data has grown exponentially, and information technology has made accessing that data possible by many means. Traditional categories and disciplines are breaking down and recombining, and new fields of study are emerging" (Shaker, 2001, p. 26). Therefore, the focus on content as the essentialists espouse to be central to learning, began to take a back seat to the focus on how to process the information that is readily available to students.

The progressivist philosophy of education stands in direct contrast to that of essentialism. John Dewey, a noted philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer, was responsible for the success of the progressive education movement in the 1920s. As Hickman (2005) stated in his presentation to the American Educational Research Association, "In Dewey's view, the transmission of standardized knowledge, although easily and efficiently accomplished, simply does not contribute much to robust educational practice" (p. 4). The progressivist believes that the student, rather than the

teacher, is at the center of the curriculum. Dewey (1950), in a book on the philosophy of education, stated, “Experiences do not consist of externally presented material, but of interaction of native activities with the environment” (p. 93). Complete immersion in real-life problems and experiential learning is fostered, rather than the amassing of large amounts of information. “Learn by doing” is a favorite slogan of this child-centered educational philosophy. Curriculum in the progressive movement is designed to provide students with real-world experiences that center and focus on their actual lives.

The philosophy of perennialism, as its name suggests, is based in the premise that there are lasting and valuable ideas that remain consistent over time. In perennialism, these timeless ideas or concepts form the core of a curriculum that promotes thinking and reasoning. In discussing perennialism, Arif, Smiley, and Kulona (2005) stated:

Begun in the 1930s, Perennialism, deeply rooted in Realism, sought to educate rational people, and the curricula often were time-honored systems of texts like Mortimer Adler’s *Paideia Proposal*, or more recent examples like William Bennett’s *The Book of Virtues* or E. D. Hirsh’s *Cultural Literacy*. (p. 606)

Aristotle, circa 300 B.C., and St. Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century were the forerunners of this style of education. Frequently, in approaches based in perennialism, inquiry-based learning or the Socratic method is utilized to discover truths and beliefs that help the learner think through a situation and come up with new ideas and realizations. In the 20th century, Adler and Hutchins were considered the leading proponents of perennialism, and they promoted the reading of the classics in order to become intellectual citizens (Ediger, 1997). Hutchins and Adler (1963) suggested that reading the great books would provide insight into man’s understanding of the world and

also into man's understanding of himself. As such, the philosophy of perennialism is similar to essentialism in that both are teacher-centered rather than student-centered and both have a set curriculum that they follow. However, they differ in their content. While essentialism has a set body of knowledge based in the physical world, perennialism relies on a philosophical base to explore timeless concepts and to understand and analyze situations.

The philosophy of behaviorism is based on the influence of the external environment on learning and human behavior. In the early 20th century, Watson founded this school of thought and Skinner then later popularized it (Funder, 2001). In his book, Skinner (1974) noted that learning occurred when the learner responded to, or operated on, the environment. He coined the phrase *operant conditioning* to describe this action. The philosophy of behaviorism is based on observable, measurable experiences and the learner's reaction to the stimuli provided through the environment. As Price (1999) explained, "Educational behaviorism focuses on observable, measurable behavior and emphasizes the control of behavior through the manipulation of environmental conditions" (p. 4). The obvious drawback to this philosophy is that the psychological aspects of the student are not considered, since these aspects are not scientifically observable. However, the philosophy of behaviorism has had much influence on the educational approaches that are currently used with students with disabilities (Shoen, 2003).

In the early part of the 20th century, Watson (2005) determined that behaviorism was "a natural science that takes the whole field of human adjustments as its own" (p. 11). Closely associated with the field of psychology, Watson felt that in order to

scientifically study humans, behavior had to be made observable and measurable.

Therefore, he advocated an experimental approach that predicted man's activities through a stimulus and response system. Watson also believed that in order to fully understand man, the life history of all of his activities needed to be understood. Believing that behavior influenced all aspects of man, Watson (2005) stated:

Give me a dozen healthy infants, well-formed, and my own specified world to bring them up in and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select—doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant, chief and, yes, even beggar-man and thief—regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocations, and race of his ancestors. (p. 82)

Existentialism appears to be the most obscure educational philosophy of the five philosophies. This philosophy focuses on the student's ability to make sense of the world in which he or she lives. Students are given control over what they study, and they are allowed to select from a variety of curriculum options. Writing about existentialist philosophy, in his book, Noddings (1998) argued, "We create value through our choices" (p. 61).

Developed by such educational and social reformers as William Counts and Theodore Brameld, this theory promoted students rights for individualized and experiential education formats; however, it also suggested curricula should embrace more than just students' wishes and needs. . . . They maintained public school curricula should be concerned with and contribute to such issues as world peace, health care, and literacy. (Arif et al., 2005, p. 608)

In his book, Brameld (1955), speaking about the type of world existential education would create, explained:

In short, it should be a world in which the dreams of ancient Christianity and modern democracy are fused with modern technology and art into a culture that is controlled by the great majority of the people, who are the sovereign determiners of their own destiny. (p. 76)

Sartre (1985) put it more succinctly, stating, “Man is nothing else but what he makes of himself” (p. 15).

Each of these five educational philosophies has served as a basis for curriculum and delivery systems. Throughout the 20th century, each has been tapped in various ways and at different times to produce a variety of educational experiences for students. This bodes well for the student with disabilities, because these five educational philosophies provide options and opportunities that general educators and special educators can use to produce meaningful learning experiences for these students. “The search for an effective special education model is a legitimate one and it requires continual exchange between general educators and special educators. Many students with disabilities benefit from intensive one-on-one approaches, direct instruction, and strategy instruction” (McGrath, Johns, & Mathur, 2004, p. 71).

During the 20th century, students with disabilities were involved in a wide range of different placement options: separate schools for mild learning disabilities; residential schools for severe disabilities; self-contained classes in regular schools; resource rooms in regular schools; mainstreaming in the regular education classroom; pull-out of regular education classrooms; and, most recently, full inclusion into the regular education

classroom in the child's neighborhood school. Within each of these options, students were taught using specialized curriculum that were, to varying degrees, linked to the regular education curriculum. The degree to which this was possible depended very much on the philosophical approach prevalent at the time. At one point, "little attention was given to the connection between [students with disabilities'] work in the special education program and that of their peers moving rapidly through the general curriculum in the general education classroom" (Abell, Bauder, & Simmons, 2005, p. 82). However, for students with disabilities, access to the general curriculum is important. Accessing the regular curriculum simply means participating in all the activities that take place during a typical school day.

Students with disabilities should attend general education classes, participate in extracurricular clubs and activities, share lunch and breaks with peers, and contribute in meaningful ways to their school communities. Students with disabilities benefit in many ways from accessing the general curriculum.

(Cushing, Clark, Carter, & Kennedy, 2005, p. 6)

In 1975, the U.S. Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. This landmark legislation, also known as Public Law 94-142, was enacted to ensure that all children with disabilities would be given a free and appropriate public education (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975). This law also provided for an individualized education program for each student, which is a written statement composed by a team of professionals that delineates every aspect of the student's educational program. It is this act and its amendments that had the most impact on what

each classified child was to learn, where the instruction took place, and how this instruction was delivered.

The five educational philosophies have been important for the way in which students with disabilities have accessed the general education curriculum over time. In the traditional essentialist view of education, students with disabilities follow the conventional school day and participate with peers in a preset curriculum and are active in social activities with their counterparts. “Research findings indicate the numerous benefits that accessing the general curriculum has for students with significant cognitive disabilities” (Cushing et al., 2005, p. 7). In the perennialist philosophy, students who participate in the regular education curriculum are also exposed to the humanities. In his book, Brameld (1955) stated, “Most American perennialists are agreed that general education should be freely available to the largest possible majority” (p. 341).

However, cooperative learning strategies, derived from the progressivist educational philosophy, argue that students with disabilities can work in meaningful groups with their peers to solve real-world problems. “Cooperative learning has been advocated as a technique that promotes positive relationships between handicapped students and nonhandicapped students and assists the handicapped students’ academic achievement” (Tateyama-Sniezek, 1990, p. 426). The existentialist philosophy is fostered mostly through computer technology where students make sense of the world by making choices. “The role of the digital curriculum and accompanying technology is beginning to bring new perspectives to how students can be engaged and have more control over their own learning” (Abell et al., 2005, p. 82). Lastly, the behaviorist view is utilized mostly with students who are classified as autistic and adopts an applied behavior analysis

format to establish responsive and lasting learning experiences. Substantial contributions have been made in using applied behavior analysis as the basis for designing treatments that are useful in coping with a wide variety of behaviors related to autism (Laties & Mace, 1993).

Significance of the Study

The education of students with disabilities in the United States has been influenced by a myriad of government policies and historical events. An analytical report of how these influences have impacted the education of students with disabilities within the context of the American experience is important in developing a comprehensive view of the monumental changes that have occurred. “As the field of special education has grown precipitously over the last several decades, it has become increasingly important that we understand the history of this field, especially in relation to the issues and trends that have influenced practice” (McLeskey, 2004, p. 79).

This study is significant in that it:

1. traces the roots of educational opportunities for students with disabilities across a 56-year period;
2. offers an historical perspective of how the special education system has grown into its current sophisticated state;
3. provides a framework from which the reader can answer questions as to how the education of students with disabilities has progressed in the development and implementation of curriculum and delivery systems; and,
4. provides moral and ethical insights into the importance of the education of all of our citizens.

Methodology

As federal policies set the tone for state and local trends in education, this study will describe the federal educational policies enacted between 1950–2005 and the social, political, and economic contexts in which they were adopted. Sources of information will include federal education policy documents, State of the Union Addresses, educational reports, federal mandates, and other national records pertinent to the education of students with disabilities. This study will further analyze the influence of federal policies on the education of students with disabilities regarding curriculum and delivery systems in each decade. This study will present an analytical review of the educational policies used with students with disabilities during each of these decades within a framework consisting of the five educational philosophies (i.e., essentialism, perennialism, progressivism, existentialism, and behaviorism).

Main Research Question

What role did the social, political, and economic structure of the United States play in shaping federal education policy and what influence did that policy have on the way in which students with disabilities have been viewed and educated from 1950–2005?

Subsidiary Questions

1. From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

2. Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?
3. How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

Organization of the Study

This study consists of eight chapters. The first chapter provides information on the background of the problem, the purpose of the study, the importance of the study, the significance of the study, the study's methodology, the organization of the study, and background on the education of students with disabilities prior to 1950. It will also present the main research question and the subsidiary questions to be answered.

Chapters 2–6 will be devoted to one decade each, and chapter 7 will be devoted to the years 2000–2005. Each chapter will present a comprehensive review of the literature of that decade, including State of the Union Addresses and the federal policies that impacted the education of students with disabilities. Each chapter will also provide an analytical examination of federal policies and procedures that affected the curriculum and delivery systems implemented for students with disabilities in order to answer the subsidiary research questions. Chapter 8 will summarize the study and present a conclusion to the historical analysis and a scholarly interpretation of the results. This chapter will also make recommendations for future research.

Statement of Bias

This researcher is approaching this scholarly work utilizing internal criticism and the interpretation of multiple primary sources from the perspective of a public school administrator of 25 years. This researcher is not an historian, nor does this researcher

have any legal background. The statements in this work regarding litigation and/or court rulings are personal interpretations of primary and secondary sources and cannot be viewed as exact and correct, but rather only as the interpretations of one scholar. This researcher has been an administrator in a New Jersey public elementary school whose population includes students with disabilities, specifically students on the autism spectrum between ages 3–14.

In this scholarly work, education is interpreted and seen as part of the contemporary sociocultural, economic, and political world. The education of students with disabilities is viewed within the context of formal, educational, and schooling issues, as well as in terms of nonschooling issues within society as a whole. Causal inferences regarding the forward progress of the education of students with disabilities are presented. Underlying reasons for these interpretations are offered to illuminate the phenomenon.

CHAPTER II

Historical Review of the 1950s

Though history never repeats itself precisely, it does repeat its general themes, and it is helpful to know our past if we are to cope with our present.
(Stone, 2005, p. 1387)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the decade of the 1950s with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and educational policy and thought regarding curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Decade of the 1950s

The 1950s were a decade of change—from war weariness and uncertainty to hopefulness and economic stability—and a decade of tension. Although the American people had begun to feel secure after World War II, the spread of Communism throughout the world was deeply felt around the country. As part of a United Nations initiative, President Harry Truman joined in resisting Communism by placing American troops in South Korea (“The Korean War,” 2000). President Dwight Eisenhower successfully obtained a truce in Korea and spent his two terms in office working feverishly towards reducing Cold War tensions and keeping America on top of the international economy (Frost, 1999). As well, he promoted prosperity in a peacetime economy. During Eisenhower’s presidency, the United States underwent a tremendous period of growth in civil rights, art, architecture, music and literature, population, and

land acquisition. Kallen (1999a), in his book, explained well this contradiction: “The fifties may have been marred by racism and the threat of nuclear annihilation, but many Americans floated through those years on a cloud of prosperity and family values” (p. 52).

Education Policy During the Truman Presidency, the Final Years—1950–1953

There was no major emphasis on the education of students with disabilities during the Truman Presidency. In reviewing his State of the Union Addresses, Truman’s references to education discussed building more schools and training teachers, but there was no mention of students with disabilities (Truman, 1965a, 1965b, 1965c). Truman advocated for local control over education, as, at this time, the federal government’s attention was focused on external matters like postwar economic stability, the Korean conflict, and the threat of atomic war (Truman, 1966b).

Education Policy During the Eisenhower Presidency—1953–1961

Following in the footsteps of Truman, Eisenhower’s first three State of the Union Addresses were concerned with meeting the demands of an ever increasing student population for new schools and properly trained teachers, and no references to students with disabilities were found (Eisenhower, 1959, 1960a). In his fourth State of the Union Address, given the recent *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) decision, which declared that “separate was not equal,” Eisenhower stated that special attention needed to be given “to the problems of mentally retarded children” (Eisenhower, 1956b, p. 12). This written report was summarized in a radio broadcast to the American people. His Inaugural Addresses and his remaining State of the Union Addresses did not mention students with disabilities (Eisenhower, 1958a, 1958b, 1959,

1960a, 1960b, 1961a, 1961b). With the successful launching of Sputniks I and II towards the end of Eisenhower's second term, science, mathematics, and foreign language education were given new importance with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Garber, 2003).

Federal Education Legislation

Education during the 1950s was viewed in light of how it could support the defense efforts of the United States during the Korean conflict and the Cold War. The general attitude of the federal government towards education during the latter part of Truman's presidency and throughout Eisenhower's administration was that education was a matter for state and local communities to control. Therefore, very little federal activity with regard to education in general and, more specifically, to the education of students with disabilities was accomplished during this time. In a book about federal aid to education, Kaestle (2000) stated: "Nonetheless, this era in the history of federal aid is often summarized as simply a period of unsuccessful attempts to pass 'general' aid bills" (p. 19).

1. 1950 – PL 81-874. Impact Aid. Construction of new schools to compensate for the shortage in classroom space (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This law impacted students with disabilities, since they occupied classroom space in public schools.
2. 1950 – PL 81-815. Impact Aid. Operating expenditures for school districts accepting students due to federal defense activities in their communities (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This law was inclusive of all students, including students with disabilities.

3. 1958 – PL 85-864. National Defense Education Act. Encouraged in-depth study of math, science, and foreign languages through financial incentives. President Eisenhower was responding to the space race and the Cold War tactics of the Soviets when he authorized this act. The act also called for further study of how the mass media could be used more effectively in the schools (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This law impacted students with disabilities as curriculum for some special classes mimicked the regular education curriculum.
4. 1958 – PL 85-905. Films for the Deaf Act. A loan service was authorized by the federal government for films that were captioned for the deaf (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
5. 1958 – PL 85-926. Education of Mentally Retarded Children Act. Teacher training for teaching handicapped youngsters was supported through federal assistance (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

Education of Students With Disabilities – 1950–1959

There was very little federal legislation during the decade of the 1950s that advanced the education of students with disabilities. In his book linking federal policies and education during the 1950s, Cross (2004), a former assistant secretary in the U.S.

Department of Education, stated:

The politics of Congress, along with the failure of several presidents to pursue the issue of education support with vigor, conviction, and muscle combined to make the decade one of frustration. The only two federal actions of any significance for

public schools in the legislative arena were both tied to national defense, NDEA [National Defense Education Act] and Impact Aid. (p. 14)

The education legislation that was passed that dealt with students with disabilities was concerned with classroom space, the education of teachers for the handicapped, and the provision of materials that would assist in the education of the deaf. However, during this time, as Palmaffy (2001) has suggested, “two distinct movements converged to form a powerful lobby in pursuit of federal legislation to address the education of children with disabilities” (p. 3). These two movements were *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) and the rise of advocacy groups comprised of parents of children with disabilities. The *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) case, initially brought to the Supreme Court on racial grounds, eventually opened doors for students with disabilities to claim equal access to education and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (Yell et al., 1998).

It took some time, however, for this case to be linked to students with disabilities, but, once the precedent was established, sweeping changes were affected in educational policies concerning students with disabilities (Yell et al., 1998). In 1950, the National Association of Parents and Friends of Mentally Retarded Children (now known as The Arc) was founded. “Its establishment by parents and friends of retarded persons in 1950 was the result of a long history of rejection, isolation, professional neglect, and violation of basic human and constitutional rights” (Roos, 1977, p. 2). While parent groups and associations were active in the 1930s, it wasn’t until The Arc organized nationally and became a clearinghouse for information on mental retardation that a powerful legislative lobby was formed. According to the *Encyclopedia Americana*, two of the initial

objectives of this organization were to provide funds for research on mental retardation and to promote the welfare of all mentally retarded children (Hay, 1952).

Prior to the existence of a national advocacy organization, various associations held meetings to exchange information on support services and to provide a forum for the discussion of important topics, such as institutional conditions, legislation, and research. Members exchanged ideas about activities for children, such as the formation of play groups and social groups, programs or classes for those children who were ineligible for public school, therapy sessions for parents and students, vocational training, parent education programs, and job placement opportunities (Hay, 1952). These grassroots efforts provided a strong foundation for advocating for mentally retarded children, and, by the time a national organization was formed in 1950, its members already had direction and purpose. In 1953, The Arc developed a position statement entitled, "Educational Bill of Rights for the Retarded Child." This statement proclaimed that it was the right of every mentally retarded child to have "a program of education and training suited to his particular needs" (Zigler, Hodcapp, & Edison, 1990, p. 4).

In the 1950s, the formation of special classes for students with disabilities was permitted, and these students were allowed to enter the public schools. This change was widely accepted as the answer to bettering the educational situation of students with special needs. Tracking according to ability level was used to make schools more orderly and productive and clustering underachieving students together in these special classes provided a much needed answer to the schools' bureaucratic tendencies (Tropea, 1987). However, there was a lack of personnel adequately trained to teach these students, and,

therefore, the schools turned to institutions and advocacy organizations for teachers and curriculum.

The public school special class, as a new kind of service for the mentally retarded, naturally leaned heavily on the programs of the American institutions. The hallmark of the institutional training programs was to be deeply imprinted on American public school special classes. (Stevens, 1954, p. 60)

The curriculum utilized in the special classes also varied, depending on the disabilities manifested. “Oral approaches to communication were almost exclusively employed with deaf students; Braille was now used in the education of blind pupils” (Winzer, 1993, p. 371). In summing up the educational opportunities of children with disabilities at the end of the decade, one researcher stated:

We can look at our accomplishments and be proud of the progress we have made; but satisfaction with the past does not assure progress in the future. New developments, ideas, and facts may show us that our past practices have become out-moded. A growing child cannot remain static—he either grows or dies. We cannot become satisfied with a job one-third done. We have a long way to go before we can rest assured that the desires of the parents and the educational needs of handicapped children are being fulfilled. (Graham, 1960, p. 4, as cited in Dunn, 1968)

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be

determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. In the decade of the 1950s, although slight and meager, federal education policies did have an impact on the way in which students with disabilities were educated. This decade was one of awareness of the plight of the education of students with disabilities, rather than one of action.

In his State of the Union Address delivered on January 4, 1950, Truman urged Congress to create a National Science Foundation that could explore the peaceful use of atomic energy. Truman (1965a) also addressed the need to improve the education system in the United States:

We must take immediate steps to strengthen our educational system. In many parts of our country, young people are being handicapped for life because of a poor education. The rapidly increasing number of children of school age, coupled with the shortage of qualified teachers, makes this problem more critical each year. I believe that the congress should no longer delay in providing Federal assistance to the States so that they can maintain adequate schools. (p. 9)

However, within 6 months, the United States was once again engaged in a conflict. As part of a unified response with the United Nations, the United States entered the Korean Conflict on June 25, 1950 ("The Korean War," 2000).

In Truman's next State of the Union Address, delivered on January 8, 1951, education took a backseat to the need for keeping the world safe for democracy. President Truman outlined 10 major legislative initiatives for Congress and education was ninth on the list.

Ninth, aid to the States to meet the most urgent needs of our elementary and secondary schools. Some of our plans will have to be deferred for the time being. But we should do all we can to make sure our children are being trained as good and useful citizens in the critical times ahead. (Truman, 1965b, p. 12)

In his State of the Union Address given on January 9, 1952, Truman reiterated the need for federal aid to schools, even going so far as to call for new school construction.

We must begin our long deferred program of Federal aid to education—to help the States meet the present crisis in the operation of our schools. And we must help with the construction of schools in areas where they are critically needed because of the defense effort. (Truman, 1966a, p. 15)

President Truman's final State of the Union Address was presented in written form on January 7, 1953, after the election of Eisenhower to the presidency (Truman, 1966b). As there was not a special emphasis placed on education during the Truman Presidency, the final address had little to say concerning education.

Eisenhower took over the presidency during the population explosion of the late 1940s and early 1950s. The need for building new schools was great, since the population of students entering school systems across the nation increased exponentially throughout the 1950s. Eisenhower's first State of the Union Address referred to this increase, and its effect on the state of the schools. "Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1.5 million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country" (Eisenhower, 1960a, p. 32). He also mentioned the need for continuing the Impact Aid program for schools in communities where defense activities were prevalent.

In their book, Buddin, Gill, and Zimmer (2001) accurately explained the premise for providing federal funds to these communities: “The federal Impact Aid statute (Public Law 103-382) first passed in 1950, was originally intended for the sole purpose of providing financial relief to local school districts that were burdened (‘impacted’) by activities of the federal government” (p. 5). In this address, Eisenhower also called for the reauthorization of a bill designed to assist with school construction. Eisenhower’s attention to educational and social problems during his first year as president provided the impetus for the creation of a new cabinet department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In his second State of the Union Address, Eisenhower spoke about the creation of this new cabinet department. He also reiterated his devotion to expanding the role of the federal government in assisting needy districts in the construction of new schools and added teacher preparation to his list of concerns. “The nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population” (Eisenhower, 1960a, p. 20–21). While affirming that state and local responsibility for education policy was important, Eisenhower called for statewide conferences that would culminate in a national conference to make recommendations as to how to best address the problems of overcrowding and proper teacher preparation.

In this address, the president also voiced concern over the racial disharmony that existed at the time and directly responded to *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954). As Eisenhower said, “It is the inalienable right of every person, from childhood on, to have access to knowledge” (1959, p. 24). He was still committed to school construction, and he stated that he was anxious to hear the results of the White

House Conference on Education. He again made mention of the responsibilities of states and local communities in education, but stood firm on his commitment of federal government help for shortages in classroom space.

At the beginning of his fourth State of the Union Address, President Eisenhower informed the Congress that among the items that “still demand immediate attention [are] legislation for school and highway construction” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 3). Although in the previous 2 years the President had spoken of local control over education, he felt it was time for the federal government to take a more active, if only temporary role, in the matter of school construction. He was basing this on the outcomes of the White House Conference on Education, which decided that the problems of the nation’s schools should be shared by local, state, and federal agencies. “So far as the Federal share of the responsibility is concerned, I urge that Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 21).

The social concerns of the children of the United States such as juvenile delinquency and child welfare services along with the civil rights of all citizens to equal access to education may have sparked the President to include another area of need being “special attention to the problems of mentally retarded children” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 21). He advocated for vocational training and for increased research to understand fully the problems of mentally retarded children so that suitable solutions could be found. President Eisenhower was also responding to the social troubles of the nation in its desegregation efforts when he reported: “Today our schools face pressing problems— problems which will not yield to swift and easy solutions, or to any single action. They

will yield only to a continuing, active, formed effort by the people toward achieving better schools” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 20).

In his fifth State of the Union Address, the president called upon Congress to give high priority to passing legislation that would provide for school construction throughout the country for children of all races. The sentiment of this statement clearly reflected the unrest caused by desegregation efforts. The President stated, “I am hopeful that this program can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 23). Knowing that school integration would be a hard fought battle, Eisenhower further stated, “I urge the people in all sections of the country to approach these problems with calm and reason, with mutual understanding and good will and in the American tradition of deep respect for the orderly processes of law and justice” (Eisenhower, 1958a, p. 23).

Fears about the spread of Communism were brought to the forefront on October 4, 1957 when Sputnik I was successfully launched into space and again on November 3, 1957 with the launch of Sputnik II according to the NASA website (Garber, 2003). The American people were astounded that the Russians had beaten them into space, and the anxiety level in America was heightened. This anxiety was reflected in President Eisenhower’s sixth State of the Union Address when he doubled the funds made available to the National Science Foundation for the improvement of science education and encouraged Americans to work hard to create intellectual capital (Eisenhower, 1959). He also called upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to renew their efforts in the area of national security by encouraging quality teaching and by increasing opportunities for students.

Schools continued to be a difficult issue throughout 1958 with several schools closing in order to resist integration. In his seventh State of the Union Address, Eisenhower (1960a) stated: “The image of America abroad is not improved when school children, through closing of some of our schools and through no fault of their own, are deprived of their opportunity for an education” (p. 17). The president allowed the courts to deal with the issue of desegregation and supported their decisions. “One of the fundamental concepts of our constitutional system is that it guarantees to every individual, regardless of race, religion, or national origin, the equal protection of the law” (Eisenhower, 1960a, p. 17). Once again, Eisenhower strove to increase the role of the federal government in education by referring to the need for a national goal for all educators to insure quality education. “We must have teachers of competence. To obtain and hold them we need standards. We need a National Goal” (Eisenhower, 1960a, p. 11). Reacting to the need for increased knowledge in scientific matters, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was approved by Eisenhower. To insure trained experts of sufficient quality and quantity to meet U.S. national security needs, Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act of 1958, according to the U.S. Department of Education website (U.S. Department of Education, n.d., ¶2).

Eisenhower addressed the need for having competent teachers who are paid a decent salary, as well as the importance of having facilities that are well-equipped and that can accommodate the most up-to-date curriculum and teaching strategies. However, he felt that this should not be done with federal dollars. He rejected the notion of federal control over education policy, stating that the federal government should create a

program of carefully crafted incentives to help state and local policymakers eliminate deficiencies. Eisenhower continued:

This approach rejects the notion of Federal domination or control. It is workable, and should appeal to every American interested in advancement of our educational system in the traditional American way. I urge the Congress to take action upon it. (Eisenhower, 1961a, p. 15)

After the election of John F. Kennedy to the presidency, Eisenhower presented a last, written State of the Union Address on January 12, 1961 (Eisenhower, 1961b). In his ninth address, Eisenhower summarized the accomplishments of his two terms in office. He lauded the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for providing opportunities for students to develop in science, mathematics, and foreign language. This act also provided opportunities for teachers to become more skilled so that the quality of instruction would be strengthened. Eisenhower credited his administration for school construction programs that helped to meet current classroom demand and future enrollment projections. He also felt that strides towards leveling the racial playing field in education were accomplished. As Eisenhower noted: “This pioneering work in civil rights must go on. Not only because discrimination is morally wrong, but also because its impact is more than national—it is world-wide” (Eisenhower, 1961b, p. 927).

Although sparse federal education legislation and policy during the 1950s impacted the way in which students with disabilities were educated, both Truman and Eisenhower called for the federal government to assist state and local agencies by providing funds for the construction of new schools or additions to existing buildings so there would be room for all students, including students with disabilities, to be properly

educated. In addition, the enactment of the Education of Mentally Retarded Children Act during the Eisenhower administration provided federal resources for the training of teachers of the handicapped. During this decade, “the amount of special education funding increased and enrollments swelled; the preparation of personnel expanded, and state and financial commitment grew” (Winzer, 1993, p. 375).

The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) would also impact the way in which students with disabilities were educated, since it ruled that “separate is not equal” and mandated equal protection under the law. Advocacy groups for students with disabilities saw this ruling as the foundation for increasing services for their constituents. These grassroots efforts began lobbying for legislation on behalf of students with disabilities. Their efforts bore fruit in 1956, when Eisenhower argued for “special attention to the problems of the mentally retarded children” (1958a, p. 21). As Robinson and Robinson (1965) pointed out, “After World War II, special classes were again promoted enthusiastically. A large part of the impetus came from parents’ groups, who combined forces to demand special facilities for their handicapped children” (p. 460). In 1958, the federal government passed another law that directly affected students with specific disabilities, the Captioned Films for the Deaf Act.

Since the 1950s were a prosperous time for many Americans, they frowned upon more government, basking as they were in a liberalism they did not wish to abrogate (Kaestle, 2000). Therefore, they were satisfied with the federal government’s minimal involvement in setting national policy with regard to education. Throughout this decade,

the federal government took the stand that state and local agencies should be responsible for directing educational policies.

However, the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 turned the tide in the opposite direction, breaking through the barriers of staunch opposition to any type of federal government intervention in matters of education. Once those barriers were broken and the federal government became a source of funding and the creator of policy initiatives, schooling became a political issue. While this legislation impacted the education of students with disabilities by providing more classroom space for special classes, its more notable impact was in opening the door for increased federal regulation of education.

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

In reviewing the five educational philosophies, it is clear that at the outset of the 1950s, progressivism was most prevalent in America. This philosophy, according to Dewey (1950), was designed to make education more relevant to the interests and needs of the student. Instead of passive learning from teacher lectures and from books, this philosophy espoused active learning through experiences and projects. This philosophy, which advocated child-centered, experiential learning, was particularly suited to the education of students with disabilities, since, at this time, project-oriented work was the focus in special classes. This curriculum was taken over from the institutions that had once housed students with disabilities and who were now entering the public school system in record numbers.

These programs followed the progressivist philosophy, as students were actively engaged in projects such as the creation rugs, baskets, scrubbing brushes, or Swiss lace. “As the gospel of progressive education became general it was to find acceptance in special classes partly because the more formal academic programs were recognized as inadequate” (Stevens, 1954, p. 60). Winzer (1993) concurred with Stevens, writing, “Special education had a strong appeal as the logical extension of American Progressivism, in fact, some of what might be ascribed to progressive education was already in place in the special schools” (p. 371).

As the growing number of advocacy groups for students with disabilities became more vocal at the local, state, and federal levels, calls for improving the academic curriculum and strengthening delivery systems were voiced. These concerns were in sync with the growing dissatisfaction of most Americans with the way in which the educational community viewed and presented curriculum in the public schools. When the Soviets successfully launched Sputnik I and II, Americans responded by blaming the schools for providing inferior education. In his book, Macht (1998) noted that “Americans reacted to Sputnik by charging schools with failing to produce scientists and technicians needed for the U.S. to remain ahead internationally in technological development” (p. 46).

Post-Sputnik, a clear shift occurred with essentialism becoming the more favored school of thought. Americans wanted a back-to-basics approach and called for a more rigorous curriculum. Rury (2005) concurred, as in his book on social changes and education, he stated: “Progressive education fell out of favor with much of the public” (p. 183). As chronicled in their book, Ellis, Cogan, and Howey (1991) stated:

[This progressive] trend continued until the mid-twentieth century, when progressive schooling practices came under severe attack from both educators and lay people alike. . . . American schools and the education they provided were sharply criticized for letting the Soviets forge ahead in the space race. Critics demanded that the child-centered, activity-oriented schools of the progressive era be abandoned and that the focus return to the content of the basic disciplines. (pp. 89–90)

A clear shift from progressivism to essentialism occurred, and students in special classes were part of this change. The less structured, project-oriented curricula of the special classes started to drift towards a concentration on the three Rs, influenced by a demand for the transformation of the curriculum and delivery systems in these classes. This trend towards a more formalized academic program continued in the special classes, as the curriculum in these classes were thought to be a weakened version of the curriculum taught in the regular classes.

Of the other educational philosophies neither behaviorism, existentialism, nor perennialism played a role in any of the federal policies on education during the 1950s.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

Technology, for the purposes of this dissertation, is defined in a book consisting of a report by the commission on instructional technology, as “...the media born of the communication revolution which can be used for instructional purposes alongside the teacher, textbook, and blackboard” (Tickton, 1970, p. 21).

There were very few technological advances during the 1950s that impacted the education of students with disabilities. The Perkins' Brailier, developed in 1947 which printed large-type books, and the megascope, which magnified printed materials (Blackhurst & Edyburn, 2000), were two major instructional technology devices available at the time for students with disabilities. However, their introduction could not be considered major technological advances.

During the 1950s, when television was made accessible in mass production, its impact on education as a supplemental teaching device proved substantive. In his book, Cuban (1986) chronicled that "by the mid-1950s, a number of school districts using Ford Foundation grants, local funds, and corporate equipment plunged into televised instruction" (p. 29). Along with television, another major invention adopted in the educational realm during the 1950s that directly affected disabled students was the closed captioning of films. The federal government, in 1958, passed the Captioned Films for the Deaf Act and provided the financial resources for this service. "The primary rationale for laws such as [this one] was to provide technology resources that could be used to improve instruction for people with disabilities" (Blackhurst & Edyburn, 2000, p. 22).

Although technological advances did not flood the education market during the 1950s, there was much research during this decade that laid the foundations for the technological advances that would eventually change the ways in which students with disabilities live and learn. Inventions that were created by the defense industry were the basis for many of the amenities that were enjoyed by the American people during the 1950s (Kallen, 1999a). Most of the technology was developed first for defense or

business purposes and it would take some time before it was adapted for home and/or educational use.

CHAPTER III

Historical Review of the 1960s

Those who work with the mentally deficient are at the threshold of an adventure more exciting and more dramatic than anything we have seen. They have a serious responsibility and a great challenge. (Stevens, 1954, p. 70)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the 1960s with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and educational policy and thought regarding curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Decade of the 1960s

The 1960s were a decade of movements, choices, conflicts, and changes. The civil rights movement, the anti-Communist movement, the women's liberation movement, and the anti-Vietnam war movement were among the most vocal and most important pressure groups of the times. While not as popular, the consumer rights movement, the gay rights movement, and the environmental movement also made their debut in the 1960s.

Americans made social, moral, political, scientific, and technical choices. Conflicts between left-wing liberals and right-wing conservatives over timely issues often ended in violence and destruction. The result was radical change in all aspects of American life.

The Kennedy–Nixon debates were the first televised presidential debates ever and in them Kennedy dazzled audiences with his youthful charm and charisma. His exuberance provided for a new optimism during the unsettling Cold War era. Television

also brought the atrocities of the racist South into American living rooms, cruelly portraying Black Americans' struggle for civil rights. During the latter part of the decade, television transmitted the Vietnam War, anti-war demonstrations, and, almost nightly, the names of the thousands of Americans who died in combat.

The Cuban Missile Crisis terrified Americans with the threat of a nuclear war, and the assassination of President Kennedy was disheartening to the Nation. Although President Lyndon Johnson worked hard to overcome the country's unease and move the nation toward being a richer economic, moral and more socially tolerant society, the Vietnam War overshadowed his most valiant efforts. Johnson, in his Great Society proposal, called for a war on poverty and more progress in the area of civil rights. His administration passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the War on Poverty Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act, which were all landmark legislative acts. The conceptual intermingling of all three led to the foundation of the Head Start programs; Volunteers in Service To America, which was considered as an American Peace Corps; and the College Work-Study Program (Holland, 1999). Johnson's re-election to the presidency in 1964 affirmed the nation's confidence in him and marked the progress that had been made.

In April 1968, the leader of the civil rights movement, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. was killed, and, in June of the same year, Robert Kennedy, who had announced his candidacy for president, was also murdered. These events, coupled with the on-going war, moved the nation to the brink of despair. Johnson did not seek re-election, and Richard M. Nixon was elected to the presidency. Holland (1991) described well the challenges of this moment:

By the end of the sixties, American culture had been seriously challenged on every level, from the most trivial issues of hairstyle to matters of life, death, and what it means to be an American citizen. In the process, friendships, families, communities, and the country itself was in many ways shaken to the core. (p. 91)

Education Policy During the Kennedy Presidency—1960–1963

Immediately following the election, President-elect Kennedy created a Task Force on Education to address major issues in the field. In 1961, President Kennedy established the President's Panel on Mental Retardation and charged it with the responsibility of discovering solutions to the problems that people with mental retardation experience. The report of this panel, issued in 1962, prompted new legislation on behalf of the mentally retarded. In his Inaugural Address, Kennedy (1962a) did not refer to education at all. In his first two State of the Union Addresses (Kennedy, 1962b, 1963), Kennedy addressed education in broad terms, but did not mention students with disabilities. However, in his third State of the Union Address (Kennedy, 1964), Kennedy did address his concern for the mentally retarded living in institutions.

Education Policy During the Johnson Presidency—1963–1969

Following the death of President Kennedy, Johnson carried forward several initiatives which Kennedy had begun. He signed into law a higher education aid bill, as a monument to Kennedy. In 1964, Johnson also passed a strongly supported, Kennedy-initiated Civil Rights Bill that attacked racial discrimination in institutions. In his last State of the Union Address, Kennedy founded the Peace Corps and spoke about the founding of a domestic unit modeled after this international initiative (Kennedy, 1964). Acting on this, President Johnson founded the Volunteers in Service to America in 1964.

Federal Education Legislation

The 1960s were the beginning of the end of complete state and local control over education. The federal government took on greater responsibility with the passage of two landmark legislative actions: the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Civil Rights Act had a great impact on education, since it “forbade discrimination in any program receiving federal money” (Kaestle, 2000, p. 20). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, on the other hand, “put the federal government in a posture of considerable active intervention overseeing the way its money was being spent, so the resistance to desegregation was reinforced by resistance to detailed federal management of education” (Kaestle, 2000, p. 20). While these two acts were a turning point in shaping the federal role in education, vocal advocacy groups, amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, smaller pieces of legislation, and executive designations came about that began the process of assistance flowing to students with disabilities. The personal interests of the Presidents during the sixties also moved the plight of the disabled to the forefront.

During the 1960s, many important pieces of education legislation were passed. In the following, the contents of the most important examples are discussed in detail.

1. 1962 – President Kennedy signed the legislation that created the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Regarding research into mental retardation, this is “perhaps the most historically significant expression of policy commitment at the national level” (Baumeister, 1996, p. 39).

2. 1963 – PL 85-926. Broadened Eisenhower’s National Defense Education Act by including teacher training and research funding for a wider array of disabilities (Martin, Martin, & Terman, 1996).
3. 1963 – PL 88-164. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act. Based on the recommendation of the President’s Panel on Mental Retardation, this legislation “was developed by the Kennedy administration, passed by Congress, and signed by President Kennedy. . . on October 31, 1963; it was one of the last laws that he signed” (Alexander, 1966, p. 23). It provided for the construction of research facilities on the campuses of medical colleges and universities. It also stated that all hard of hearing, speech and visually impaired, deaf, mentally retarded, and physically disabled children must be educated. In their book, Cruickshank and Johnson (1967) noted: “The inclusion of the emotionally disturbed child within the purview of P.L. 88-164 stimulated an unprecedented activity in colleges and universities insofar as teacher preparation, demonstration, and research were concerned” (p. 52). As explained at the website of the Kennedy Library, this bill established the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, a new division in the U.S. Office of Education (Kennedy Library and Museum, 1963).
4. 1963 – PL 88-210. Vocational Education Act of 1963. Vocational education received the support of federal funds for schools, research, work-study programs, and training (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

5. 1965 – PL 89-10. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Grants were given to both elementary and secondary schools for the education of low-income students, instructional materials and supplementary services were provided, and research institutions and state agencies were given resources (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
6. 1965 – PL 89-313. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1965. Title I funds could be used for handicapped students who were currently in state institutions (Martin et al., 1996). “Congress in 1966 mandated a Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped (BEH) under Title VI of the ESEA [Elementary and Secondary Education Act], which also provided grants to states to initiate, expand, or improve programs for educating children with disabilities” (Martin et al., 1996, p. 27).
7. 1965 – PL 89-36. National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act provided resources for a residential, post-secondary school for the deaf (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
8. 1966 – President Johnson established the President’s Committee on Mental Retardation through Executive Order No. 11280. The committee was to act in an advisory capacity on relevant issues and future legislation with respect to the mentally retarded (Exec. Order No. 11280, 1996).
9. 1966 – PL 89-511. Library Services and Construction Act Amendments provided services for individuals who couldn’t read or use conventional printed materials as noted in a grant report completed by the National Institute

on Disability and Rehabilitation Research for the United States Department of Education (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

10. 1966 – PL 89-694. Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act. This act allowed Gallaudet College to establish and operate a secondary school for the deaf (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
11. 1967 – PL 90-170. Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967. These amendments made funds available for services rendered in community facilities for the mentally retarded (Baker & Bellordre, 2003). This law also required that all disabled children participate in physical education (Winzer, 1993).
12. 1968 – PL 90-247. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1968. These amendments established supplemental programs to support, expand, and improve services for students with disabilities (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
13. 1968 – PL 90-480. Architectural Barriers Act of 1968. This act stated that all new construction after 1969 must be barrier free and accommodate all disabled persons (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
14. 1968 – PL 90-538. The Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act. This act provided for early childhood educational programs for students with disabilities (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
15. 1968 – PL 90-576. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These amendments established that 10% of vocational education grant funds be earmarked for students with disabilities (Martin et al., 1996).

16. 1969 – PL 91-230. Children with Specific Learning Disabilities Act of 1969, Part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1969, Special Programs for Children with Specific Learning Disabilities. This act presented new terminology for specific learning disabilities as noted in Carrier's book (1986).

Education of Students With Disabilities—1960–1969

The 1960s brought a renewed sense of optimism concerning the education of students with disabilities. President Kennedy convened a President's Panel on Mental Retardation, and advocacy groups were ecstatic with this newfound support for their cause. In 1963, Kennedy created a new division in the U.S. Office of Education known as the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth. Johnson followed Kennedy in maintaining a vigilant focus on the disabled, as he was spurred on by Vice President Humphrey whose granddaughter had Down syndrome (Winzer, 1993).

The consciousness of America was raised during the 1960s, and humanitarian ideals were awakened. Equality of opportunity for blacks and women were ideas that were gaining momentum and with this came equality of opportunities for the disabled. "The deprived and the oppressed, and those who saw themselves that way, became more militant, and the civil rights movement brought decisive action to improve the lot of blacks, of Chicanos, of women, and of the disabled" (Winzer, 1993, p. 376).

In the second chapter of the book, *Mainstreaming: Problems, Potentials, and Perspectives*, Chaves (1977) stated:

The recent expansion of services for the handicapped can largely be explained by recent federal legislation. Legislative acts, such as Kennedy's signing in 1963 of

the Mental Retardation Facilities Act, which appropriated over \$50 million for the education of the handicapped, the establishment of the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth under the Office of Education, the appropriation of \$11 million during 1964-1965 for scholarships and fellowships for prospective teachers, supervisors, college teachers, and researchers of the handicapped (Connor, 1964) have made it quite obvious that the role of federal legislation in the advancement of special education has been unsurpassed by any other single factor. (p. 37)

Federal legislation began to provide much needed funds for research into the causes and effects of disabilities, so that more successful programs could be constructed. As Kirk and Bateman (1962) aptly stated at the time, “When we are able to diagnose disabilities accurately and then to prescribe appropriate remedial instruction to ameliorate these disabilities, we will have arrived one step closer to our goal—the development of a scientific pedagogy” (p. 78). Researchers focused on understanding how children learn and develop. Psychology joined with education and the fundamentals and applied nature of behavioral science began to emerge.

With federal monies available, and, due to the compassion, humanism, and democratic ideals that were so prevalent in the sixties, psychological discourse as to the process of education in terms of cognition, development, and behavior flourished, according to a book on curriculum (Marshall, Sears, & Shubert, 2000). Piaget described developmental stages of learning. Maslow theorized about humanism in the educational environment and based it on a hierarchy of needs, and Bruner specified that knowledge is a process and that learning calls for participation in that process (Ellis et al., 1991). Benjamin Bloom’s

1956 book, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*, which became popular in the 1960s, specified six levels of cognitive functioning, which moved from the acquisition of information to the formation of concepts and ideas. “Benjamin Bloom typifies the shift in emphasis from social and philosophical to psychological foundations in curriculum work” (Marshall et al., 2000, p. 33).

Another theorist who achieved notoriety and who advocated for democratic principles was Hilda Taba. Her 1962 landmark work, *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*, also contributed to the educational discourse on cognition via her “strategies of how the brain processes information and the conditions that facilitate meaning” (Costa & Loveall, 2002, p. 59). “Drawing on the principles of progressive education and on social psychological and cognitive developmental theory, Taba directed Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools, an antiprejudice project involving scores of cities in the United States” (Middaugh & Perlstein, 2005, p. 234). This psychological discourse on the learning process in relation to the education of students with disabilities had the most profound effect in the area of behavior.

Early in the 20th century, Watson, a noted psychologist, was the first to champion the behavioral movement. “Behaviorism was the work of several psychologists although it was John Broadus Watson who defined it, shaped it, promoted it, coined the terminology, and gave American psychology its behavioral footing” (Winzer, 1993, p. 307). Social scientists and theorists took an interest in Watson’s behavioristic view of learning and began to explore it in different ways.

Beginning in the 1960s, behaviorism swept from the arena of psychology into education with an air of authority that was startling. Schooling became structured

around the premise that if teachers provided the correct stimuli, then students would not only learn, but their learning could be measured through observations of student behaviors. (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002, ¶ 2)

“Watson set the stage for the work of B.F. Skinner and the proponents of the use of behavior modification in the classroom.” (Winzer, 1993, p. 259). Skinner is the psychologist most associated with behaviorism in modern American culture as his work was the most publicized and discussed (Rutherford, 2003). Throughout his research, which emphasized the use of positive reinforcement, the tenets of behavior modification were swiftly absorbed by special educators. Behavior modification and the use of token reinforcement began to be successfully utilized with general education students and, more importantly, with students classified as socially maladjusted, emotionally disturbed, and behaviorally disordered. In reporting on a study that had been done in a special education class, O’Leary and Becker (1967) summarized:

With the introduction of the token reinforcement program, an abrupt reduction in deviant behavior occurred. Delay of reinforcement was gradually increased to four days without increase in deviant behavior. The program was equally successful for all children observed, and anecdotal evidence suggests that the children’s appropriate behavior generalized to other school situations. (p. 637)

Psychologists began to explore and experiment in a sub-area of behavioral science known as applied behavior analysis. By the late 1960s, the general theories and practical applications of applied behavior analysis flooded the literature and were the driving force behind the establishment of the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, which was first published in 1968.

In the inaugural issue, some of the distinctive features of the field were described by Baer, Wolf, and Risley (1968) in a seminal article entitled “Some Current Dimensions of Applied Behavior Analysis.” This paper became perhaps the most highly referenced and reprinted article ever published in *JABA* and each of its three authors went on to become an editor of the journal, collectively guiding the first seven volumes. (Hayes, Rincover, & Solnick, 1980, p. 27)

The applied behavior analysis approach, as utilized in the treatment and education of challenged youngsters, would have a great impact in the coming decades.

By the end of the 1950s, the idea of special classes for students with disabilities was accepted as the universal remedy to these students’ educational needs. These special classes spilled over into the 1960s where, in the early part of the decade, parents were satisfied that their children were receiving specialized services. As Sigmon (1987) noted in his book analyzing special education, “During the 1950s and 1960s special classes became the preferred type of educational service for students with mild cognitive impairments, while residential institutions and special schools flourished for the blind, deaf, and physically handicapped” (p. 28).

However, throughout the nation, there were still permissive laws on the books stating that special classes were suitable only when students were deemed to be educable. In the book, *Rethinking Special Education for a New Century*, the authors of the second chapter stated: “Indeed, as recently as 1973, perhaps as many as one million students were denied enrollment in public schools solely on the basis of their disability” (Horn and Tynan, 2001, p. 23). Moreover, institutions were still utilized, as there were still many students not being serviced by the public schools. “For some, institutions were the only

facilities open to them. Programs for the multiply handicapped, preschool-aged handicapped, autistic, and brain-injured were practically nonexistent. Improvements still were needed, too, in the quality of services” (Chaves, 1977, p. 39). Not only were improvements needed, but a complete investigation into the conditions and practices in state institutions was warranted as evidenced by the abuses that were taking place.

In 1966, Blatt and Kaplan published a book of photographs entitled *Christmas in Purgatory* that depicted the deplorable conditions in several large institutions. The photographs showed poorly clothed or naked residents, residents locked in rooms whose only window was a rectangular piece of glass measuring 3x6 inches, and large, lonely day rooms with excrement smeared on the walls, floors, and ceilings. *Look* magazine published many of the photographs, which resulted in a public outcry (Zigler et al., 1990, p. 5).

In 1968, Lloyd Dunn, past president of The Council for Exceptional Children, wrote what has become a seminal article in the history of special education. Dunn, who for 20 years was an avid proponent of special classes for the education of the mentally retarded, began to question the ethical and moral suitability of this arrangement. In referring to the special class, Dunn (1968) strongly stated his changed position:

In my view, much of our past and present practices are morally and educationally wrong. We have been living at the mercy of general educators who have referred their problem children to us. And we have been generally ill-prepared and ineffective in educating these children. Let us stop being pressured into continuing and expanding a special education program that we know now to be undesirable for many of the children we are dedicated to serve. (p. 5)

As a much-respected man in the special education community, Dunn's article was widely read and discussed in educational circles and in advocacy groups. "Immediately after Dunn challenged special schools and special classes, a proliferation of supportive articles appeared in the literature" (Chaves, 1977, p. 40). The debate opened by Dunn raged throughout the later part of the 1960s and into the 1970s. The idea of special classes as the answer to the educational needs of students with disabilities was attacked, and the idea of mainstreaming these youngsters into regular education classes emerged.

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. During the period 1960–1969, federal legislation provided greater opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in public education programs. Research on mental retardation, spurred by money from the federal government, provided insight into meaningful and beneficial educational experiences for students with disabilities.

In his Inaugural Address delivered on January 20, 1961, Kennedy discussed the Cold War in broad terms and made no mention of domestic education (Kennedy, 1962a). However, in his first State of the Union Address given just 10 days later, Kennedy commented on the shortage of schools, especially colleges, and the need for trained, qualified personnel to fill these institutions. He called on Congress to give immediate redress by way of federal grants to help institutions and students pursue and meet their

educational goals (Kennedy, 1962b). Kennedy also broadened the scope of education to include other continents and countries and called for the development of a Peace Corps to assist in this endeavor.

In 1961, President Kennedy established the President's Panel on Mental Retardation and charged it with the responsibility for discovering solutions to the problems that people with mental retardation experience. The report of this panel, issued in 1962, prompted new legislation on behalf of the mentally retarded. This report was also the impetus for future federal involvement in the education of students with disabilities and increased financial aid to states to assist with these students' education (Alexander, 1996).

Kennedy stated in his second State of the Union Address delivered on January 11, 1962 that every American is entitled to a free and public education. He further stated that economically deprived youngsters should have hot lunches and fresh milk at school. He encouraged the Congress to act upon the bill he proposed to provide federal financial assistance for the construction of elementary schools and to increase teachers' salaries. In referencing education for all students, including students with disabilities, Kennedy (1963) stated:

Our program is to open to all the opportunity for steady and productive employment, to remove from all the handicap of arbitrary or irrational exclusion, to offer to all the facilities for education and health and welfare, to make society the servant of the individual and the individual the source of progress, and thus to realize for all the full promise of American life. (p. 9)

In 1962, Kennedy tried to get Congress to pass a bill entitled the National Education Improvement Act of 1962. This bill would have provided money for the construction of new facilities and for teachers' salaries. While this bill was defeated, both the House and the Senate worked hard to create successful education legislation, which they sent to the White House in early November. "Also passed were extensions of impact aid and vocational education and the first small program of assistance for educating disabled children" (Cross, 2004, p. 21).

In his third and final State of the Union Address, Kennedy was very specific in stating that the education of America's youth needed to include all children. He eloquently argued that every child matters and that a nation "is irreparably damaged, whenever any of its children is not educated to the full extent of his talent" (Kennedy, 1964, p. 13). His plan for creating a domestic Peace Corps included services for mental hospitals and for the handicapped, among other groups. Kennedy's (1964) strong and passionate statements further advanced the plight of students with disabilities. For example, he commented:

Finally, and of deep concern, I believe that the abandonment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded in the grim mercy of custodial institutions too often inflicts on them and on their families a needless cruelty which this Nation should not endure. The incidence of mental retardation in this country is three times as high as that of Sweden, for example—and that figure can and must be reduced. (p. 14)

Johnson delivered his first State of the Union Address on January 8, 1964, just 7 weeks after the assassination of Kennedy. He outlined his vision of America as a Great

Society and addressed education in the context of the war on poverty, stating that a lack of education was a symptom/cause of poverty and that he encouraged the Congress to recognize this and to do all they could to modernize existing school buildings, construct new buildings, and provide financial support for the training of teachers and guidance counselors (Johnson, 1965). Johnson felt that it was a moral obligation to educate every American, which included students with disabilities, and to abolish racial discrimination in the schools.

Johnson copied Kennedy's format of establishing committees and thus created his own Task Force on Education. This team focused their attention on the disadvantaged child, keeping with the themes of the war on poverty and the Great Society. One of the recommendations of this committee was to establish centers where remediation could be given and where programs for the disabled could be conducted (Cross, 2004).

After his election as president in 1964, Johnson's second State of the Union Address was delivered on January 4, 1965. Johnson continued with his idea of America as a Great Society and, regarding education, recommended that Congress pass legislation that would provide \$1,500 million to strengthen education at all levels. (This bill would be passed later that year as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965). He continued Kennedy's commitment to students with disabilities stating, "Community centers can help the mentally ill and improve health care for school-age children from poor families, including services for the mentally retarded" (Johnson, 1966a, p. 7). In his Inaugural Address given on January 20, 1965, Johnson (1966b) explored the theme of change and professed that education was important to the changing face of America.

Johnson's third State of the Union Address (Johnson, 1967) continued with his recommendations for providing the resources necessary for America to become a Great Society, including a commitment to the educational programs that were recently passed and action on the proposed Teacher Corps. He also wanted to further the education of children in the international community through early intervention programs. He also spoke of his upcoming proposal for an International Education Act.

The Equality of Educational Opportunity study, better known as the Coleman Report, was published in 1966. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the effects of federal aid on American schools. The premise was that the more money a school was given, the better the students would perform on standardized tests. However, the findings of this report did not substantiate this premise; rather, the report found that the child's home environment and social class had more to do with success than did the school. "By holding socioeconomic status constant, the Coleman Report concluded that the quality of a school (library, curriculum, building, teachers' qualifications, and so on) had very little independent effect on the academic performance of students" (Rossides, 2004, p. 5). This report served to fortify Johnson's appeal for educational opportunities for all, including students with disabilities.

In 1967, Johnson's State of the Union Address had few references to education, but it appears that all of them focused on students with disabilities. The first dealt with strengthening the Head Start program by starting it at age 3. He also called for the investigation of new methods of childhood development so that early intervention could alleviate future problems (Johnson, 1968). Johnson further mentioned that the television should be used as a supplemental educational aid.

In his fifth State of the Union Address delivered on January 17, 1968, Johnson (1970a) marginally addressed education and did so from a technological standpoint, indicating that children in the United States and other countries could be educated by satellite communications and televised instruction. He also referred to students with disabilities by inviting technological advances in medicine that would cure or prevent the many crippling diseases still faced by children.

Johnson's final State of the Union Address was delivered on January 14, 1969, following the election of Nixon to the presidency (Johnson, 1970b). In summing up his contribution to education, Johnson made the simple statement that "schools and school children all over America tonight are receiving Federal assistance to go to good schools" (Johnson, 1970b, p. 1264). This is quite an understatement since more federal assistance to education had been given by his administration than any preceding administration (as adjusted for inflation). In discussing students with disabilities, Johnson recommended that the costs of catastrophic illness be shared by families and the government.

The humanistic attitude of this decade permeated all aspects of life, including the political, educational, cultural, moral, and social arenas. Federal education policy was affected by this growing compassion for the rights of all oppressed peoples, and this mindset furthered the cause of students with disabilities. President Kennedy immediately mobilized committees within his administration to address the needs of the mentally retarded and established advisory groups to assist him in the creation of future legislation. He addressed the issue of education in all three of his State of the Union Addresses and specifically referred to helping the mentally ill and the mentally retarded in his final address (Kennedy, 1964). In keeping with their predecessors, both Kennedy and Johnson

advocated for an increase in the number of schools and the number of competent teachers to fill them (Johnson, 1965; Kennedy, 1962b).

While Kennedy's short-lived presidency prevented him from gaining the momentum to enact landmark education legislation, Johnson made up for it with his swift and dramatic victory in the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, which was "the nation's most comprehensive federal education bill to date" (Rury, 2005, p. 200). The timing of this federal initiative was germane to its success, as it was established within the context and conditions created by the civil rights movement and Johnson's War on Poverty. The passage of this bill directly tied education legislation to the moral, economic, and social health of the nation. Throughout his presidency, Johnson also upheld Kennedy's commitment to the disabled by enacting legislation that targeted students with disabilities.

The 1960s were a truly remarkable decade for federal education legislation that addressed the problems of handicapped youth. Among the most notable occurrences were: the formulation of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1961; the establishment of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in 1962; the construction of research facilities attached to universities designated in the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act in 1963; the establishment of the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth in 1963; and the organization of the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in 1966, along with other amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Snyder & Tan, 2005). The disability movement gained strength during this decade with advocacy groups vocalizing their concerns and successfully lobbying politicians for equal opportunities for

their constituents. “Throughout the 1960s federal and state assistance contributed to further expansion in special education” (Winzer, 1993, p. 377).

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

Rury (2005) clearly outlined the dynamic of the U.S. educational system in the 1960s: “The nation’s educational system was itself profoundly affected by ideological shifts and by underlying patterns of economic and demographic change” (p. 184). His statement is true in that social trends in postwar America had a profound impact on American schools and the way in which students with disabilities were viewed and educated. The changing face of schools across disabled, ethnic, and racial lines was most noticeable in big cities. However, disabled children coming out of the educational system often had difficulty finding work, as the number of unskilled jobs diminished as employers sought to hire an educated workforce.

At the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, a clear course had been set for curriculum development. The essentialist philosophy was adopted to support a back-to-basics approach that would restore national pride and educate students with an emphasis on science, mathematics, and foreign language. However, this focus became obscured during the turbulent 1960s. As Ravitch (1983), a noted historian and former Assistant Secretary of Education during the first Bush presidency, perceptively wrote in her book:

When the decade of the 1960s opened, the problems of the schools seemed solvable, if only enough talent, commitment and money could be mobilized; by

the late 1960s, the waning of national self-esteem was evident in the schools.

Where once there had been a clear sense of purpose about educational goals, there was uncertainty. The educational pendulum began to swing back toward a revival of progressivism (p. 234–235).

In this decade of change, the essentialist and the progressivist philosophies of education were not the only recognized philosophies, as it was at this moment that the philosophy of behaviorism began to emerge. “Progressive schools, adopting the tenets of John Dewey and other exponents of American progressivism in education, embraced behavioristic concepts” (Winzer, 1993, p. 309). Initially defined by Watson, a psychologist from the early 20th century, behaviorism rose to prominence during the 1960s with the work of Skinner. In Skinner’s work, behaviorism received its fullest explication and quickly spread to all areas of educational research and thinking.

Following from the turbulence and upheaval of the 1960s, existentialism was also a frequently employed educational philosophy. The numerous social movements based in the rights of certain groups of individuals brought about a sense of questioning what was really relevant, both within educational institutions and beyond. “Students’ causes expanded beyond war and racism to include demands for a greater role in university decision making and the right to choose their own courses and design their own curricula, preferably those that were ‘relevant’ to their interests,” noted Ravitch (2000) in her book (p. 385). As such, curricular offerings were expanded to include nonacademic, alternative courses.

Several shifts in educational philosophy can be seen during this decade. A shift from the essentialist philosophy, which emerged at the end of the 1950s, to a more

progressivist position occurred. This, in many ways, amounted to a return to progressivism. The introduction of behaviorism was also evident in its psychological and humanistic applications to education. Finally, the existentialist philosophy can be seen in certain manifestations of the counterculture movement, especially in those demanding an opening up of educational institutions to include more student input.

This researcher has found no evidence to suggest that the perennialist philosophy played any role in federal policies on education during the years 1960–1969.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

During the 1960s, research and conceptual advances, rather than any one specific invention, shaped the decade in terms of technology. In 1965, Blackhurst wrote an article for *Exceptional Children* in which he suggested ways in which future technology could impact special education. Using the terminology *student-subject matter interface*, he described how computers might be used with a variety of disabilities:

1. to assist blind children with the magnification of materials, to provide a colored background for easier reading for severely visually impaired students, or to give olfactory cues to determine location;
2. to provide adaptations for cerebral palsied and physically disabled students, which could be utilized with functional body parts, and to provide templates for typewriters or keyboards to ensure successful use;

3. to provide programmed instruction for deaf students along with on-screen facial representations that would assist in developing speech reading (lip reading);
4. to invent a device that would convert a written message to a classroom screen so that the speech-impaired student could effectively communicate with the class without being ridiculed;
5. to assist behavior disordered children through repetitive programmed instruction;
6. and to provide programmed instruction commensurate with intellectual levels where branching would account for individual differences (Blackhurst, 1965).

While Blackhurst's ideas would one day be implemented, the technology of this decade was unable to realize them. Computers were available; however, they were massive machines utilized for business applications, rather than in educational settings.

The one innovation that was utilized at this time was Skinner's teaching machine. The teaching machine was the precursor to computerized programmed instruction. While some felt that this technology would revolutionize education, others were critical of this device, feeling that it removed the bond between student and teacher that was essential to the learning process. "Popular articles in the early 1960s, besides noting the revolutionary potential of programmed instruction, also repeatedly reported the public's concern about the dehumanization of education through machine technology" (Rutherford, 2003, p. 9).

During this decade, electronics companies saw the economic potential of technology in the field of education and merged with publishing companies or bought them outright. "For example, in 1964, IBM merged with Science Research Associates; in

1965, Xerox purchased American Education Publications; and in the same year General Electric acquired Time, Inc.'s General Learning Corporation" (Silberman, 1966, as cited in Rutherford, 2003, p. 12). These conglomerates began producing programs that complemented their own technological devices.

There were few technological innovations during this decade that impacted students with disabilities. The laser cane, which produced a beam of light to keep the physically disabled on a straight path, became available. The first desktop and hand-held calculators were available and learning-disabled students were able to realize a certain amount of mathematical success using them. According to the website of Capacitance Electronic Discs, in 1966, the first acoustic modem was available for widespread use (CED, 2006). This device allowed the deaf to communicate by telephone. The IBM Selectric typewriter made it easier for the learning disabled child to produce printed material. Blind students benefited from the 8-track cassette tape as books-on-tape could be easily accessed and "read."

While the 1960s was the dawn of a new era in technology, practical applications had not yet caught up with technological research. Researchers in special education were beginning to see the implications that technology would have on students with disabilities. While technology was slowly seeping into mainstream America and educational settings, it would still be some time before students with disabilities would reap its benefits.

CHAPTER IV

Historical Review of the 1970s

In 1973, Lloyd Dunn, Ph.D. edited a book that presented the reader with a complete picture of how he felt schools should provide for the education of students with disabilities. In reviewing the past and looking forward to the future, he stated:

In the years ahead, both general and special educators are likely to be molded by a variety of changes which are taking place in society today. One force is a heightened awareness of the right of the individual to be different and to pursue his own goals in his own way. This new humanism should augur well for integrating more deviating students into general education. (Dunn, 1973, p. 57)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the 1970s with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and educational policy and thought regarding the curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Decade of the 1970s

The 1970s were a decade of transformations according to Britten and Mathless (1998) in their book on the decade. The rebels of the 1960s began settling into adult life, transforming their once alternative lifestyles into mainstream American culture. Amidst a severe economic downturn and a growing lack of confidence in the government, these once-radical activists began to look inward and to concern themselves with the protection of their families, rather than with political and social change. The shallowness of this decade was revealed in the phrase, “the me decade,” which was used to refer to the

heightened interest in self and diminished interest in the world at-large. As stated by Britten and Mathless (1998), “In the society as a whole preoccupation with self became so pronounced that writer Tom Wolfe labeled the ‘70s the Me Decade” (p. 30).

At the beginning of the 1970s, the Vietnam War was still raging. President Nixon, elected to office in 1969, pledged that he would swiftly put an end to the war. Instead, Nixon escalated the war with an invasion into Cambodia. However, “despite his periodic escalations of the war, Nixon was committed to pulling American troops out in favor of South Vietnamese forces—a policy he called Vietnamization” (Britten & Mathless, 1998, p. 24).

With the reduction of the number of troops in Vietnam in 1972, people felt that the Nixon administration was making an attempt to withdraw American forces. This, combined with a shrewd advertising campaign, won Nixon a landslide victory in the next presidential election. However, the confidence that the American people had in Nixon and his administration came to an abrupt end with the events that occurred between 1972–1974.

On June 17, 1972, intruders were discovered inside the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee, which led to an investigation and, ultimately, to the resignation of President Nixon from office on August 9, 1974 (*The Watergate Files*, 2005–2006). Prior to this, on October 10, 1973, Vice President Spiro Agnew resigned from his post due to charges of having accepted bribes (Potter & Schamel, 2001). Two men, never elected by the people to the offices of President and Vice President, would later serve in those positions, Gerald R. Ford and Nelson A. Rockefeller, respectively. While Ford would seek a term in office, his full pardon of President Nixon made many

Americans feel that he was part of the conspiracy and corruption of the Nixon presidency. Jimmy Carter was elected president and his administration saw through the end of the decade, which was marked by a misery index, endless gas lines, and American hostages in Iran. As noted in Stewart's (1999) book:

As the decade of the 1970s neared an end, few Americans had any sense of nostalgia about it. In a parody of the beginning of Charles Dicken's *A Tale of Two Cities*, one magazine editorial said of the '70s, "It was the worst of times, it was the worst of times," and urged that the decade end right away, "one year early and not a moment too soon." (p. 107)

Education Policy During the Nixon Presidency—1969–1974

In 1970, the Education of Handicapped Children Act was passed as Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1970. This act provided grants to states for the improvement of educational programs for students with disabilities and for the preparation of personnel to teach these students. In the same year, research into the education of the deaf was furthered with the establishment of the Kendall Demonstration School. In 1972, students with disabilities were included in Head Start programs with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972, and, in 1974, the Community Services Act insured that 10% of the children in those Head Start programs would consist of students with disabilities.

Education Policy During the Ford Presidency—1974–1977

As one of his first official acts, Ford signed the Nixon-initiated Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments bill on August 21, 1974. During his presidency, two major laws were passed that involved students with disabilities: the Education of the

Handicapped Act of 1974 and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. Also passed in 1974 was an extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act whose Section 504 would be later used by schools to bypass complying with stricter special education law requirements (Cross, 2004).

Education Policy During the Carter Presidency—1977–1981

In 1978, the Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Service, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments were passed. This law defined the term developmental disability, clarified university programs, and created the National Institute of Handicapped Research. In 1980, the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act was passed that insured the rights of all persons who were institutionalized. President Carter's administration was also responsible for creating the Department of Education as a cabinet-level position.

Federal Education Legislation

The federal role in education was gradually increasing. Since the language of Nixon's education proposals was frequently unacceptable to certain interest groups, few of his initiatives were enacted (Cross, 2004). However, during the Ford and Carter years, a great deal of education legislation was enacted and the Department of Education was created. In the following, the contents of the most important instances of legislation are discussed in some detail.

1. 1970 – PL 91-230. Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Programs, Extension. Established a National Commission on School Finance and authorized grants to states and local education agencies for comprehensive planning and evaluation (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This act also

created a separate act, The Education of the Handicapped Act, which authorized grants to states to assist them in initiating, expanding, and improving programs for the education of children with disabilities according to Horne's (1996) news digest, a publication of the National Center for Children and youth with Disabilities.

2. 1970 – PL 91-517. Developmental Disabilities Services And Construction Act of 1970. Provided federal support for programs for mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy (Sigmon, 1987).
3. 1970 – PL 91-587. Kendall Demonstration Elementary School Act. Federal funds were used to establish this school for the deaf at Gallaudet University, expanding its role to include research and dissemination (Sigmon, 1987).
4. 1972 – PL 92-318. Education Amendments of 1972. In addition to other changes, it “amended current U.S. Department of Education programs to increase their effectiveness and better meet special needs” (Snyder & Tan, 2005, p. 427).
5. 1972 – PL 92-424. Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. Handicapped students became eligible to participate in Head Start programs (Sigmon, 1987).
6. 1973 – PL 93-112. Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Revised the formula for grants supporting vocational rehabilitation; established a procedure for enforcing architectural barriers; included Section 504, which prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities in any federally subsidized programs; and

required that electronic and information technology be accessible to disabled persons (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

7. 1974 – PL 93-644. Community Services Act. Mandated that 10% of the children enrolled in Head Start programs must be children with disabilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
8. 1974 – PL 93-380. Education Amendments of 1974. Established a Center for Educational Statistics and consolidated other programs (Snyder & Tan, 2005). It also amended Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Education Act that served as the basis for how to provide financial assistance to and how to protect of the rights of handicapped children (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
9. 1975 – PL 94-103. Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act. Established a bill of rights and created funded services for persons with developmental disabilities. It also added new funding for university-affiliated facilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
10. 1975 – PL 94-142. Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Provided for the free and appropriate education of all handicapped youngsters, one which was designed to meet their unique needs (Snyder & Tan, 2005). It also stipulated that an individual education program be developed for each classified youngster and mandated placement in the least restrictive environment (Winzer, 1993).
11. 1976 – PL 94-482. The Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1976. Established that “10% of all state monies from federal funding were to be

used for vocational training of handicapped individuals of any age” (Sigmon, 1987, p. 27).

12. 1977 – PL 95-207. Career Education Incentive Act. Career education programs were established in elementary and secondary schools (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
13. 1978 – PL 95-602. Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments. Defined the term *developmental disability* and identified the functions of the university-affiliated programs; created the National Institute of Handicapped Research; and provided recreation programs, independent living centers, and comprehensive service centers for persons with disabilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
14. 1979 – PL 96-88. Department of Education Organization Act. Established a new cabinet level department, U.S. Department of Education (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

Education of Students With Disabilities—1970–1979

“Well into the 1970s, many professionals held segregated classes to be the most promising option for exceptional students” (Winzer, 1993, p. 380). On the other hand, many parents were dissatisfied with this situation, as they argued for equal rights and against segregated placements. Professionals joined in when research began to emerge that indicated that segregated classes for special needs students might not be the best placement.

Exceptional children should be integrated into the educational mainstream to the maximum extent possible and provided with special education services only when

necessary. Whenever possible special education should be made available through team teaching of regular and special teachers in the regular classroom. (Dunn, 1973, p. 53)

New solutions were being sought for integrative arrangements, which included a continuum of services and provisions that deemphasized segregated classes and favored assimilation strategies. According to Horn and Tynan (2001):

In the early 1970s, the federal courts, in response to litigation brought by parents of children with disabilities, began to rule that schools owed students equal protection under the law and could not discriminate against individual students on the basis of disability. (p. 24)

The first landmark case was *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, (1972, as cited in Horn & Tynan, 2001, p. 24), A group of mentally retarded children were denied admission to school because state law in Pennsylvania required that a child have a mental age of 5 years before being admitted. When the decision was made, “the district court found that all children have the ability to learn, regardless of having a disability, and cannot be denied a free and appropriate public education” (Sergen, 2005, ¶ 18). Yell et al. (1998) pointed out that once these children were admitted into the schools, the courts stated that placement should be in a program like that of their nondisabled peers. In their book, Sage and Burrello (1994) noted that “while the PARC case dealt only with children with mental retardation, it was closely followed by more comprehensive litigation in *Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia* (1972)” (p. 80).

This second landmark case, *Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia*, (1972, as cited in Horn & Tynan, 2001, p. 24)), broadened the scope of disabilities; dealt with due process in the event of suspensions, transfers, and expulsions; and addressed financial responsibilities.

The action was brought by the parents and guardians of seven children who presented a variety of disabilities including behavior problems, hyperactivity, epilepsy, mental retardation, and physical impairments. These seven children were certified as a class, thereby representing over 18,000 students who were denied or excluded from public education in Washington, D.C. (Yell et al., 1998, ¶ 29)

According to the National Council on Disability's position statement, Judge Waddy, the presiding judge in *Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia* (1972, as cited in Horn & Tynan, 2001, p. 24), refused to accept the defendant's argument that the education of these students would cost more than they could afford, stating that "the District of Columbia's interest in educating the excluded children clearly must outweigh its interest in preserving its financial resources" (Wright, 2005, p. 12). Furthermore, "Judge Waddy outlined very specific procedures for due process hearings. Many of these procedures were copied almost verbatim into the procedural safeguards of the Education for All [Handicapped] (EAHCA) Children Act in 1975" (Wright, 2005, p. 13).

The Mills case appears to have opened the door to a number of succeeding rulings that have established that children with disabilities have the right to an education and that it is unconstitutional to deny that right, that public funds must be

provided for educational opportunities for all children, and that legal redress in the courts is available if these rights are denied. (Sage & Burrello, 1994, p. 80)

With the decisions of *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1972, as cited in Horn & Tynan, 2001, p. 24) and *Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia* (1972, as cited in Horn & Tynan, 2001, p. 24) and with the growing demand by advocacy groups for legislation on behalf of students with disabilities, a sense of urgency for adopting legislation arose. Congress responded by passing the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Section 504 of this act stated that any organization receiving federal assistance could not discriminate on the basis of disability. Therefore, schools receiving federal resources had to enroll students with disabilities or give up their federal funds. While students with disabilities had to be admitted into the schools, this act did not specify the services they should receive.

Despite initial problems with implementation, the Rehabilitation Act provided much needed protections for students with disabilities. The Rehabilitation Act's main impact was in the area of higher education in the 1980s, as students with disabilities were attending colleges and universities in greater numbers and these institutions were now required to comply with the law in order to continue to receive federal funding. (Yell et al., 1998, ¶ 36)

According to a book on school law, students with disabilities in public schools were significantly affected by the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. This act caused a number of important changes in how they were educated and in what legal protections they were afforded (La Morte, 2005). Under this legislation exceptional children were, for

the first time, accorded the right to a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. Their parents or guardians were given the right of due process and confidentiality, and school boards were mandated to provide a range of educational services, an individual education plan for every exceptional student, and culturally fair testing. (Winzer, 1993, p. 382)

This single piece of legislation forever changed the way in which students with disabilities would be educated in the United States. As Mostert and Crockett (1999–2000) noted, “Pub. L. No. 94-142 radically transformed educational approaches and considerations for children and youth with disabilities and resulted in profound departures from previous educational configurations” (p. 140).

In order to receive services under this law, a child had to be eligible under one of the classifications stipulated in the law. The child was then evaluated by a multidisciplinary team using a variety of assessments to determine eligibility and present level of educational performance (Katsiyannis et al., 2001). An individual education program was then developed by the team with parental and, when possible, student input. Following the development of appropriate programming, the team then made the placement of the child in the least restrictive environment, which could be in a regular classroom with support services in the child’s neighborhood school (Katsiyannis et al., 2001).

Responding to the Education for All Handicapped Children Act’s least restrictive environment regulation, a variety of educational settings were made available to educate students. These settings differed from one district to the next depending on the needs of the students.

Educational settings fall on a continuum from highly restrictive (e.g., hospital and homebound placement), to moderately restrictive (e.g., special school and classes), to minimally restrictive (e.g., regular classroom with part-time special class placement, resource assistance, or consultation between the regular education teacher and a specialist). (Schloss, 1992, p. 235)

The movement of children with disabilities into regular classrooms came to be known as *mainstreaming*. Although this word was not used in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, it quickly entered popular and academic vocabularies (Wilcox & Wigle, 1997, p. 371).

During the 1970s, research using applied behavior analysis with students diagnosed by physicians as being on the autism spectrum occurred in clinics and specialized schools. Dr. O. Ivar Lovaas was, and is, the most acclaimed researcher in this field, as a result of his famous longitudinal study that began in 1970 at the University of California, Los Angeles. This project, titled the Young Autism Project, provided intense instruction using applied behavior analysis in a one-to-one instructional mode as described in their contribution to the book, *Evidence-based Psychotherapies for Children and Adolescents*, (Lovaas & Smith, 2003). However, this instructional strategy would not impact the public schools during this decade. At this time, the printed research had not been published, reviewed, and studied enough to sanction programming using this procedure in the public schools.

At the decade's end, placement and services for students with disabilities had significantly changed. Normalization—"which advocates making available to mentally retarded and other disabled persons patterns and conditions of everyday life that are as

close as possible to those of the mainstream society” (Winzer, 1993, p. 380)—was becoming accepted as the way in which students with disabilities should be educated. “Normalization prompted a powerful surge in the educational system toward abandoning many special classes and replacing them with regular class programs supported by special education services” (Winzer, 1993, p. 381).

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. The 1970s witnessed a number of important federal policy changes regarding the education of students with disabilities. Policies established during this period have withstood the test of time and have served as the basis for almost all future legislation concerning students with disabilities.

In his Inaugural Address given on January 20, 1969, President Nixon stated that our country could be proud that American children are better educated and listed one of the goals of his administration as excellence in education (Nixon, 1971a). In his first State of the Union Address delivered on January 22, 1970 and in his second State of the Union Address on January 22, 1971, he stated that governmental reform to produce a superior education was a goal of his administration (Nixon, 1971b, 1972). However, Nixon’s primary focus during both addresses was the shifting of power over education and other social services from the federal government to state and local municipalities.

The time has now come in America to reverse the flow of power and resources from the States and communities to Washington, and start power and resources flowing back from Washington to the States and communities and, more important, to the people all across America. (Nixon, 1972, p. 53)

During his first few years as president, court cases were filed in states across the nation that dealt with the formula used for distributing education funding: *McInnis v. Shapiro* (1968, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 368) and *McInnis v. Ogilvie* (1969, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 368) in Illinois; *Burruss v. Wilkerson* (1969, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 368) in Virginia; and *Serrano v. Priest* (1971, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 368) in California. In his third State of the Union Address, Nixon cited these cases as he spoke of the unfair effects of elevated property taxes on fixed-income residents.

We have long looked in this Nation to the local property tax as the main source of financing for public primary and secondary education. As a result, soaring school costs, soaring property tax rates now threaten both our communities and our schools. They threaten communities because property taxes, which more than doubled in the 10 years from 1960 to 70, have become one of the most oppressive and discriminatory of all taxes, hitting most cruelly at the elderly and the retired; and they threaten schools, as hard-pressed voters understandably reject new bond issues at the polls. The problem has been given even greater urgency by four recent court decisions, which have held that the conventional method of financing schools through local property taxes is discriminatory and unconstitutional.

(Nixon, 1974, p. 39)

Litigation on this issue, since this time, has permeated the courts in many other states, and court decisions have upheld the initial requirement that inequities in financing be corrected (La Morte, 2005).

The Nixon administration proposed the Emergency School Assistance Act to deal with desegregation and school busing; however, it would not be passed for another 2 years. In the interim, the Emergency School Aid Program was created, which gave financial assistance by rewarding districts that had successfully desegregated and which provided incentives for voluntary integration (Cross, 2004). In keeping with the formulation of policies of nondiscrimination, legislation on behalf of students with disabilities was passed as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1970. This act authorized a number of discretionary programs and also established a competitive grant program for local education agencies for research, demonstration, and personnel preparation (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

Higher education also got a boost early in the decade with the signing of the Education Amendments of 1972. Tacked on to this legislation was aid for desegregation and Title IX, which prohibited discrimination based on gender. “Although the 1972 bill put in place the most significant set of higher education programs ever enacted, the White House statement that day was all about school busing, as were the press stories that followed” (Cross, 2004, p. 50).

Nixon’s second Inaugural Address delivered on January 20, 1973 (Nixon, 1975a), and his fourth State of the Union Address presented in written form on February 2, 1973 (Nixon, 1975b), both sounded the theme of less federal intervention. In his last State of the Union Address, Nixon urged Congress to pass legislation with regard to education

and specifically mentioned affording more opportunities to the disadvantaged: “Special targeting will give special help to the truly disadvantaged among our people” (Nixon, 1975c, p. 51–52). The Emergency School Assistance Act proposed 2 years earlier passed both houses in early July; however, not in time for Nixon to sign it. President Nixon resigned on August 9, 1974 in the wake of a criminal investigation known as Watergate. In his resignation speech delivered the night before he left office, Nixon cited the major accomplishments of his 5 and 1/2 years. He did not mention education once (Nixon, 1975d).

Ford was President of the United States for only 2 and 1/2 years. In his three State of the Union Addresses, Ford’s major issues were restoring the faith of the American people in government and governmental leaders, capping energy consumption and building resources, developing positive foreign relations, restoring economic stability, strengthening defense measures, and effectively fighting crime (Ford, 1977, 1979a, 1979b). His second State of the Union Address was the only one that targeted education; however, it was grouped with other social concerns and dealt with the consolidation of federal programs and grants to allow states and local municipalities to have more say in how federal aid would be spent (Ford, 1979a). Ford would not be elected President, as his full and complete pardon of President Nixon sealed his fate “...Ford pardoned Nixon for his actions, sparing the nation a continuing agony, and in a single stroke of the pen, [paved] the way for the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976” (Cross, 2004, p. 53).

Although in office for only a short time, Ford made a profound difference in the education of students with disabilities. The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 included sweeping reforms regarding the free and appropriate public education of

handicapped children. Furthermore, this legislation insured that the education of handicapped students would be accomplished in the least restrictive environment possible.

President Carter took the oath of office and delivered his Inaugural Address on January 20, 1977. While no mention of education was made, Carter did start out with a quote from his high school teacher (Carter, 1977). In his first State of the Union Address delivered on January 19, 1978, Carter announced the creation of a separate Department of Education fulfilling a campaign promise made to the National Education Association (Carter, 1979). However, the new department would not be in place for at least 2 more years. During this same year, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments was being drafted. This act passed easily through the House and the Senate and was signed into law on November 1, 1978. In his second State of the Union Address on January 25, 1979, since the new Department of Education still had not been created, Carter urged the Congress to “extend major reorganization efforts to education” (Carter, 1980, p. 105). Carter’s third State of the Union Address addressed foreign concerns almost exclusively. When discussing domestic affairs, Carter did mention “a good education for every citizen” (Carter, 1981a, p. 200), but, clearly, the dangers present in world affairs took precedence.

Carter’s final State of the Union Address was presented in written form on January 16, 1981, after he was defeated by Ronald Reagan. In an extraordinarily lengthy report of painstaking detail, Carter cited the accomplishments of his administration. In the area of education, his greatest achievement was the creation of a new cabinet-level position, the Department of Education which “has given [education] a stronger voice at

the Federal level, while at the same time reserving the actual control and operation of education to states, localities, and private institutions” (Carter, 1981b, p. 2945). Carter specifically stated that budgetary requests for education were unprecedented and that they were particularly sensitive to the education of handicapped students. Carter also noted that, during his administration, Section 504 regulations were implemented for the first time to protect the rights of the handicapped in a variety of settings, including the classroom (Carter, 1981b). As Cross (2004) stated, “The Carter years were seen by many as the best of times. Education got a seat at the cabinet table in the West Wing, federal dollars increased substantially, and a score of new programs were created” (p. 70).

Federal policies developed in the 1970s followed those of the 1960s in trying to use the schools to achieve social, racial, and economic equity. Delay in school desegregation throughout the nation, particularly in the South, moved the federal government to enact more legislation. The funding formula utilized by many districts was notably criticized by Nixon in his 1972 State of the Union Address (Nixon, 1974). While the Nixon administration provided funding for successful school integration programs, Nixon advocated the defederalization of control over schools and greater local decision-making over spending federal funds.

Litigation in U.S. district courts furthered the concerns of students with disabilities. The Ford administration’s policy and enactment of legislation on behalf of this population created a great deal of legislative momentum. The federal role was firmly and forever established in the far-reaching requirements of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. “Atkins described the Education for All Handicapped Children Act as ‘one of the sharpest instruments of the

federal government into the details of teaching practice' because of its unprecedented specification of teacher behavior" (Ravitch, 1983, p. 317).

The establishment of the cabinet-level position, the Department of Education, was accomplished during the latter part of the Carter administration. This solidified the federal role in the bureaucratic creation of educational rules and regulations. Carter's administration was also responsible for a sizeable increase in funding for education. However, the increasing role of the federal government in education during the Carter administration raised fears about the "bureaucratization of the American classroom" (Ravitch, 1983, p. 317). In the end, the 1970s "ended with education having become somewhat of a national issue, even if for reasons that were more political and bureaucratic than substantive" (Cross, 2004, p. 70).

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

In the 1970s, the progressivist philosophy that was dominant at the end of the 1960s continued to hold sway. However, the existentialist philosophy also emerged as an important influence during the "me decade." Academic course work was not foremost in curricular offerings, rather a more general array of courses was available and these courses were considerably less rigorous than before. "Neither academic nor vocational, the general track consisted of courses such as driver education, general shop, remedial studies, consumer education, training for marriage and adulthood, health education, typing, and home economics" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 405).

The student activism, political forces, and social movements that characterized the 1960s persisted throughout the 1970s and profoundly affected American education. The distrust of the government permeated the educational community whose validity was seriously questioned by parents, students, and professionals. “Decline in the confidence of conventional curriculum thinking and practice bottomed out in the late 1970s, as did the decline in our national confidence” (Marshall et al., 2000, p. 147). Accountability for learning was discussed and testing programs to measure educational progress in the schools emerged. “In 1975, the state of the nation’s schools became a national political issue with the revelation in the press that scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) for college admission had fallen sharply since 1963-1964” (Ravitch, 2000, p. 403).

The essentialist philosophy was apparent as parental concerns were heard and school choice flourished with magnet schools cropping up in many communities. “Educational ‘alternative’ programs sprang up all across the land providing, in some communities, a number of viable schooling options for parents. They ranged from the most basic, traditional school programs to the most avant garde, and everything in between” (Ellis et al., 1991, p. 91). Ravitch (2000) concurred and also recognized the presence of essentialism in this decade, as she stated, “Some school districts created alternative schools in response to parents who wanted their children to attend a ‘fundamental’ school that emphasized traditional academics, a dress code, and good behavior” (p. 399).

While the behaviorist philosophy had become part of the educational landscape in the late 1960s, a solid foundation for research was just beginning to emerge in the 1970s. Useful applications of the principles of this philosophy and its direct impact on the public

school education of emotionally disturbed and behaviorally disordered students were in their infancy. Psychologists, psychiatrists, and behavior therapists were experimenting with the constructs of behaviorism in offices, clinics, and institutions; however, the transference of this knowledge into the public school classroom had yet to be realized as noted in a book by Kazdin (1978).

With the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, every student with a disability was required to have an individualized educational program. Depending on the unique needs of the child, the educational philosophy utilized to determine programming and subsequent placement differed. While one student may have benefited from educational experiences using the behaviorist philosophy, another might have responded better to educational experiences using progressivism, essentialism, existentialism, or perennialism.

The function of the IEP [individual education plan] product represents the multiple dimensions of a child as well as the multiple realities of its developers. An infinite number of dimensions is possible for one child, as well as across many children. The intent is for the multiple dimensions and the multiple realities to flow together in creating multiple best practices. Obviously, some of the best practices will be better suited to one child than to another. (Kaye & Aserlind, 1979, p. 140)

Therefore, shifts in educational philosophies that determine the programs and placements for students with disabilities will continuously be evident as individual education plans are written and implemented.

All five educational philosophies (i.e., essentialism, existentialism, progressivism, perennialism, and behaviorism) were reflected in the federal policies on education of students with disabilities during 1975–1979 due to the mandating of individualized educational programs for all students with disabilities.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

The regulations of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 stipulated that the education of students with disabilities must be done in the least restrictive environment. Students were entitled to receive special education services, as well as any related services necessary to accommodate their unique needs. A report by the U.S. Government Office of Technology Assessment noted, “It is these provisions of the act that have significant effects on the use of technologies by disabled children” (Kemp, 1982, p. 114). Determining the type and extent of services has been considerably debated for the past 30 years. However, at the time, examples were given as to what this terminology meant.

The examples themselves are not well defined; they include transportation, developmental and corrective services, speech pathology and audiology services, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, medical services for diagnostic or evaluation purposes, school health services, social work, and parent counseling and training. Decisions on what may be included under each example category still need to be made by local and State agencies and, ultimately, the courts. For example, a case on whether catheterization (a medical service) must be

provided is still being fought in the courts; the current status is that States do not have to provide that service. A second reason that 'related services' has been a difficult issue is that education agencies now have the responsibility for providing services that have historically been the domain of the medical community.

(Kemp, 1982, p. 115)

The individual education program, which dictates the type of related services that a child needs, will obviously impact the technologies that need to be provided for each child.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 also impacted the use of technology for the education of students with disabilities. This act provided for the enforcement of architectural barriers, elevators, ramps, lighting, widened doorways, and other facility and environmental modifications in schools to give disabled youth access to once inaccessible buildings and programs. In addition, this act required that electronic and information technology be made accessible to disabled persons. Therefore, any device that was on the market and that would fulfill the unique needs of these children had to be provided.

The 1970s witnessed the arrival of a number of advanced technologies to the marketplace, some of which were utilized in schools with students with disabilities. The daisy-wheel printer, dot-matrix printer, food processor, microprocessor, and the videocassette recorder were all invented in the early 1970s. Word processors, the ethernet, post-it notes, and the laser printer followed close behind. The ink-jet printer, the walkman, the first inter-networked transmission, and cellular phones finished off the decade. In the latter part of the 1970s, computers were available on a limited basis for use in homes and schools. The Apple II, Commodore PET, and Tandy TRS-80 were

introduced in 1977, but the next generation of these computers would not be utilized effectively in education until the next decade (Blackhurst & Edyburn, 2000). Rapid growth in the computer industry would take place in the 1980s and 1990s, and smaller and more powerful personal computers and digital assistants emerged then (*Columbia Encyclopedia*, 2004).

In order for educational technology for students with disabilities to be successfully utilized, a research and knowledge base must be established. The publication of articles in journals, which serve to provide professionals with current projects worthy of discussion or replication, were not available for most of the 1970s. Technology was so new in the 1970s that the *Journal of Special Education Technology* was only first published in 1978 (Blackhurst & Edyburn, 2000). However, the publication of this journal represented the expansion of educational and academic research and scholarship as a result of innovations in the field of special education technology.

The need for information dissemination is just as great at the delivery and use stages of the technology lifecycle as it is at the R&D, evaluation, and marketing stages. Only with the best possible information can an individual's needs, desires, and capabilities be appropriately matched with available technologies. Perhaps more important is that only with complete information on what technologies are available (on the market), how they perform, how they may be obtained, and how they may be funded can the best use be made of limited resources. Yet many of the numerous parties-at-interest, such as users, provider, and third party payers, who need such information have only small parts of it available. Thus, the

decisions made that result in an individual's use or disuse of a particular technology are often desirable only on a short-term basis. (Kemp, 1982, p. 131)

In the rapidly emerging field of technology, it behooves educational providers to keep abreast of the literature on the research and development of technological innovations for students with disabilities. Given the opportunity to use equipment customized to their specific needs, students with disabilities can achieve their educational potential with dignity and with a greater degree of ease.

CHAPTER V

Historical Review of the 1980s

Persons with disabilities have demonstrated again and again the incredible ability of the human spirit to triumph over adversity. Professionals in rehabilitation and special education and their partners, the families of persons with disabilities, have demonstrated the enormous commitment they have to creating a society that includes full participation for people with disabilities. (Martin, 1989, p. 273)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the 1980s with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and education policy and thought regarding the curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Decade of the 1980s

The 1980s were a decade of triumphs and tragedies, of decadence and monetary self-indulgence. The decade began with a big bang as Washington State's Mount St. Helens erupted "on May 18, 1980, producing the most spectacular natural disaster of the decade" (Britten & Mathless, 1999, p. 7) as chronicled in their book. The hostages in Iran were released the day Reagan took the oath of office; 3 months later, Reagan survived an attempted assassination. Relations with Russia improved as Gorbachev started *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (restructuring) in the Soviet Union according to Kallen's (1999b) book. The space shuttle Challenger exploded minutes after lift-off, and, the following year, insider trading fueled the stock market crash known as Black Monday.

The Berlin Wall came tumbling down, and the Vietnam Wall was erected, commemorating the soldiers who fought in that war.

According to the *Monthly Labor Review*, in the 1980s, technology had an increasing impact on schools, businesses, and the personal lives of all Americans (McConnell, 1996). Apple II computers hit the market and were quickly followed by the Macintosh. Computers literally changed the way Americans lived, worked, and attended school. “The personal-computer revolution had swept across the nation in less than a decade, and for the front-line participants it had been a wild, exhilarating ride” (Britten & Mathless, 1999, p. 81).

The importance of the personal computer cannot be overstated. At first the machines were complicated and expensive and confined to use by businesses. But the user-friendly features pioneered by the Palo Alto Research Center of Xerox (Xerox PARC), Apple, and others removed the mystery from computers and made them household items. (Kallen, 1999b, p. 97)

Education Policy During the Reagan Presidency—1982–1988

The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments were passed in 1983. This act was administered by the Office of Special Education Programs, which had replaced the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. This act clarified the education of students with disabilities in nonpublic schools, provided incentives for early intervention programs, and established information centers for parents. In 1984, the National Council on Disability became an independent federal agency. In 1986, a Commission for the Deaf was established, and the Handicapped Children’s Protection Act insured that legal fees would be paid when parents initiated due process hearings. In 1988, the Civil Rights

Restoration Act clarified the definition of an individual with a disability. In 1988 as well, grants were provided to states to provide assistive technology to individuals with disabilities.

Federal Education Legislation

“In the early 1980s, there was a palpable sense that something had to be done to improve educational standards. The galvanizing event was the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983” (Ravitch, 2000, p. 411). The powerful language contained in this report heightened the country’s sense that the educational system was floundering.

With 36 pages and an engaging title, *A Nation at Risk*, the bully pulpit for the federal role in education had been elevated to a new height. There would be no turning back. Education had become a national issue and the stakes would only become higher. (Cross, 2004, p. 78)

Since Reagan was for a reduction in the federal role, the legislation that was enacted during the 1980s mostly dealt with reauthorizing, consolidating, and clarifying old acts and with providing incentives for alternate funding sources. There were very few new initiatives. However, progress for students with disabilities was evident.

1. 1980 – PL 96-247. Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons. States could be sued for violations of the rights of persons who are in mental hospitals or facilities for the mentally retarded (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
2. 1983 – PL 98-199. Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments. Clarified the role of handicapped children in private schools and added the Architectural Barrier Amendment (Snyder & Tan, 2005). This act also provided incentives for early intervention programs and the establishment of

parent information centers. “All programs under EHA [Education of the Handicapped Act] became the responsibility of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), which by this time had replaced the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH)” (Horne, 1996, p. 7).

3. 1984 – PL 98-221. Rehabilitation Act Amendments. “Transformed the National Council on Disability from an Advisory Board in the Department of Education into an independent Federal agency” (Baker & Bellordre, 2003, p. 63).
4. 1984 – PL 98-524. Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. This act, which replaced the Vocational Education Act of 1963, secured funding for vocational education through 1989 and included assistance for handicapped and disadvantaged persons, incarcerated persons, single parents, and homemakers (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
5. 1986 – PL 99-371. Education of the Deaf Act. The name of Gallaudet College was changed to Gaullaudet University. In addition, a Commission on Education of the Deaf was established (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
6. 1986 – PL 99-372. Handicapped Children’s Protection Act. Parents of handicapped children were allowed to collect attorney’s fees for due process proceedings under the Education of the Handicapped Act (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
7. 1986 – PL 99-457. Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments. A new grant program was made available to states for the improvement of their early intervention systems (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

8. 1986 – PL 99-498. Higher Education Act Amendments. Provided financial assistance through grants and loans for construction or renovation so that institutions of higher education could become barrier free for disabled students (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
9. 1988 – PL 100-258. Civil Rights Restoration Act. Redefined the Rehabilitation Act's definition of an individual with a disability and broadened the coverage of Section 504 (Baker & Bellordre, 2005).
10. 1988 – PL 100-407. Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act. This act provided grants to states in order to develop programs for assistive technology (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
11. 1989 – PL 101-137. Children with Disabilities Temporary Care Reauthorization Act. Programs that were developed in the Crises Nurseries Act of 1986 and the Temporary Child Care for Handicapped Children were revised and extended (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
12. 1989 – PL 101-239. Childhood Education and Development Act. The funds necessary to maintain and expand the Head Start program were authorized, and child care services for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were included (Snyder & Tan, 2005). These programs directly impacted students with disabilities.

Education of Students With Disabilities—1980–1989

Educating the handicapped child in the 1980s began with the entitlement to a free and appropriate public education and placement in the least restrictive environment, following the requirements of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Since the

regulations for this law were not published until 1978, the 1980s were the testing ground for their implementation (Whorton, Siders, Fowler, & Naylor, 2000). “The notion of least restrictive environment refers to the type of program the handicapped student is placed into and the ancillary special education services to help maintain it” (Sigmon, 1987, p. 29). Through individual education programs, students were placed in a variety of settings, and this was often referred to as a continuum or cascade of services. A widely used glossary of special education terminology defined *continuum of services* as “a range of placement options and related services provided to students with disabilities that range from the most to least segregated educational settings” (Bui, 2003, ¶ 8).

Based on the work of Reynolds (1962), Deno (1970), and Dunn (1973), Sigmon (1987) developed his own continuum of services that consisted of eleven placements into what he called a hierarchy of increasingly less-restrictive programs. His model begins with total inclusion in the regular education classroom with no support services and ends with placement in home instruction. The other nine placements are a combination of accommodations within regular education programs in the neighborhood school, resource rooms, special classes, specialized schools, residential schools, and hospitals.

When a student is determined to be eligible for special education and related services and the program of instruction is agreed upon by a professional and parent/student team, the written individual education program determines the least restrictive environment. Since the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was passed, a great number of students have been moved from specialized schools or classes and placed in regular education classrooms in neighborhood schools, with or without support services. Resource rooms have also been utilized, wherein students spend a

portion of their day in intense, individualized instruction. In-class support is another method of helping students who are in the regular classroom; in this arrangement, a special education teacher co-teaches with a regular education teacher. Students may remain in their specialized classes or be placed in a regular education class all day or for a portion of the day.

This arrangement is often referred to in the literature as mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming can be defined as:

The provision of an appropriate educational opportunity for all handicapped students in the least restrictive alternative, based on individualized education programs, with procedural safeguards and parent involvement, and aimed at providing handicapped students with access to and constructive interaction with nonhandicapped peers. (Johnson & Johnson, 1980, p. 90)

Much controversy has surrounded the question of mainstreaming, due to the fact that some parents and professionals think that complete participation in regular educational programs will overcome any adverse problems facing students with disabilities.

Although the general philosophy receives almost universal support, there is a sharp division over whether all separate school or class settings are undesirable. Federal efforts to enforce this provision of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act have seemed to some to violate the act's promise of an available continuum of placements, as well as an important role for parental choice. (Martin, 1989, ¶ 11)

This difference of opinion produced divisiveness in the field of special education, and two opposing forces emerged in the second half of the 1980s, the abolitionists and conservationists.

Abolitionists want the elimination, or dramatic diminution, of the cascade of services. They call for an end to separate schools and facilities and for the integration of all children into home-schools, if not into mainstream classrooms. By contrast, conservationists are for the preservation of the cascade and the principle of the least restrictive environment. They argue that ‘an appropriate education for all children’ sometimes requires separate instruction and that the cascade of services ensures its delivery. (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1992, p. 413)

In addition to the concerns of parents and the educational community for the correct placement of handicapped students, mainstreaming was also controversial because regular education teachers’ attitudes and competencies were frequently questioned. Because of a lack of appropriate preparation, many educators do not know how to adapt and modify the curriculum and instructional programs to meet diverse student needs, deal with behavioral difficulties, and/or provide the specialized tools, techniques, and supports that some students will need to be successful in the mainstream. (Wilcox & Wigle, 1997, p. 379) “Elementary teachers must acquire new skills in working with students who are academically and socially disadvantaged” (Schloss, 1992, p. 242). “Regular class teachers should receive help from support personnel on how to make necessary accommodations within mainstream settings” (Deno, 1994, p. 381).

This was especially true in the education of students who presented with severe handicaps. While the education of students with severe handicaps was debated, for the

most part, specialized schools and programs were still considered as acceptable. Schools for students who were deaf and blind flourished and specialized schools for emotionally disturbed children existed. Programs for students with autism using Lovaas' applied behavior analysis approach appeared in the private and, to a lesser extent, the public sector. "Despite the proven effectiveness of the principles of applied behavior analysis (ABA) in producing academic and social behavior change, educators have been slow to accept educational procedures based on these principles" (Skinner & Hales, 1992, p. 219). Lack of knowledge and the training of regular education teachers were major problems to be overcome if handicapped children were to be mainstreamed.

During the 1980s, a new controversial issue entered the public debate, the regular education initiative, which had been previously debated in the professional literature. Referring to the regular education initiative, Davis (1989) noted that "the proposed merger of special and regular education into a unitary system has attracted both strong advocates and critics" (p. 440). Some felt that the marriage between regular and special education had already taken place with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, while others argued that a true unification had yet to be realized. One problem was that it was special educators, and not regular educators, who were fueling the debate (Davis, 1989). "Although the regular education initiative represents the ultimate object of mainstreaming principles, questions that revolve around the mainstreaming of exceptional students into the regular educational milieu remain the most controversial" (Winzer, 1993, p. 384).

In the 1980s, litigation was used to clarify some of the concepts in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. While the Education for All Handicapped Children

Act stated that all children were entitled to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, the terminology *least restrictive environment* and *free appropriate public education* were highly subjective.

La Morte (2005) described one of the landmark cases, *Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School v. Rowley* (1982, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 327), which centered on Amy Rowley, a deaf child. After a meeting between parents and professionals, it was determined that a regular kindergarten class was an appropriate placement for Amy. During her year in regular kindergarten, Amy was provided with an amplifying device. Amy not only successfully completed that year, she performed better than the average regular kindergarten student. Contrary to the district's recommendation, Amy's parents felt that a sign-language interpreter was necessary for her first-grade year. After lower court proceedings, the U.S. Supreme Court ultimately made the final ruling: "The Court held that schools need only provide sufficient services to 'permit the child to benefit educationally' . . . [rather than] maximize the potential of each child with a disability or to eliminate the effects of the disability as much as possible" (La Morte, 2005, p. 333). One outcome of this case was that the Supreme Court developed "a two-part test to be used by other courts to determine whether a school has met its obligations to provide a free and appropriate public education" (Drasgow, Yell, & Robinson, 2001, p. 360). Despite this development, the courts, in subsequent decisions, "have clung to a case-by-case approach in determining what an 'appropriate' education is" (Palmaffy, 2001, p. 11).

In *Daniel R. R. v. State Board of Education* (1989, as cited in Palmaffy, 2001, p.12), Daniel, a 6-year-old with Down syndrome, was placed in a regular education

classroom. Since his communication skills were that of a 2-year-old, the teacher had to devote an excessive amount of time to Daniel at the expense of the other students in the class. Thus, Daniel was placed in a separate, specialized class (Palmaffy, 2001). The parents sued but the court ruled against their request for placement in a regular classroom. The final ruling by the Fifth Circuit Appeals Court established a test that was used to determine first, whether the child was benefiting from the inclusive educational environment, and, second, if not, whether the school district was mainstreaming the child to the maximum extent appropriate.

The Fifth Circuit's two-part test has become the benchmark by which LRE [least restrictive environment] cases in the past 5 years have been decided. It has been a significant factor in most of the LRE cases decided since 1989. In some of these decisions, courts have used the test to order inclusive placements for students with severe disabilities. (Osborne & Dimattia, 1994, ¶ 13)

Another term in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act that was not clearly specified was "related services." In the case of *Irving Independent School District v. Tatro* (1984, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 337), a child born with spina bifida needed a clean intermittent catheterization performed every 3 to 4 hours to avoid injury to her kidneys. This procedure can be performed in minutes by a lay person who can be trained in an hour. La Morte (2005) stated: "The Court held that CIC was not a medical service that the school need only provide for purposes of diagnosis or evaluation but was a required related service necessary for the child to benefit from special education" (p. 337). The court also clarified that a nurse does not have to provide medicine or treatment

that can be performed outside the school day and that the schools are not qualified to perform services that can only be provided by a physician (La Morte, 2005).

The 'stay-put' provision of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was also cause for concern. It . . . requires that during the pendency of any proceedings, unless the school and parents agree otherwise, the child must remain in the then current education placement. This provision was made to guarantee consistency of education for the child during administrative and court proceedings. (Yell & Espin, 1990, ¶ 7)

This provision caused concern on two counts. First, parents who thought their students were not placed properly would remove them, relocating them to another setting (mostly private schools), and then sue the school district for tuition. In *Burlington Connecticut State Board of Education v. Department of Education* (1985, as cited in Yell & Espin, 1990, ¶ 8)), the parents of Michael Panico, a learning disabled pupil, disagreed with the individual education program, and pending review, moved Michael into a state-approved private school for special needs students without the permission of the school district. The final decision by the Supreme Court held that the individual education program was incorrect and that Burlington was responsible for tuition and tuition reimbursement and stipulated that if the original placement had been correct, the parents would have been liable for the tuition (Yell & Espin, 1990).

On the second count, the school district would suspend or expel disruptive students with disabilities, and parents protested. The school district excluded these students during the proceedings. An important consideration when handicapped students are disciplined is whether or not their actions are caused by their disability. "If a child's

behavior is a manifestation of a disability, it would be unfair to punish that child for behavior that was caused by the disability” (La Morte, 2005, p. 343). In *Honig v. Doe* (1988, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 341), “California school officials were attempting to expel two emotionally disturbed children from school indefinitely for violent and disruptive conduct related to their disabilities” (La Morte, 2005, p. 341). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a 10-day suspension could be imposed as a cooling-down period, during which the school district could try to reason with the parents that an interim placement was necessary and could pursue an individual education program review (La Morte, 2005).

Since attorney’s fees for due process hearings were a severe financial burden, some parents filed suit to recoup attorney’s fees, as current laws did not address this problem. The courts dealt with this issue on a case-by-case basis. “An analysis of this case law is difficult, because a number of disparate rulings have been issued by the federal courts” (Yell & Espin, 1990, ¶ 12). In *Anderson v. Thompson* (1981, as cited in Yell & Espin, 1990, ¶ 13), Monica Anderson’s parents disagreed with the placement of their daughter and challenged the individual education program. Although the court found in favor of the Andersons, the court failed to provide for any attorneys’ fees, stating that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was concerned with appropriate educational placement, not compensatory relief (Yell & Espin, 1990). This situation would be rectified by the passing of the Handicapped Children’s Protection Act of 1986, in which parents of handicapped children were allowed to collect attorney’s fees for due process proceedings (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

While the education of students with disabilities had progressed in the 1980s, controversy within the ranks of special and regular educators remained, especially concerning the existence of a dual system of education. At the heart of the controversy was the principle of mainstreaming and the degree to which handicapped students should participate in regular education classes. At the close of the decade, one critic was to comment that “the extent to which exceptional students can be profitably educated in association with their nondisabled peers is perhaps the dominant issue facing special education in North America” (Winzer, 1993, p. 384).

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. Federal education legislation and policy regarding students with disabilities during the 1980s focused on refining previous legislation. Federal education policy also concentrated on new initiatives in early intervention and assistive technology for use with students with disabilities.

During his campaign for the presidency, Reagan advocated abolishing Carter’s recent creation of the Department of Education. When it came to education, “the Reagan strategy had three major components: eliminating the federal department, consolidating programs, and reducing spending” (Cross, 2004, p. 75). Reagan (1982, 1988a) made no mention of education in either of his Inaugural Addresses. In fact, when his administration passed the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, it

consolidated 42 programs into only 7 programs. Reagan wanted to reduce the role of the federal government in matters of education, since he believed that “the states should be the primary educational agent. Consequently, he initially wanted to eliminate the newly created Department of Education and substantially cut federal aid to education” as noted in Berube’s (1991) book (p. 90).

True to his campaign, in his first State of the Union Address on January 26, 1982, Reagan stated that savings would occur through the “dismantling [of] the Department of Education” (Reagan, 1983, p. 74). Not only would this not happen, but then Secretary of Education, Terrel Bell, would catapult education to the forefront of the national consciousness, making it a national issue in the 1984 election. “What Bell had in mind was a restructuring that would create an independent agency of noncabinet status, roughly equivalent to the NSF [National Science Foundation]” (Cross, 2004, p. 76).

If any man was single-handedly responsible for the excellence school reform movement, he was Terrel Bell. As Reagan’s first secretary of education, Bell commissioned *A Nation at Risk* without presidential approval. He surreptitiously engineered a report he knew would be critical of education. His aim was to prod the president into exercising leadership in education. In the process, he launched a school reform movement. (Berube, 1991, p. 97)

On January 25, 1983, Reagan cited, in his second State of the Union Address, four major educational goals: upgrading math and science instruction, savings plans for college tuition, tuition tax credits for private school attendance, and prayer in the public schools (Reagan, 1984). However, in April of that year, the report, *A Nation At Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), was published, and this began

the excellence in education reform movement. The language in this report was powerful and inflammatory, as Bell had intended. Once the Reagan administration fully understood it, Reagan embraced the reforms that were proffered and made them the cornerstone of his educational platform.

From that point forward, efforts by the Reagan administration to scuttle the Department of Education dissolved, never to return, even though the Republican right wing—which dominated platform writing—would keep the abolishing of the department as an issue for years to come. (Cross, 2004, p. 79)

In his 1984 State of the Union Address, Reagan actually took credit for the production of *A Nation At Risk*, when he proudly stated, “Our children come first, and that’s why I established a bipartisan National Commission on Excellence in Education to help us chart a commonsense course for better education” (Reagan, 1986, p. 91).

Reagan was elected to a second term, and, while his second Inaugural Address neglected to mention education (Reagan, 1985a), his fourth State of the Union Address presented a radiant picture of education: “In the area of education, we’re returning to excellence... we’re stressing the basics of discipline, rigorous testing, and homework” (Reagan, 1988b, p. 133–134). In this same year, Secretary of Education Terrel Bell resigned out of frustration, and Reagan appointed William J. Bennett to take his place. Bennett was highly visible and argued for the “3 Cs” of education: content, character, and choice. According to Bennett (1988), during his tenure he advocated for curriculum and values education. Under Bennett, the most important national education issues were character education, parental choice, higher and rigorous standards, back-to-basics curriculum, and greater accountability.

Reagan's fifth State of the Union Address delivered on February 4, 1986 contained the same message as the previous year, with the addition of the ideas of vouchers and school prayer (Reagan, 1988c). In his sixth State of the Union Address, Reagan called for a "safe and drug free learning environment" (Reagan, 1989, p. 59). Reagan's final address touted excellence in educational reform during his administration noting:

We all know the story of the sixties and seventies—soaring spending, plummeting test scores—and that hopeful trend of the eighties, when we replaced an obsession with dollars with a commitment to quality, and test scores started back up.

There's a lesson here that we all should write on the blackboard a hundred times: In a child's education, money can never take the place of basics like discipline, hard work, and, yes, homework. (Reagan, 1990, p. 87)

In 1980, abolishing the Department of Education was foremost on the agenda of the new president, Ronald Reagan. However, his Secretary of Education, Terrel Bell, in an effort to focus Reagan's attention on educational concerns, formed the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The resultant report of this commission, *A Nation At Risk*, with its strong language and straightforward recommendations, established education as a national concern.

Noting problems of declining achievement in American schools, the report called for a massive reform of education, focusing on higher standards of performance. *A Nation at Risk* also served to deflect attacks on the Department of Education, but its overall impact was momentous. National polls showed a widespread public concern that education was slipping in quality, and that this was linked to

American economic strength. In short, schooling had simply become too important a part of the nation's social and economic life for the federal government not to play a leading role in formulating policy questions, and in funding key elements of the educational system. It became a political imperative that leaders of both parties could not ignore, yet another dimension of the human capital revolution. (Rury, 2005, p. 213)

Although this report announced that a major crisis in education was occurring, it did not lead to any resulting legislation, since Reagan was adamantly opposed to federal control over education. In explaining how rhetorical crises, such as *A Nation At Risk*, do not always have tangible consequences, Kaestle (2000) stated, "Because the Reagan administration was firmly committed to a reduction in the federal role, the legislative aspect of this crisis played itself out mostly at the state level" (p. 22).

Although Reagan was consistent in his views that a strong federal presence in the educational forum was wrong, he embraced the recommendations of *A Nation At Risk* and eventually made education one of his domestic topics. This was a far cry from his earlier stance on education, but his educational platform helped Reagan get re-elected in 1984.

With the appointment of Bennett as Secretary of Education, educational policies were continuously in the limelight. While reform was called for, few original education legislative initiatives were enacted. However, the laws that were passed favored handicapped individuals in education.

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

The essentialist philosophy was clearly the dominant philosophy during the decade of the 1980s. With the report of *A Nation At Risk*, Americans were shocked and realized that the current educational system was failing. This report documented the decline of the American student in all areas of instruction, particularly in the higher order thinking skills required in interpreting information. It also reported a serious decline in SAT scores and in scores on national tests in science and mathematics.

Recommendations called for an end to mediocre expectations and a drive for excellence in education. A back-to-basics curriculum, influenced by the essentialist philosophy, came back to the forefront of the debate (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

Individual education programs were still the vehicles that determined the placement of students with disabilities. Since the Education for All Handicapped Children Act called for the integration of handicapped students into regular education classes to the greatest extent possible, many students with disabilities moved into regular education classes where the essentialist philosophy presided. However, there were many students with severe disabilities who were still educated in specialized classes where applied behavior analysis methods were employed. Therefore, while the essentialist philosophy was dominant, other educational philosophies coexisted, depending on the individualized education program prescribed.

All five educational philosophies (i.e., essentialism, existentialism, progressivism, perennialism, and behaviorism) were reflected in federal policies for the education of students with disabilities during the 1980s, due to the individualized educational programs used to meet these students' unique educational needs.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

The invention of the microprocessor or microchip, and its subsequent mass marketing in the form of personal computers and assistive devices, was the impetus for the technological revolution that took place during the 1980s. Handicapped students benefited greatly from devices that provided them with numerous educational advantages. Customized hardware and software offered handicapped students access to learning in a variety of modalities. For example, blind students used Braille 'n Speak, which was a "pocket-sized, battery-operated note-taker with a Braille keyboard and speech output," and Light Talker, "a device that uses an optical headpointer, speech synthesis and special software to allow non-speaking students to 'talk'" (Tyre, 1988, ¶ 10).

The Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 coined the phrase *assistive technology* and defined it as any item, piece of equipment, or product, whether acquired commercially, off the shelf, modified or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities. As explained in a book chapter by Blackhurst and Lahm (2000), "The purpose of the Tech Act is to provide financial assistance to the states to enable them to

conduct needs assessments, identify technology resources, provide assistive technology services, and conduct public awareness programs, among other beneficial activities” (p. 12). This act would insure that students with disabilities were provided with the technology necessary for them to be successful students.

While there were numerous software and hardware programs on the market, assistive devices needed to be customized to meet the needs of the handicapped individual. “The types of activities enhanced by the use of technology vary according to the needs of the students” (Tyre, 1988, ¶ 19). Careful and thorough evaluation and assessment of the disability combined with knowledge of assistive devices can best match the student with the enabling apparatus or provide directionality for the creation of the necessary product.

Basically, a product’s features and functions should be carefully studied, yet the ‘intended’ applications taken only as a starting point. Educators working with students who need extra support and nurturing realize that each student is different. It is that instructor’s mission to find as many materials as possible to help special students reach their full potential. (Greenfield, 1992, ¶ 45)

CHAPTER VI

Historical Review of the 1990s

Although questions about the integration of students with disabilities should no longer be controversial, passionate discussion about inclusion continues to escalate because its philosophy not only focuses on students with disabilities of any type and severity level, but also seeks to alter the education for all students and hence general education.
(Kavale & Forness, 2000, p. 279)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the 1990s with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and education policy and thought regarding the curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Decade of the 1990s

While the United States entered the 1990s as a peaceful nation in world affairs, the racial, economic, and political situation at home was in turmoil. Millions of Americans lost their jobs to corporate downsizing, to the closing of military installations, to outsourcing to labor-cheap countries, and to advances in automation. Unemployment rose to 7.5%, and the number of uninsured Americans skyrocketed to 37.4 million (Kallen, 1999c). Racial divisiveness was brought to the forefront, as the beating of Rodney King by L.A. police officers and their subsequent acquittal, caused riots in South Central Los Angeles as chronicled in Somerville's (2000) book.

George H. W. Bush brought the United States through two foreign conflicts: the invasion in Panama, Operation Just Cause, and the invasion in the Persian Gulf,

Operation Desert Storm. While the success of Desert Storm raised President Bush's approval ratings, his inability to deal with domestic economic woes prevented him from winning a second term in office. In 1992, William Jefferson Clinton won the presidential election with Albert Gore as his running mate.

Clinton had difficulty enacting many of his campaign promises, two of which were gay rights and health care reform. The one major accomplishment during Clinton's first term was the successful enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act, which affected millions of Americans on welfare (Kallen, 1999c). Hints of scandals also appeared during Clinton's first term, but, because the economy was improving, these distractions did not negatively impact the popularity of this president who was elected to a second term in 1996.

Racial issues and violence on the home front also were prevalent during Clinton's presidency, as seen in the O. J. Simpson trial, the World Trade Center bombings, the raid on the Branch Davidian compound in Waco, Texas, and the Oklahoma City Federal Building bombing. In addition, the massacre in Littleton, Colorado proved to be one of the most tragic school shootings to date (Somerville, 2000).

Clinton's second term was riddled with personal controversy. Impeachment proceedings were initiated for perjury and obstruction of justice, but, in the end, Clinton prevailed. "When Clinton appeared on national television to apologize to his wife and the country for his indiscretions, his ratings, remarkably, climbed. Americans appeared to feel sorry for Clinton. With no help from an overzealous media, he survived" (Somerville, 2000, p. 28).

The single, most important event during the 1990s was the invention of the world wide web. Initially used by scientists, this instant communication tool filtered into the lives of any person who had access to a computer (Traylor, 1999). During the 1990s, the immediate exchange of information was not only used by doctors to save the lives of patients, but by big businesses as well to conduct and to speed up the course of business (Kallen, 1999c).

Education Policy During the George H. W. Bush Presidency—1989–1993

In 1990, the Americans With Disabilities Act was passed along with a reauthorization of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, now referred to as the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. In that same year, the Developmental Disabilities Act Amendments were also passed. In 1991, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act extended programs to infants and toddlers.

Education Policy During the Clinton Presidency—1993–2000

In 1994, the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 was reauthorized, and this renewed version advocated for more consumer intervention in assistive technology for students with disabilities. In 1993, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Amendments were passed, which updated and rewrote programs of national significance. In that same year, school-to-work programs for students with disabilities were strengthened, and support services for families of students with disabilities were provided. In 1996, companies manufacturing telecommunication devices were instructed to make these devices accessible to students with disabilities. In 1997, the Individuals With Disabilities Act was

reauthorized to include early interventions for students with disabilities and access to general education curriculum by all students with disabilities.

Federal Education Legislation

During the 1990s, the federal role in education was significantly expanded. Since Clinton had been instrumental in formulating educational policy during the Bush presidency, he carried out the same objectives and focused on the same policy issues, with some minor variations, throughout his own two terms. Education, as a federal concern, was on solid ground. Under Bush and Clinton, accountability for teaching and learning, systemic reform, and excellence in education all remained fundamental principles that guided legislation. Educational legislation that was enacted included:

1. 1990 – PL 101-336. Americans with Disabilities Act. “Guaranteed the civil rights of people with disabilities by prohibiting the discrimination against anyone who has a mental or physical disability in the area of employment, public services, transportation, public accommodations, and telecommunications” (Baker & Bellodre, 2003, p. 67).
2. 1990 – PL 101-392. Carl D. Perkins Vocational Educational Applied Technology Amendments. Assured that students with disabilities would have access to qualified vocational and supplementary programs (Baker & Bellodre, 2003).
3. 1990 – PL 101-476. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments. Education of the Handicapped Act was renamed and programs that supported transition services and secured assistive technology for students with

disabilities were reauthorized (Baker & Bellordre, 2003). Autism and traumatic brain injury were added to eligibility categories (Horne, 1996).

4. 1990 – PL 101-496. Developmental Disabilities Act Amendments. Reauthorized programs already in existence under this act (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
5. 1990 – PL 101-508. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. Established financial arrangements for student aid (Snyder & Tan, 2005). It also supported community living situations for the mentally retarded and related disabling conditions (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
6. 1991 – PL 102-119. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA]. Support programs were extended and toddler's and infant's programs were enhanced (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
7. 1991 – PL 102-166. Civil Rights Act. Rectified previous U.S. Supreme Court decisions regarding employment discrimination and established the Technical Assistance Training Institute. This act also authorized the payment of damages that were incurred citing the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Baker & Bellordre, 2003; Snyder & Tan, 2005).
8. 1992 – PL 102-569. Rehabilitation Act Amendments. This act afforded greater participation in the process of rehabilitation, access to rehabilitation was granted to the most significantly disabled persons, and career advancement opportunities were expanded (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
9. 1994 – PL 103-218. Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act Amendments. Reauthorized the Technology-Related

Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 and advocated for more consumer intervention in assistive technology (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

10. 1994 – PL 103-230. Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Amendments. University affiliated programs, advocacy systems, and programs of national significance were rewritten and updated (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
11. 1994 – PL 103-239. School-to-Work Opportunities Act. Funds were provided for transition programs that assisted students, including students with disabilities, with moving from school to work (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
12. 1994 – PL 103-382. Improving America's School Act. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides a framework of grants, was reauthorized. The IDEA was also amended to provide support services for families of students with disabilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
13. 1995 – PL 104-235. Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments. Supported programs that would assist the needs of families of students with disabilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
14. 1996 – PL 104-104. Telecommunications Act. This act stipulated that companies that manufactured telecommunication devices must make them accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).

15. 1996 – PL 104-183. Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act Amendments. Extended the original act in order to provide additional funding for stated programs (Baker & Bellordre, 2003).
16. 1997 – PL 105-17. Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments. This act extended appropriations for the IDEA to 2002 and amended certain provisions involving early interventions (Baker & Bellordre, 2003). These amendments also contained assessment conditions, which implied access to general education curriculum by students with disabilities (Abell et al., 2005).
17. 1998 – PL 105-394. Assistive Technology Act. Assistive needs of students with disabilities were addressed in the rewritten law replacing the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
18. 1999 – PL 106-98. Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act. Individuals with disabilities were provided access to health care coverage and work opportunities (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

Education of Students With Disabilities—1990–1999

With the renaming of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 as the IDEA of 1990, Congress expanded the definition of *disability* to include children with autism and children with traumatic brain injury (Horne, 1996). In this law, the word handicapped was replaced with the word disabled throughout the text. The IDEA also added related services, in particular assistive technology, therapeutic recreation, social work, and rehabilitation counseling.

The reauthorization of the IDEA in 1997 contained provisions to align curriculum, assessment, and standards for students with disabilities with regular education policies. However, the basic tenets of the IDEA remained the same: (a) provision for a free appropriate public education with related services that meet unique individual needs; (b) protection of the rights of parents or guardians, as well as of children with disabilities; (c) assistance to states in providing education for students with disabilities; and (d) assessment of efforts to educate students with disabilities (*Summary: Twenty-Second Annual Report*, 2000).

The education of students with disabilities during the 1990s, therefore, followed the principles established in the 1980s. Individual education programs were developed, and students with disabilities were placed in the least restrictive environment, with the regular education classroom to be considered as, but not mandated as, the first choice in placement decisions. Even though this procedure was to be followed throughout the 1990s, students with disabilities were still not moved into general education classes or into resource room environments to any great extent. Proponents of inclusive placements were disheartened by this and looked to statistics to support their position.

By 1990. . . only 1.2 percent more students with disabilities were in general education classes and resource room environments: 69.2 percent in 1990 compared with 68 percent in 1977. . . . Investigators discovered that every state was out of compliance with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and that U.S. officials are not enforcing compliance. (Kluth, Villa, & Thousand, 2002, p. 24)

The controversy that existed in the 1980s regarding the directionality of special education continued well into the 1990s. Researchers in the field still debated and disagreed with each other as to the dual educational system and its benefits and shortcomings. “Special education is under fire from within and without, and the disability community, long known for its cohesiveness appears to be coming apart at the seams” (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995, p. 522). This disjointed attitude permeated the schools as educators, dependent upon their perceived definitions and belief systems, placed students with disabilities in a variety of settings—either locating them in regular education classrooms with no supports, placing them in segregated special classes with supportive services, or anywhere in between.

Within the research of the time, multiple interpretations of the term *inclusion* existed. One model, full inclusion, described abolishing the continuum of placements and placing all students with disabilities in regular education classrooms with support services given in that setting. Another model of inclusion incorporated the continuum of placements along with placement in the regular classroom (Crockett & Kauffman, 1998). Yet a third inclusion model, as described in the newspaper, *Education Week*, consisted of a separate, specialized school, mainly for students with emotional or behavioral problems, as part of an overall inclusion plan (Sack, 1997).

Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, completely opposed full inclusion. “Requiring all disabled children to be included in mainstream classrooms, regardless of their ability to function there, is not only unrealistic but also downright harmful – often for the children themselves” (Shanker, 1994-1995, p. 18). He further noted that because of the overwhelming costs of special education, districts were

advocating for full inclusion because it relieved them of financial burdens, since the federal government had not contributed the necessary funds to satisfy mandated policies.

Agreeing with Shanker were Douglas Fuchs and Lynn S. Fuchs, both Special Education Professors at John F. Kennedy Center, George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University in Tennessee.

Although we are sympathetic to the cost problem and recognize that in some districts too many students are placed in special education programs, we believe eliminating special education placements in the name of full inclusion will deprive many students with disabilities of an appropriate education. (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994–1995, p. 22)

They also pointed out that the least restrictive environment regulations in the IDEA included a continuum of alternate placements, indicating that Congress recognized that one option, the regular education classroom, for the education of children with disabilities was not acceptable (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994–1995). Other major disability-related organizations were also against full inclusion.

The [full-inclusionist] position is opposed by the American Council on the Blind, the Commission on the Education of the Deaf, the Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, the Council for Exceptional Children, and the Learning Disabilities Association, whose public statements strongly endorse special education placement options and, implicitly or explicitly, reject full inclusion. (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994–1995, p. 26)

An article in *U.S. News and World Report* declared that the placement of students with disabilities into regular education classrooms was harmful for all students, especially

if the student with a disability was violent (Leo, 1994). This article also claimed that districts were saving millions of dollars by placing students with disabilities in regular education classrooms and, thus, by not providing the services that they would normally have to provide in a special classroom.

The call for “full inclusion” should surely lead to some discussion about when exclusion is justified, what the financial and social costs of the program will be and what kind of learning will go on in classes where severe disturbance is allowed to set the tone. This movement has rolled along without enough input from the public. If it goes much further, it may turn out to be yet another advertisement for school-choice programs. (Leo, 1994, p. 22)

Mara Sapon-Shevin, a Professor of Education at Syracuse University, is an advocate of full inclusion. “It is very important for children to have the opportunity to learn and grow within communities that represent the kind of world they’ll live in when they finish school” (O’Neil, 1994–1995, p. 7). Sapon-Shevin argued that there should be only one education system for all children, and she realized that major reform was necessary for it to be successful (O’Neil, 1994–1995). “Inclusion really calls for a fundamental restructuring of the school districts and the schools. It means changes in the curriculum, changes of pedagogy, in staff allocation, teacher education, and so on” (O’Neil, 1994–1995, p. 9). Sapon-Shevin is passionate about full inclusion as representative of a diverse, democratic society.

When one person is oppressed, no one is free. When one student is not a full participant in his or her school community, then we are all at risk. By embracing

inclusion as a model of social justice, we can create a world fit for us all. (Sapon-Shevin, 2003, p. 28)

Margaret C. Wang, Professor of Educational Psychology at Temple University, Maynard C. Reynolds, Professor Emeritus of Educational Psychology at the University of Minnesota, and Herbert J. Walberg, Research Professor of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago, were also proponents of full inclusion. They believed that labeling students was harmful, and they challenged traditional approaches to the education of students with disabilities. The ten suggestions they proposed called for sweeping reforms of current practices, the prevention of learning problems, and changes in attitudes concerning the education of all children.

We desperately need to extend and improve early education programs and to develop all promising approaches to preventing learning problems. And we also must make systematic efforts to staff all schools with the most competent teachers available, especially urban schools with many students who need more educational support than usual. (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1994–1995, p. 16)

Cynthia L. Warger, an educational consultant, and Marleen C. Pugach, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, viewed full inclusion from a curriculum-centered approach. Their four-phase process includes orientation, problem identification, intervention, and closure (Warger & Pugach, 1996). “Curriculum-centered collaboration. . . lets educators focus their collective attention on the real barriers to student success and craft new environments where all students have a greater chance of success in school” (Warger & Pugach, 1996, p. 65).

In 1993, a study was done on the attitudes of general education teachers on including a student with severe disabilities in their classrooms. This study took place in Vermont and included 19 situations where dual sensory impaired students were included in the regular education classroom. The result of the study “reflects emerging support for the inclusion of students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms, and challenges traditional notions regarding the need for centralized special classes or special schools” (Giangreco, St. Denis, Cloninger, Edelman, & Schattman, 1993, p. 360).

Robert Slavin, Co-Director of the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University, had an entirely new vision of what should occur and called it *neverstreaming* (Slavin, 1996). Slavin felt that children do better if they meet with success in the learning process the first time anything is taught to them. The concept of neverstreaming puts emphasis on meaningful and strong early intervention programs that prevent students from failing in the first place.

Inclusion goes beyond returning students who have been in separate placements to the general education classroom. It incorporates an end to labeling students and shunting them out of the regular classroom to obtain needed services. It responds to Slavin’s call for ‘neverstreaming’ by establishing a refashioned mainstream, a restructured and unified school system that serves all students together. (Lipsky & Gartner, 1998, p. 81)

In addition to professional debates over the directionality of special education, parental concerns were voiced in the many court cases filed during the 1990s. In *Christy Greer v. Rome City School District* (1990–1991, as cited in Douvanis & Hulsey, 2002, ¶9), a kindergarten child with an IQ of 40 was placed in a self-contained kindergarten

classroom. The court stated that since the individual education program team did not consider placing the child in the regular education classroom first, the individual education program team was incorrect. According to an article in the ERIC digest,

From this case, the concept of the “continuum of placement options” was first developed. Before moving down the continuum to a more restrictive placement, the IEP committee must at least consider, discuss, and justify not placing a student in the general education classroom (Douvani & Hulsey, 2002, ¶ 9).

Another important case was *Rafael Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District* (1993–1994, as cited in Etscheidt & Bartlett, 1999, ¶17), in which a New Jersey student was placed in a special class but was not mainstreamed with nondisabled peers during the day. After several hearings, the court found that the school district failed to prove that Rafael could not be educated in a regular education classroom with supplementary aids and services and that the school district failed to educate Rafael with nondisabled peers (Etscheidt & Bartlett, 1999). According to a memorandum issued by the New Jersey State Department of Education, as an outcome of the Oberti case, a three-prong test to determine placement in the regular education classroom in the state of New Jersey was established (New Jersey State Department of Education, n.d.). “This is the case that begins the change from the IDEA’s ‘mainstreaming’ approach to the concept of ‘inclusion.’ Clearly, inclusion is a judge-made law, and not legislative action” (Douvani & Hulsey, 2002, ¶ 10).

In the case of the *Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Rachel Holland* (1994, as cited in Douvani & Hulsey, 2002, ¶11), Rachel’s parents felt that their third-grade child could be satisfactorily educated in the regular

education classroom (Douvanis & Hulsey, 2002). While the court did not make a placement decision, it did state that four factors need to be considered when deciding upon the least restrictive environment.

The standard involved a four-factor balancing test in which a court is to consider (a) the educational benefits of a full-time regular class placement, (b) the nonacademic benefits of a regular class placement, (c) the effect a student has on the teacher and the children in the class, and (d) the cost of mainstreaming. (Yell, 1995, ¶ 21)

In the case of *Clyde K. v. Puyallup School District* (1994, as cited in Etscheidt & Bartlett, 1999, ¶ 21), the court ruled that this child, who had Tourette syndrome, could be removed from the regular education classroom. The child was violent and disruptive and despite teacher training and supplemental services for him he was not benefiting from the regular educational placement (Etscheidt & Bartlett, 1999).

In another landmark case, *Cedar Rapids v. Garret F.* (1999, as cited in La Morte, 2005, p. 338), a severely disabled student in a wheelchair and on a ventilator needed one-on-one nursing care. While the care that he needed need not be performed by a physician, it was nevertheless quite costly. The courts ruled that the district must provide the necessary related services as stipulated by the IDEA. “Under the Tatro test, the services were necessary for the student to benefit from special education” (La Morte, 2005, p. 338).

In the 1990s as well, a series of cases were brought to the courts by parents of students with autism. Forty-five published cases, which took place from 1993 to 1998, labeled the Lovaas Hearings and Cases, were analyzed by Yell and Drasgow (2000).

These cases involved parental requests that children with autism be provided with a treatment program developed by O. Ivar Lovaas. The Lovaas treatment program involves operant conditioning by a one-on-one therapist or teacher for 2 to 40 hours per week, usually provided in the home of the child (Yell & Drasgow, 2000). The results of their analysis reported that out of the 45 cases, parents were successful in getting funding for tuition or program costs in 34 of them. “In 76% of these cases, therefore, school districts have been compelled to reimburse parents for in-home Lovaas treatment, fund the continuation of Lovaas treatment, or both” (Yell & Drasgow, 2000, p. 208). Yell and Drasgow (2000) attributed these outcomes to individual education program procedural failures and to the inclusion of the term *meaningful benefit* as part of the idea of free and appropriate public education as contained in the IDEA.

In sum, the definition of a FAPE [free and appropriate public education] has evolved through legislation and litigation since the initial passage of EACHA [Education for All Handicapped Children Act] in 1975. This evolution has resulted in an emphasis on providing and documenting meaningful education benefits in programs for students with disabilities. We believe that schools are now going to be held to a higher standard in providing a FAPE and that they must be prepared to meet this challenge. (Yell & Drasgow, 2000, p. 214)

In the 1990s, the education of students with disabilities was in flux. Researchers were at odds concerning best practices and placements. The interpretation of the IDEA of 1990 was different from one setting to another, and the courts were instrumental in further defining the terms and conditions of the law. The reauthorization of the IDEA occurred in 1997, but the regulations were not published until 1999. Despite all the

turmoil, however, the education of students with disabilities was significantly and positively furthered during the 1990s.

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. Federal education policy during the period of 1990–1999 impacted the way in which students with disabilities were educated. The reauthorization of the IDEA in 1990 and 1997 ensured that students with disabilities would have access to general education curriculum and delivery systems.

In his Inaugural Address delivered on January 20, 1989, President Bush did not mention education but thanked school children for watching democracy happen (Bush, 1990). In his first year as president, Bush initiated a President's Education Summit, which took place at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. It included all the cabinet members and the governors from 49 states.

Every cabinet member was required to attend, and 49 of the 50 state governors came (the only governor not to show up was Rudy Perpich of Minnesota). No educators were invited, nor were any members of Congress other than those from Virginia. These were omissions that would cause some serious problems later, especially with members of the House and Senate education committees. (Cross, 2004, p. 93)

This summit forged an agreement to set national performance goals in education.

During his first State of the Union Address given on January 31, 1990, Bush explained the summit and announced the six goals that this summit established. These goals included: readiness to learn; increased high school graduation rates; assessment of students in Grades 4, 8, and 12 in five core areas; U.S. students first in math and science education; every adult American literate and participating fully in citizenship; and American schools drug and violence free and with disciplined environments conducive to learning (Bush, 1991). In this address, Bush acknowledged the key figures participating in the summit, including Governor Campbell, Governor Branstad, and Governor Clinton. In summing up his education proposal, which was later called America 2000, Bush stated, "The nation will not accept anything less than excellence in education" (Bush, 1991, p. 132).

In 1990, Bush replaced Lauro Cavazos, an ineffective Secretary of Education, with Lamar Alexander, former Governor of Tennessee and President of the University of Tennessee. Alexander had been instrumental at the Governor's Summit in 1989. Alexander had a plan when he took over the office. His plan, "called America 2000. . . aimed at building on the goals [of the summit] by establishing national academic standards in the subject areas and by creating national tests, all of them voluntary, so as not to challenge the primacy of local control" (Cross, 2004, p. 100). As Alexander traveled the country making speeches, he brought with him the first set of national voluntary standards developed by the National Council of Mathematics Teachers (Cross, 2004). Gradually, educational organizations began to add their own voluntary standards.

In his second State of the Union Address on January 29, 1991, Bush petitioned Congress to pass legislation that would reflect the Governor's Summit and that would

add school choice into the mix (Bush, 1992). He also stated that together we “unshackled the potential of Americans with disabilities,” referring to the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the IDEA Amendments, both enacted in 1990 (Bush, 1992, p. 75).

In his final State of the Union Address on January 28, 1992, Bush again requested that the Congress pass America 2000 legislation, but no legislative action on this proposal occurred (Bush, 1993). “An important factor in the failure of Congress to act was because no Senator or Representative from the congressional education committees had been invited to the summit” (Cross, 2004, p. 102).

Since President Clinton had been such an integral part of the Governor’s Summit in 1989, much of George H. W. Bush’s educational agenda was, in fact, created by Clinton. Therefore, there were few, if any, changes in the educational platform under the Clinton administration. With no mention of education in his Inaugural Address (Clinton, 1994), Clinton’s first State of the Union Address, delivered on January 25, 1994, touted an education plan dubbed Goals 2000, which consisted of Internet connectivity in every classroom, charter schools to give parents school choice, higher standards, grassroots reforms, and fortification of school-to-work programs (Clinton, 1995). Clinton urged Congress to pass the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the first piece of legislation that he proposed in his presidency. “In little more than a decade, education as a national issue had gone from being slated for elimination to becoming the first priority of a new administration” (Cross, 2004, p. 105).

On January 24, 1995, following the passage of Goals 2000, Clinton gave his second State of the Union Address. His only reference to education was a brief statement

of his commitment to educational opportunities, to Head Start, and to higher education (Clinton, 1996). In his third State of the Union Address, Clinton showcased Goals 2000, which highlighted Internet connectivity, well-trained teachers, national standards, public school choice, accountability, character education, school uniforms, and incentives for higher education (Clinton, 1997). Following his re-election to a second term, Clinton emphasized education in his second Inaugural Address stating, “In this new land, education will be every citizen’s most prized possession. Our schools will have the highest standards in the world, igniting the spark of possibility in the eyes of every girl and every boy” (Clinton, 1998b, p. 45).

Clinton’s dedication to educational reform was seen in his fourth State of the Union Address, where he revealed that education would be his number one priority for the next 4 years. Clinton gave highly detailed explanations of his ten principles in what was a call to action (Clinton, 1998a). These principles included: standards, best teachers, tutors for literacy, early learning, public school choice, character education, new school construction, tax incentives for college, lifetime learning opportunities, and internet connectivity (Clinton, 1998a). A news article in *The Washington Post* 2 days later stated:

Yesterday, school officials nationwide said that they were dazzled by the extraordinary emphasis that Clinton put on improving education in his State of the Union address. His call for tougher standards, an army of reading tutors, tax breaks for college tuition, and heaps of aid for school repairs and classroom technology is precisely the kind of support many educators have been longing for from Washington. (“President’s \$51 Billion Dollar Crusade,” 1997, p. 118, as cited in Cross, 2004)

On January 27, 1998, in his fifth State of the Union Address, Clinton explained how his principles had been implemented and added three additional items. He advocated for a reduction in class size in the early grades with additional teachers and classroom space. He stated that national tests would be administered in Grade 4 Reading and in Grade 8 Mathematics. He also called for an end to social promotion, encouraging children to attend mandatory summer school in order to earn promotion to the next grade or a diploma upon graduation (Clinton, 1999).

In his sixth State of the Union Address, Clinton proudly explained the successes of Goals 2000 and cited areas in need of improvement. He called for the passage of the “Education Accountability Act [which] will require every school district receiving federal help to take. . . five steps” (Clinton, 2000, p. 64). These steps included literacy requirement upon graduation, closure of the worst performing schools if no progress is made towards improvement, competent teachers who know their subject matter, school report cards so that parents can make wise choices, and effective discipline policies so that children can learn in a safe environment (Clinton, 2000). “If we do these things—end social promotion, turn around failing schools, build modern ones, support qualified teachers, promote innovation, competition and discipline—then we will begin to meet our generation’s historic responsibility to create 21st century schools” (Clinton, 2000, p. 65).

Clinton’s final State of the Union Address was delivered on January 27, 2000, following the election of George W. Bush to the presidency. Clinton cited his accomplishments in education and discussed the success of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (Clinton, 2001).

The 1990s were a hallmark decade for the formulation of federal policy concerning education in general, and specifically, concerning the education of students with disabilities. In his first State of the Union Address, George H. W. Bush lauded the state governors for their hard work in creating national education goals during the 1989 summit. While he was unsuccessful in enacting legislation for his administration's plan, called America 2000, Bush was successful in the reauthorization of the Education of the Handicapped Act, which was renamed the IDEA in 1990. This bill broadened the disability categories and related services for the education of students with disabilities. This IDEA was also landmark legislation, as this law extended support services and strengthened early intervention programs for students with disabilities.

During the Clinton years, the role of the federal government in education was further solidified. Since Clinton was instrumental in the Governor's Summit in 1989, the groundwork for his administration's policy on education was established even before he became president. "Whereas Clinton's election changed the occupancy of the White House, the education agenda remained committed to the National Education Goals and the ideal of high standards of learning for all children" (Cross, 2004, p. 104). Clinton changed America 2000 to Goals 2000 and added two additional objectives. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was passed in October 1994. In discussing the impact of Goals 2000, Cross (2004) stated:

The significance of the 1994 bill is hard to overstate. . . . Whereas the 1965 passage of the ESEA [Elementary and Secondary Education Act] in the Johnson administration had broken the logjam that had heretofore prevented the enactment of any truly significant programs for elementary and secondary education, the

1994 law placed the federal government in the position of setting the agenda for almost every school district and every state in the nation. The federal government had moved from being a passive actor, providing resources, research, and some guidance, to being a partner that provided the intellectual framework for school reform and education improvement. (p. 113–114)

Following his re-election in 1996, Clinton, in his 1997 State of the Union Address, declared that education would be his number one priority and further delineated his proposals. However, since the Republicans held a majority in both the House and the Senate, Clinton had difficulty passing overall educational legislation. Nevertheless, students with disabilities fared well during this time. The reauthorization of the IDEA in 1997 was a milestone, as it specifically stated that students with disabilities should have access to the general curriculum.

During the 1990s, the federal role in the education of all students, including students with disabilities, took on a new dimension. Not only was landmark legislation passed for regular and special education, but litigation in the federal courts furthered the plight of the education of disabled youth. According to Reese (2005) in his book on the American public schools, “Federal involvement in educational policy, particularly in the setting of national goals and achievement standards. . . gained political authority in the waning decades of the twentieth century” (p. 323).

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

The essentialist philosophy, renewed during the 1980s, continued without check into the next decade, especially with Goals 2000 and the introduction of standards and accountability. Since testing was the measure by which a school was deemed successful, schools responded with a focus on basic curriculum. “In the last decade of the century, schools across the country were attempting to offer stronger academic programs to all students” (Rury, 2005, p. 230).

The case of *Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District* (1992, as cited in Palmarffy, 2001, p. 12) set the precedent for more inclusive settings for students with disabilities. Following this case, the numbers of students with disabilities being educated in general education classes swelled. As Spring (2004) noted, “In 1991, for instance, 32.8 percent of disabled students were receiving their education in regular classrooms. By 1995, the figure had risen to 44.5 percent” (p. 89). Therefore, a good number of students with disabilities were exposed to the essentialist philosophy in the regular education classroom.

While the essentialist philosophy was prevalent in regular education classrooms in the 1990s and many students with disabilities were provided with access to the general curriculum in these settings, there were still students with disabilities whose least restrictive environment was not the regular education classroom. Individual education programs were still used to provide students with disabilities services that were unique to their needs. Therefore, curriculum and delivery systems in alternate placements could follow any of the educational philosophies, depending on the distinct requirements of the individual.

All five educational philosophies (i.e., essentialism, existentialism, progressivism, perennialism, and behaviorism) were reflected in the federal policies concerning the education of students with disabilities during the 1990s through individualized educational programs developed to meet their unique educational needs.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

Technological innovations during the 1990s made the education of students with disabilities much easier. The passage of the IDEA in 1990 secured the availability of assistive technology for students with disabilities, as did the reauthorization of Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act in 1994 and its rewriting in 1998 as the Assistive Technology Act of 1998. The progression of these acts assured that students with disabilities were provided with any device necessary to benefit from a free and appropriate public education as outlined in their individual education program.

Since the invention of the microprocessor in the 1980s, computerized devices had been designed to help assist almost any disabled student in almost any educational situation. In order to know about these devices and how to access them, a database, ABLEDATA (ABLEDATA, n.d.) was created. ABLEDATA is a service that “provides objective information on assistive technology and rehabilitation equipment available from domestic and international sources, to consumers, organizations, professionals, and caregivers within the United States. We serve the nation’s disability, rehabilitation, and senior communities” (ABLEDATA). This organization is sponsored by the National

Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, which is a part of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. ABLEDATA is a clearinghouse of information about products, manufacturers, and distributors to persons in need of these services.

Navigating through the ABLEDATA website will give the user access to the numerous product descriptions. These products are categorized into 19 different areas, including architectural elements, blind and low vision, communication, computers, controls, deaf and hard of hearing, deaf blind, education, home management, orthotics, personal care, prosthetics, recreation, safety and security, seating, therapeutic aids, transportation, walking, wheeled mobility, and workplace (ABLEDATA, n.d.). Each area is described and explained and is easily accessed through their point and click navigation system. ABLEDATA currently provides information on over 29,000 assistive products.

While it is impossible to describe all of the assistive technology devices that are available to persons with disabilities in this scholarly work, knowing how to access this information in the age of technology is important. Utilizing the Internet effectively in locating information and being able to acquire products is key. Technology has given new life to persons with disabilities and has provided numerous innovations that assist in the education of students with disabilities.

CHAPTER VII

Historical Review of the Years 2000–2005

IDEA 2004 begins with the following statement of findings: Congress finds the following: (1) Disability is a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of individuals to participate in or contribute to society. Improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities. (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, 2004, p. 3)

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of 5 years, 2000–2005, with an extensive literature review that includes Presidential Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses, federal education legislation and policy, and education policy and thought regarding the curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities.

Introduction to the Years 2000–2005

The presidential election of 2000 was extremely close and hotly contested. Three days after his inauguration, George W. Bush launched his education platform with his No Child Left Behind program, as education had become a prominent topic during the campaign.

Among the themes touched on in innumerable public forums about the new millennium was the importance of education. If people were to live in peace and prosperity and humankind was to move forward, schooling of one sort or another was seen as critical. As never before, education had become an expression of hope for the future. (Rury, 2005, p. 232)

However, despite routine domestic concerns at the dawn of the new millennium, the years 2000–2005 can be characterized as a time of terror. On September 11, 2001, hijacked planes hit the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., and, another plane, which was headed for the White House or the U.S. Capital, crashed into a field in Pennsylvania. The fear and devastation of an unprovoked war on American soil forever changed Americans' ideas about freedom, privacy, and the meaning of civil liberties.

In the aftermath of what is now known as 9/11, the U.S. Office of Homeland Security was established to coordinate efforts to avert new threats from al-Qaeda (Exec. Order No. 13288, 2001). The United States, along with several other countries, invaded Afghanistan targeting the Taliban government, Osama bin Laden, and al-Qaeda terrorists. Operation Enduring Freedom has been on-going through 2005. In March 2003, the United States and Great Britain invaded Iraq citing weapons of mass destruction, failure to abide by the United Nations weapons inspections, and Saddam Hussein's human rights abuses as reasons for the invasion, according to the Time Almanac (Brunner & Rowen, 2003). What appears to be a civil war in Iraq has escalated throughout the period 2003–2005.

Education Policy During the George W. Bush Presidency—2001–2005

George W. Bush initiated his education agenda immediately upon taking office. No Child Left Behind was presented three days following his inauguration. The No Child Left Behind Act became law in 2002. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act became law in 2004; however, regulations for this law have not been published as of December 2005.

Federal Education Legislation

During the years 2000–2005, very few new pieces of education legislation were enacted. The strongest and most far reaching was the No Child Left Behind Act, which was Bush's very first project.

On January 20, George W. Bush was inaugurated as the 43rd president of the United States. Three days later, at a ceremony in the White House East Room, he announced that his first major initiative would be in education, and labeled that initiative No Child Left Behind. (Cross, 2004, p. 123)

The other notable act was the reauthorization of the IDEA of 1997 in 2004 (subsequently renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act). The regulations for this act have not been published as of December 2005. According to the U.S. Department of Education, "While regulations implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 are being prepared, the regulations implementing the 1997 law remain in effect, to the extent that they are consistent with the IDEA 2004 statute" (Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2006, ¶ 9). In addition, the *Digest of Education Statistics* has not yet published the 2005 federal education legislation. As a result, the following discusses only the education legislation enacted during the period 2000–2004.

1. 2002 – PL 107-110. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 with additional provisions that included parental choice, accountability, flexibility, and early literacy programs (Snyder & Tan, 2005). Students with disabilities are part of the accountability system established in this legislation.

2. 2004 – PL 108-364. Assistive Technology Act of 2004. This act reauthorized assistive technology programs (Snyder & Tan, 2005).
3. 2004 – PL 108-446. Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. This act reauthorized the IDEA of 1997 (Snyder & Tan, 2005).

Education of Students With Disabilities—2000–2005

The purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 was to provide an alignment of IDEA of 1997 with No Child Left Behind in order to configure suitable accountability measures and assessments for students with disabilities, to amend individual education program regulations, to stipulate requirements for highly qualified teachers, to amend disciplinary procedures, and to utilize scientifically based research strategies in identifying and educating students with disabilities (Wright & Darr Wright, 2005, 2006). The reauthorization of the IDEA of 1997 was done in 2004; however, the federal regulations have not yet been published. Therefore, the regulations for 1997 are still being followed. While there have been no significant changes to the ways in which students with disabilities have been educated from 1997 through 2005 (see Chapter 5), student and parental accountability and responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 has changed. Regulations in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, when published, will indicate how these changes will affect the future of the education of students with disabilities.

Analysis Question 1

From an historical review of educational programs as discussed in Inaugural and State of the Union Addresses and federal education legislation from 1950–2005, can it be

determined whether or not federal policy has had an impact upon curriculum development and the classroom strategies put into place for students with disabilities?

Yes. While there have been very few legislative acts during the period of 2000–2005, all of them have involved students with disabilities. The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act in 2004 increased the responsibility of students with disabilities and their parents, as well as the use of scientifically based research in the identification of and services provided for students with disabilities.

In his first Inaugural Address, Bush set the stage for his vision of education, stating that “some Americans are limited by failing schools” (Bush, 2003c, p. 1). His first State of the Union Address delivered a month later outlined his proposal for No Child Left Behind (Bush, 2003b). Bush made education his top priority and called for excellent schools. Literacy, character education, and accountability in the form of student testing were major components, as was the recruitment of competent, qualified teachers (Bush, 2003b). In the case of failing schools, Bush advocated for school-choice: “In the end, every child in a bad situation must be given a better choice because, when it comes to our children, failure is simply not an option” (Bush, 2003b, p. 141). Bush also mentioned disabled Americans and the need to provide them with opportunities for success (Bush, 2003b).

Following the events of September 11, 2001, Bush’s second State of the Union Address, delivered on January 29, 2002, was concerned with annihilating the terrorists that festered in the countries he designated as the “axis of evil.” However, Bush also talked about domestic concerns and applauded the bipartisan efforts that led to the

passage of No Child Left Behind just 20 days earlier (Bush, 2004a). “The remarkable bipartisan consensus that emerged in 2001 was largely fueled by political leaders’ frustration over the slow response of the education community to the changes put in place in the 1994 reauthorization” (Cross, 2004, p. 124). Bush also stressed the need for early intervention programs and competent instructors:

There is more to do. We need to prepare our children to read and succeed in school with improved Head Start and early childhood development programs. We must upgrade our teacher colleges and teacher training and launch a major recruiting drive with a great goal for America: a quality teacher in every classroom. (Bush, 2004a, p. 133)

Bush’s third State of the Union Address was delivered on January 28, 2003. In it, he called upon all schools to comply with No Child Left Behind: “To lift the standards of our public schools, we achieved historic education reform—which must now be carried out in every school, and every classroom, so that every child in America can read, and learn, and succeed in life” (Bush, 2003a, ¶ 5). The remainder of his speech was devoted to preparing the nation for the impending invasion of Iraq.

In Bush’s fourth State of the Union Address, delivered on January 24, 2004, Bush once again applauded the Congress for passing the No Child Left Behind Act. He stated that schools were accountable and that parents were able to choose to place their children in successful schools. Bush also proposed high school reforms that would help students enter the work force with the necessary job skills to be successful (Bush, 2004a).

Following his re-election to the presidency, Bush’s Inaugural Address was delivered on January 20, 2005. In this address, Bush explained that schools were held to

high standards (Bush, 2005b). Thirteen days later, on February 2, 2005, in his fifth State of the Union Address, Bush reiterated his previous statements on the benefits of the No Child Left Behind Act (Bush, 2005b). He also stated that expectations for high schools needed to be raised so that the issuance of diplomas would be meaningful and lead to successful careers.

During the 5-year period of 2001–2005, President Bush and the federal government directly affected the way in which all students, including students with disabilities, were educated. Bush's No Child Left Behind Act provided for the accountability of all students through a testing and accountability programs for all students. It also provided for the accountability of entire schools through the reporting of adequate yearly progress. If no progress was made, the school was declared a failing school and parents had the right to move their children and place them in schools that were succeeding.

Bush took a personal interest in education, making it the first order of business of his first administration. The federal government took on an expanded role, as Cross (2004) noted in a comparison between Presidents George W. Bush and Johnson:

Presidential involvement illustrates how the federal role in education policy has evolved. From a time when education programs were seen as a funding stream where it was hoped that more dollars and getting a better education would mean getting out of poverty, by the turn of the century, the issue was how reading would be taught, with what program and by whom. (p. 123–124)

With the George W. Bush administration, the federal role in education, indeed, had risen to new heights.

Analysis Question 2

Was there a shift in the educational philosophies that influenced curriculum and delivery systems for students with disabilities?

There is insufficient evidence to show any significant shift in educational philosophies during the period 2000–2005. In fact, the essentialist philosophy prevalent at the end of the 1990s was strengthened by the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002. Mastery of the basics of reading and mathematics was now expected in every school in the United States. Accountability of student achievement towards that goal was to be measured through state testing, and student scores were to be used to determine whether or not a school has met the adequate yearly progress requirement. Students with disabilities were included in the accountability phase, some with alternate assessment requirements.

All five educational philosophies (i.e., essentialism, existentialism, progressivism, perennialism, and behaviorism) were reflected in the federal policies on the education of students with disabilities during the period of 2000–2005 through individualized educational programs developed to meet their unique educational needs.

Analysis Question 3

How have major technological advances influenced the ways in which students with disabilities are educated?

ABLEDATA (ABLEDATA, n.d.) continues to be the most comprehensive information clearinghouse for technological advances in educational assistive technology for students with disabilities. This organization is sponsored by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, which is a part of the U.S. Department of

Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Navigation through the ABLEDATA website provides the most current information on products, manufacturers, and distribution centers for all items and services. (See Chapter VI).

CHAPTER VIII

Conclusions and Recommendations

Special education has had a remarkable half-century of innovation and change and has transformed the shape and contour of American education. Its goals fit well with key American values such as individualization and helping those who need special help. It has used the engines of change extensively: new legislation, landmark court cases, extensive administrative rule making, and many diverse professional initiatives. It has built an impressive infrastructure of personnel preparation, research centers, and TA [technical assistance] programs that have been models for all of education.
(Gallagher, p. 288)

Summary of Findings

For most of the 1950s, the country was more interested in combating Communism, promoting civil rights, and keeping the world safe for democracy, than in educating its citizens. However, after the successful launching of the two Sputniks, anxious Americans wanted to strengthen their educational system to fortify the sciences and to put themselves ahead of the Russians in terms of technology. Riding on the coattails of the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, advocacy groups for students with disabilities began to organize and grow in number, so much so that students with mental retardation had started to be recognized as deserving of the same opportunities as regular education students. Students with disabilities who went to separate day schools and/or who were housed in institutions, were now entering the public schools in record numbers and were placed in special classes, the universally accepted placement at the time.

Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, avid supporters of local control over educational issues, supported federal policies for temporary intervention in assisting states to build new schools and expand older buildings. The passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 also affected students with disabilities as curriculum and delivery systems in special classes took on a more traditional, rather than a progressive approach. Curriculum and delivery systems in special classes, which started out as institutionally supplanted project-oriented approaches, changed, in some instances, to concentrate on drilling the 3Rs, mimicking the regular education curriculum.

At the outset of the 1950s, the progressivist philosophy reigned. It had been the most prominent philosophy of the 20th century, until growing unrest over students studying nonessential curriculum emerged. Panic set in when Sputnik was successful and the nation called for a back-to-basics approach to curriculum. The essentialist philosophy became dominant at the end of the 1950s and into the 1960s.

As the 1960s dawned, humanistic attitudes prevailed. President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation, established to find solutions to the problems that people with mental retardation faced, was seen as a monumental breakthrough for students with disabilities, since it brought national attention to their condition. Much-needed research centers and the development of community facilities were both funded, as were studies in every state on the status of services provided to people with mental retardation. During the Johnson administration, a landmark piece of educational legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was passed and has since been reauthorized continuously through the present day. Amendments to this act established the Bureau for the Education

of the Handicapped and provided funds to states for the improvement of programs for students with disabilities.

When advocacy groups, along with scholars, began to question the efficacy of the segregated special class as the most suitable placement of students with disabilities, ideas were generated as to alternative placements and the idea of mainstreaming students with disabilities into regular education classrooms emerged. The turbulent period of the 1960s saw the emergence of existentialism, as the search for relevance was critical in this moment. Psychology paired up with education, and the behaviorist philosophy surfaced. Moreover, the end of this decade witnessed a resurgence of progressivism.

Dialogue regarding dissatisfaction with segregated special classes continued well into the 1970s. Scholars and advocacy groups were growing stronger in their conviction that alternatives to segregated placements should be investigated and in their efforts to lobby legislators to enact legislation that would benefit students with disabilities. Litigation in the early part of the decade heavily favored students with disabilities. Written findings of these court decisions became the basis upon which meaningful laws were drafted. The passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act was watershed legislation, as it forever changed the way in which students with disabilities were educated. By the end of this decade, students with disabilities were entitled to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment as stipulated in a written individualized education program. Education, in general, also rose to new heights, as a new cabinet-level department, the Department of Education, was established.

During the 1970s, essentialism, existentialism, behaviorism, and progressivism were all apparent in educational practices and thinking. Moreover, with written individual

education programs for students with disabilities, perennialism could also be said to be present. All five educational philosophies were employed during the latter part of the 1970s and continued to be important down through the present day, due to the use of individualized educational programs.

While previous decades questioned the efficacy of the segregated class as the correct placement for students with disabilities, discourse among scholars during the 1980s focused on the efficacy of the current dual educational system, and a clear divide appeared. Proponents of the regular education initiative advocated for a unitary system that would merge special education and regular education, while others found that the current system, which provided a cascade or continuum of services for students with disabilities, was more in keeping with a focus on individual needs. Also prominent during the 1980s was a groundswell of litigation that served to clarify and define many of the undefined aspects of the legislation, especially with regard to the related services terminology. The court decisions rendered in most of these cases appeared to favor the parents of children with disabilities.

During the final decade of the 20th century, 1990–1999, and the first 6 years of the next decade, 2000–2005, scholars continued to be divided over the dual educational system question and litigation brought by parents was a dominant feature of the educational landscape. The IDEA was reauthorized three times, in 1990, 1997, and 2004, and, with each reauthorization, the education of students with disabilities was strengthened. However, the research base that was being formulated during this period was also a key element that affected the education of students with disabilities. During this period as well, accountability measures were put in place to assess the progress in

educational performance achieved by students with disabilities. At the outset of the new millennium, students with disabilities were expected to participate in state assessments or, when deemed appropriate, participate in detailed, alternative assessments.

Conclusions

It is the strong belief of this researcher that the education of students with disabilities during the years 1950–2005 changed from being an issue of little importance to one that garnered national attention. During this 56-year period, the education of students with disabilities changed completely, moving from a philosophy of cruel isolation to one of hopeful and, at times contested, integration. Students with disabilities, once excluded from the public education system altogether, are now included in regular education classrooms and are given access to the regular education curriculum alongside their nondisabled peers.

Tracing the history of the federal role in the education of students with disabilities over this 56-year period provided the researcher with many interesting insights. The education of students with disabilities as a political and social topic has gained prominence to the extent that it has been a campaign issue in every recent presidential election. Advocacy groups, such as The Arc, have developed strong lobbying bases and now influence the areas that are studied and the laws that are passed on behalf of students with disabilities. Over the years, as more federal legislation has been passed, more federal control over the education of students with disabilities has been realized, since the regulatory implications of these laws created stricter oversights. It is apparent that drastic changes in the federal role have occurred from Truman and Eisenhower, in the 1950s, who wanted little to do with federal control over education, to George W. Bush, whose

legislative acts, such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, not only determined specific programs to be implemented, but also laid out strict accountability measures to be followed.

The progressivist philosophy permeated the educational scene for most of the 20th century, and, for the most part, Americans were satisfied with what was going on in the schools. In the education of students with disabilities from 1975 forward, any one of the five philosophies could have been followed. However, the most prominent philosophy during the years 1950–2005 was the most traditional, essentialism. This researcher believes that this can be attributed to the fact that Americans perceive themselves as the strongest, most forward-thinking country, as the best at everything. Therefore, in order to remain on top, strict core curriculum and back-to-basics education were seen as the road to success.

The researcher found it interesting that one of the major driving forces behind the federal role in the education of students with disabilities during 1950–2005 has been the litigation that occurred beginning with *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* in 1954. This case was broadened in its interpretation to cover discriminatory practices against all minority groups, which thus included students with disabilities. The courts also ruled that deviant behavior is not cause for the exclusion or removal of students with disabilities from public schools. In addition, the courts have ruled that the medical services that students with disabilities need to function in an educational setting must be provided by school districts, as long as they need not be administered by a physician.

During the period 1950–2005, practically all of the cases brought to the courts were initiated by dissatisfied parents, and, in the majority of cases, the findings of the

courts were in favor of the parents. It can be argued that, in some cases, parental demands concerning the education of their children with disabilities have gone from reasonable expectations to unreasonable demands. Since parents have been successful in the past, they feel that they can continue to make demands on school systems via litigation.

However, on November 14, 2005, in *Schaffer v. Weast* (2005, as cited in Trotter, 2005, ¶ 1), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that if parents challenge the individual education programs of their children, the burden of proof rests with the parents rather than with the school districts. This was a major blow to the parents of students with disabilities. Since this litigation is so new, it has not yet borne the test of time and its implications are uncertain. The researcher predicts that the pendulum, which has rested so long in one position, in favor of the parents, is now beginning to swing the other way and the parents of students with disabilities are now beginning to lose some of the momentum that they have built up over this 56-year period.

The debate among scholars in the field of education over students with disabilities poses moral, ethical, and scientific questions. While experts in the field disagree about whether or not a unitary education system is in order or whether maintenance of a dual educational system is warranted, this researcher is of the opinion that the passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act in 1975 was the virtual beginning of a comprehensive educational system that services all children and that is inclusive of students with disabilities. Moreover, it appears that the repeated reauthorization of the IDEA has solidified this system. The researcher also believes that the most important part of these legislative acts is the continuum or cascade of services for students with disabilities, as it is this comprehensive array of services that presents options that, when

chosen correctly, will suffice in meeting the varying needs of all students with disabilities.

Even though the regulations for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 have not yet been published, this researcher has observed that one interesting thread permeates various aspects of the law, namely, the reliance on scientific, research-based instruction and intervention. For example, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 has moved away from the discrepancy model, a procedure that determines whether or not a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability is noted. In fact, the law suggests that the discrepancy model, currently used to identify specific learning-disabled students, be relinquished in favor of a response-to-intervention model. The response-to-intervention model is a process based on the systematic assessment of the student's response to a research-based intervention. Also new to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 is the addition of early intervention services for teachers and students that utilizes scientific, research-based interventions. The most interesting point is that these academic and behavioral services, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, are provided to students who are not identified as needing special education services. The terms and conditions of this law further support the researcher's view that one comprehensive education system already exists for all children, both students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the researcher makes a number of recommendations for future research.

1. This study examined federal education policy and legislation that influenced the education of students with disabilities within the context of five educational philosophies. This study could be replicated using any one of the 50 states' policies and legislation within the same framework of educational philosophies.
2. This study could be replicated and qualitatively broadened through interviews with relevant federal legislators and/or personnel having served in the U.S. Department of Education during the period of 1950–2005.
3. A quantitative analysis of the impact of the confluence of No Child Left Behind and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 on the academic progress of students with disabilities could be conducted in light of the stricter accountability measures proscribed by these laws.
4. This study could be enhanced by including an analysis of the influence of educational organizations, such as the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers, on the education of students with disabilities.
5. This study could be replicated by a person with legal expertise in order to investigate more fully the federal and/or state litigation that affected the education of students with disabilities.
6. This study could be continued through 2025 to affirm or negate the researcher's prediction that parental litigation victories will decline in future decades.

7. This study could be replicated by a special education administrator, a teacher, a superintendent, or a curriculum director whose biases present different views from those of the researcher.
8. This study could be further enhanced by analyzing the degree to which advocacy organizations influenced federal legislation concerning the education of students with disabilities over the period 1950–2005.
9. This study could be further enhanced by adding any one of a number of subsidiary questions, such as:
 - a. What role did religious organizations play in the education of students with disabilities in each decade?
 - b. What were the experiences of regular education teachers after including students with disabilities in their schools and/or classrooms?
 - c. How did the parents of students without disabilities react to the increasing inclusion of students with disabilities in public schools?

References

Section 1
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles

- Abell, M. M., Bauder, D. K., & Simmons, T. J. (2005). Access to the general curriculum: A curriculum and instruction perspective for educators. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 41*(2), 82–86.
- Alexander, D. (1996). The Vanderbilt Kennedy Center and the mental retardation research centers. *Peabody Journal of Education, 71*(4), 22–24.
- Arif, M., Smiley, F. M., & Kulonda, D. J. (2005). Business and education as push-pull processes: An alliance of philosophy and practice. *Education, 125*(4), 602–614.
- Bagley, W. (1941). The case for essentialism in education. *Today's Education: Journal of the National Education Association, 30*(7), 201–202.
- Baumeister, A. A. (1996). The Kennedy Center's coming of age. *Peabody Journal of Education, 71*(4), 38–44.
- Blackhurst, A. E. (1965). Technology in special education—Some implications. *Exceptional Children, 31*(9), 449–456.
- Blackhurst, A. E., & Edyburn, D. L. (2000). A brief history of special education technology. *Special Education Technology, 2*(1), 21–36.
- Costa, A. L., & Loveall, R. A. (2002). The legacy of Hilda Taba. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18*(1), 59–62.
- Crockett, J. B., & Kauffman, J. M. (1988). Taking inclusion back to its roots. *Educational Leadership, 56*(2), 74–77.
- Cushing, L. S., Clark, N. M., Carter, E. W., & Kennedy, C. H. (2005). Access to the general education curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 38*(2), 6–13.
- Davis, W. E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. *Exceptional Children, 55*(5), 440–446.
- Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. *Exceptional Children, 37*, 229–237.
- Deno, E. (1994). Special education as developmental capital revisited: A quarter century appraisal of means versus ends. *The Journal of Special Education, 27*(4), 393–40.

- Drasgow, E., Yell, M. L., & Robinson, T. R. (2001). Developing legally correct and educationally appropriate IEPs. *Remedial and Special Education, 22*(6), 359–373.
- Dunn, L. (1968). Special education for the mildly retarded—Is much of it justifiable? *Exceptional Children, 35*(1), 5–22.
- Ediger, M. (1997). Influence of ten leading educators on American education. *Education, 118*(2), 267–258.
- Etscheidt, S. K., & Bartlett, L. (1999). The IDEA amendments: A four-step approach for determining supplementary aids and services. *Exceptional Children, 65*(2), 163–174.
- Franklin, B. M. (1989). Progressivism and curriculum differentiation: Special classes in the Atlanta public schools, 1898–1923. *History of Education Quarterly, 29*(4), 571–593.
- Frost, B. (1999). Dwight D. Eisenhower: Doing what needed to be done. *Biography Magazine, 3*(6), 100–114.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1994–1995). Sometimes separate is better. *Educational Leadership, 52*(4), 22–26.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1995). What’s “special” about special education? *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(7), 522–530.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1992). Editorial: Special education’s wake-up call. *The Journal of Special Education, 25*(4), 413–414.
- Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, Annual 2001*, Article A73232708, 197–219.
- Giangreco, M. F., St. Denis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). I’ve counted Jon: Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 59*(4), 359–373.
- Greenfield, E. (1992). At-risk, ESL, and special education: Many products with many uses. *Technological Horizons in Education, 19*(10) ¶ 45.
- Hayes, S. C., Rincover, A., & Solnick, J. V. (1980). The technical drift of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13*(2), 275–285.
- Hicks, J. W. (2000). Who cares about public school education? *Phi Delta Kappan, 5*(81), 398–401.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1980). Integrating handicapped students into the mainstream. *Exceptional Children, 47*(2), 90–98.

- Jones, M. G., & Brader-Araje, L. (2002). The impact of constructivism on education: Language, discourse, and meaning. *American Communication Journal*, 5(3), ¶ 2.
- Katsiyannis, A., Yell, M., & Bradley, R. (2001). Reflections on the 25th anniversary of the individuals with disabilities education act. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(6), 324–335.
- Kavale, K. A., & Forness, S. R. (2000). History, rhetoric, and reality analysis of the inclusion debate. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(5), 279–296.
- Kaye, N. L., & Aserlind, R. (1979). The IEP: The ultimate process. *Journal of Special Education*, 13(2), 137–143.
- Kirk, S. A., & Bateman, B. (1962). Diagnosis and remediation of learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 29(2), 73–78.
- Kluth, P., Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (2002). “Our school doesn’t offer inclusion” and other legal blunders. *Educational Leadership*, 54(4), 24–27.
- The Korean War. (2000). *American History*, 35(3), 58–59.
- Laties, V. G., & Mace, F. C. (1993). Taking stock: The first 25 years of the journal of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 26, 513–525.
- Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1998). Taking inclusion into the future. *Educational Leadership*, 56(2), 78–81.
- Martin, E. W. (1989). Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation: Rise and fall...and rise again? *Exceptional Children*, 56(3), 270–273.
- Martin, E. W., Martin, R., & Terman, D. L. (1996). The legislative and litigation history of special education. *The Future of Children Special Education for Students With Disabilities*, 6(12), 25–39.
- McGrath, M. Z., Johns, B. H., & Mathur, S. R. (2004). Is history repeating itself—Services for children with disabilities endangered. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 37(1), 70–71.
- McLeskey, J. (2004). Classic articles in special education: Articles that shaped the field, 1960 to 1996. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(2), 79–87.
- Middaugh, E., & Perlstein, D. (2005). Thinking and teaching in a democratic way: Hilda Taba and the ethos of Brown. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 20(3), 234–256.
- Mostert, M. P., & Crockett, J. B. (1999–2000). Reclaiming the history of special education for more effective practice. *Exceptionality*, 8(2), 133–143.

- O'Leary, K. D., & Becker, W. C. (1967). Behavior modification of an adjustment class: A token reinforcement program. *Exceptional Children*, 33(7), 637-642.
- O'Neil, J. (1994-1995). Can inclusion work: A conversation with Jim Kauffman and Mara Sapon-Shevin. *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 7-11.
- Osborne, A. G., Jr., & Dimattia, P. (1994). The IDEA's least restrictive environment mandate: Legal implications. *Exceptional Children*, 61(1), 6-14.
- Parrish, M. E. (1977). Cold War justice: The Supreme Court and the Rosenbergs. *American Historical Review*, 82(4), 805-842.
- Pfeiffer, D. (1993). Overview of the disability movement: History, legislative record and political implications. *Policy Studies Journal*, 4(21), 724-733.
- Potter, L. A., & Schamel, W. (2001). Letter from house minority leader, Gerald R. Ford to President Richard M. Nixon. *Social Education*, 65(2), 116.
- Price, D. (1999). Philosophy and the adult educator. *Adult Learning*, 11(2), 3-5.
- Reynolds, M.C. (1962). A framework for considering some issues in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 28, 367-370.
- Roos, P. (1977). The role of the voluntary sector in the delivery of rehabilitation services. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 43(1), 26-27.
- Rossides, D. W. (2004). Knee-jerk formalism: Reforming American education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(6), 667-703.
- Rutherford, A. (2003). B. F. Skinner's technology of behavior in American life: From consumer culture to counterculture. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 39(1), 1-23.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion: A matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-28.
- Schloss, P. J. (1992). Mainstreaming revisited. *The Elementary School Journal*, 92(3), 233-244.
- Shaker, P. (2001). Literacies for life. *Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 26-29.
- Shanker, A. (1994-1995). Full inclusion is neither free nor appropriate. *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 18-21.

- Shoen, A. A. (2003). What potential does the applied behavior analysis approach have for the treatment of children and youth with autism? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 30*(2), 125–130.
- Skinner, M. E., & Hales, M. R. (1992). Classroom teacher's 'explanation' of student behavior: One possible barrier to the acceptance and use of applied behavior analysis procedures in the schools. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 3*(3), 219–232.
- Slavin, R. (1996). Neverstreaming: Preventing learning disabilities. *Educational Leadership, 53*(5), 4–7.
- Smith, A., & Kozleski, E. (2005). Witnessing Brown: Pursuit of an equity agenda in American education. *Remedial and Special Education, 26*(5), 270–280.
- Stevens, G. D. (1954). Developments in the field of mental deficiency. *Exceptional Children, 21*(2), 58–62, 70.
- Stone, G. R. (2005). Free speech in the age of McCarthy: A cautionary tale. *California Law Review, 95*(5), 1387–1412.
- Tateyama-Sniezek, K. M. (1990). Cooperative learning: Does it improve the academic achievement of students with handicaps? *Exceptional Children, 56*(5), 426–434.
- Tropea, J. L. (1987). Bureaucratic order and special children: Urban schools, 1950s–1960s. *History of Education Quarterly, 27*(3), 339–361.
- Tyre, T. (1988). Technology gives kids with special needs the power to learn. *Technological Horizons in Education, 15*(10), ¶ 10.
- Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1994–1995). Serving students at the margins. *Educational Leadership, 52*(4), 12–17.
- Warger, C. L., & Pugach, M. C. (1996). Forming partnerships around curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 53*(5), 62–65.
- Whorton, J. E., Siders, J. A., Fowler, R. E., & Naylor, D. L. (2000). A two decade review of the number of students with disabilities receiving federal monies and the types of educational placements used. *Education, 121*(2), 287–297, 300.
- Wilcox, D. J., & Wigle, S. E. (1997). Mainstreaming revisited: 20 years later. *Education, 117*(3), 371–380.
- Yell, M. L. (1995). The last [sic] restrictive environment mandate and the courts: judicial activism or judicial restraint. *Exceptional Children, 61*(6), 578–581.

- Yell, M. L., & Drasgow, E. (2000). Litigating a free appropriate public education: The Lovaas hearings and cases. *Journal of Special Education, 33*(4), 195–214.
- Yell, M. L., & Espin, C. A. (1990). The Handicapped Children's Protection Act of 1986: Time to pay the piper? *Exceptional Children, 56*(5), 396–407.
- Yell, M., & Katsiyannis, A. (2004). Placing students with disabilities in inclusive settings: Legal guidelines and preferred practices. *Preventing School Failure, 49*(1), 28–35.
- Yell, M., Rogers, D., & Lodge Rodgers, E. (1998). The legal history of special education what a long, strange trip it's been! *Remedial & Special Education, 19*(4), 219–228.
- Zigler, E., Hodcapp, R. M., & Edison, M. R. (1990). From theory into practice in the care and education of mentally retarded individuals. *American Journal of Mental Retardation, 95*(1), 1–12.

Section 2
Government Documents and Publications

- Baker, P. M. A., & Bellordre, C. (2003). Factors influencing adoption of wireless technologies: Key issues, barriers and opportunities for people with disabilities. Unpublished paper written to fulfill grant requirements under National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research of the U.S. Department of Education.
- Brown v. Board of Educ., 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Bush, G. H. W. (1990). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. H. W. (1991). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. H. W. (1992). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. H. W. (1993). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. W. (2003a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. W. (2003b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. W. (2003c). *Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/sou.php>
- Bush, G. W. (2004a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bush, G. W. (2004b). *Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/sou.php>
- Bush, G. W. (2005a). *Inaugural address*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/sou.php>

- Bush, G. W. (2005b). *Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Retrieved January 5, 2006 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/sou.php>
- Carter J. E. (1977). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Carter, J. E. (1979). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Carter, J. E. (1980). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Carter, J. E. (1981a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Carter, J. E. (1981b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume III, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1994). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1995). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1996). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1997). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1998a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clinton, W. J. (1998b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. (1999). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. (2000). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. (2001). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office..

Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Bill H.R. 94-332, 94 Cong., (1975).

Eisenhower, D. D. (1958a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1958b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1958c). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1959). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1960a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1960b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1960c). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1960d). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Eisenhower, D. D. (1961a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Eisenhower, D. D. (1961b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Exec. Order No. 11280, 31FR 7167, May 17, 1966.
- Exec. Order No. 13288, 66FR 51812, October 10, 2001.
- Ford, G. R. (1977). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ford, G. R. (1979a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ford, G. R. (1979b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume III, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Bill number, H.R. 1350 108 Cong., (2004).
- Johnson, L. B. (1965). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Johnson, L. B. (1966a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Johnson, L. B. (1966b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Johnson, L. B. (1967). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Johnson, L. B. (1968). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Johnson, L. B. (1970a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Johnson, L. B. (1970b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume II, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kemp, K. B. (Ed.). (1982). *Technology and handicapped people. A report of the Office of Technology Assessment*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1962a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1962b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1963). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1964). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1971a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1971b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1972). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1974). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Nixon, R. M. (1975a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1975b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1975c). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nixon, R. M. (1975d). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Resignation speech*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1982). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1983). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1984). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1986). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1988a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Inaugural address*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1988b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1988c). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Reagan, R. W. (1989). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Reagan, R. W. (1990). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Volume I, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Snyder, T. D., & Tan, A. G. (2005). Digest of education statistics, 2004. Retrieved February 1, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/>
- Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. U.S. Department of Education. (2006). Retrieved May 19, 2006 from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/special/guid/idea/idea2004.html>
- Summary: Twenty-second annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.* (2000). Retrieved August 10, 2004, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2000/eseccsumm.html>
- Truman, H. S. (1965a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Truman, H. S. (1965b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual Report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Truman, H. S. (1966a). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Truman, H. S. (1966b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Annual report to Congress on the state of the union*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Promoting educational excellence for all Americans*. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/history.html?exp=6>
- U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2004*. Washington, D.C.
- The Watergate Files.* (2001–2006). Retrieved March 25, 2006, from http://www.fordlibrarymuseum.gov/museum/exhibits/watergate_files/index.html

Section 3
Books

- Bennett, W. J. (1989). *Our children and our country: Improving America's schools and affirming the common culture*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Berube, M. R. (1991). *American presidents and education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Blackhurst, A. E., & Lahm, E. A. (2000). Technology and exceptionality foundations. In J. D. Lindsey (Ed.), *Technology and exceptional individuals* (3rd ed.) (pp. 3–45). Austin, TX: Pro-ed.
- Brameld, T. (1955). *Philosophies of education in cultural perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Britten, L., & Mathless, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Our American century: Time of transition, the 70s*. Richmond: Time-Life Books.
- Britten, L., & Mathless, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Our American century: Pride and prosperity, the 80s*. Richmond: Time-Life Books.
- Brunner, B., & Rowen, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Time almanac 2004*. Needham: Pearson Education.
- Buddin, R., Gill, B. P., & Zimmer, R. W. (2001). *Impact aid and the education of military children*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Carrier, J. G. (1986). *Learning disability: Social class and the construction of inequality in American education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Chaves, I. M. (1977). Historical overview of special education in the United States. In P. Bates, T. L. West & R. B. Schmerl (Eds.), *Mainstreaming: Problems, potentials, and perspectives* (pp. 25–41). Minneapolis, MI: National Support Systems Project.
- Columbia Encyclopedia* (6th ed.). (2004). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cross, C. (2004). *Political education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cruikshank, W. M., & Johnson, G. O. (Eds.). (1967). *Education of exceptional children and youth*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cuban, L. (1986). *Teachers and machines*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Dewey, J. (1950). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dunn, L. M. (Ed.). (1973). *Exceptional children in the schools: Special education in transition* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Ellis, A. K., Cogan, J. J., & Howey, K. R. (1991). *Introduction to the foundations of education* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gallagher, J. J. (2006). *Driving change in special education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Hay, W. (1952). *Encyclopedia Americana*. Chicago and New York: Associations for parents of mental retardates.
- Himmelberg, R. F. (2001). *The great depression and the new deal*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Holland, G. (1999). *A cultural history of the United States: Through the decades, the 1960s*. San Diego, CA: Lucent Books.
- Horn, W. F., & Tynan, D. (2001). Time to make special education “special” again. In C. E. Finn, Jr., A. J. Rotherham & C. R. Hokanson, Jr. (Eds.), *Rethinking special education for a new century* (pp. 1–20). Dayton, OH: The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Hutchins, R. M., & Adler, M. J. (Eds.). (1963). *Gateway to the great books*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Kaestle, C. F. (2000). Federal aid to education since World War II: Purposes and politics. In *The future of the federal role in elementary and secondary education* (pp. 14–36). Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.
- Kallen, S. A. (1999a). *A cultural history of the United States: Through the decades, the 1950s*. San Diego: Lucent Books.
- Kallen, S. A. (1999b). *A cultural history of the United States: Through the decades, the 1980s*. San Diego: Lucent Books.
- Kallen, S. A. (1999c). *A cultural history of the United States: Through the decades, the 1990s*. San Diego: Lucent Books.
- Kandel, I. L. (1961). *William Chandler Bagley: Stalwart educator*. New York: Kappa Delta Pi.

- Kazdin, A. E. (1978). *History of behavior modification experimental foundations of contemporary research*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- La Morte, M. (2005). *School law cases and concepts* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Lovaas, I. O., & Smith, T. (2003). Early and intensive behavioral intervention in autism. In A. E. Kazdin & J. R. Weisz (Eds.), *Evidence-based psychotherapies for children and adolescents* (pp. 325–340). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Macht, J. (1998). *Special education's failed system: A question of eligibility*. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., & Schubert, W. H. (2000). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Morris, V. C. (1961). *Philosophy and the American school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Noddings, N. (1998). *The philosophy of education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Palmaffy, T. (2001). The evolution of the federal role. In C. E. Finn, Jr., A. J. Rotherham & C. R. Hokanson, Jr. (Eds.), *Rethinking special education for a new century* (pp. 1–20). Dayton, OH: The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Parkay, F., & Hass, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Curriculum planning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ravitch, D. (1983). *The troubled crusade American education, 1945–1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of battles over school reform*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reese, W. J. (2005). *America's public schools: From the common school to "no child left behind"*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, H. B., & Robinson, N. M. (1965). *The mentally retarded child: A psychological approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rury, J. L. (2002). *Education and social change: Themes in the history of American schooling* (2nd ed.). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sage, D. D., & Burrello, L. C. (1994). *Leadership in educational reform: An administrator's guide to changes in special education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

- Sartre, J. P. (1985). *Existentialism and human emotions*. New York: Kensington Publishing.
- Sigmon, S. B. (1987). *Radical analysis of special education: Focus on historical development and learning disabilities*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About behaviorism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Somerville, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Our American century: The digital decade, the 90s*. Richmond, VA: Time-Life Books.
- Spring, J. (2004). *American education* (11th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Stewart, G. B. (1999). *A cultural history of the United States: Through the decades, the 1970s*. San Diego: Lucent Books.
- Tickton, S. G. (Ed.). (1970). *To improve learning: An evaluation of instruction technology. Volume I. Part I: A report by the commission on instructional technology*. New York: R. R. Bowker Company.
- Traylor, M. E. (Ed.). (1999). *20th-Century America*. Richmond, VA: Time-Life Books.
- Watson, J. B. (2005). *Behaviorism*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Winzer, M. (1993). *The history of special education: From isolation to integration*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Wright, P. W. D., & Darr Wright, P. (2005, 2006). *Wrights law IDEA 2004*. Hartfield, Virginia: Harbor House Law Press.

Section 4

Non-Scholarly Articles, Conferences, Journals, Lectures, Magazines, Newspapers,
Papers, Reports, Websites

- ABLEDATA. (n.d.). *Your source for assistive technology information*. Retrieved May 6, 2006, from <http://www.abledata.com>
- Bui, Y. (2003). *Special education as an evolving discipline: Influences of the past, glossary*. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from http://www.teachspecialed.com/coursesEval/ocada7011_norm2/23/24_1/27.html
- CED. (2006). *CED in the history of media technology*. Retrieved March 20, 2006, from <http://www.cedmagic.com/history/acoustic-modem.html>
- Douvanis, G., & Hulsey, D. (2002). *The least restrictive environment mandate: How has it been defined by the courts?* Retrieved May 2, 2006 from <http://ericed.org/digests/e629.html>
- Garber, S. (2003). *Sputnik the fortieth anniversary. Sputnik and the dawn of the space age*. Retrieved January 16, 2006, from <http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/sputnik/>
- Hickman, L. A. (2005). *A pragmatic view of concepts*. Paper presented at the 2005 annual meeting of the American educational research association SIG-Education, Science and Technology cosponsored with SIG-Advanced Technologies for Learning. Center for Dewey Studies. Southern Illinois University Carbondale.
- Hill, E. (1960). My memorial day. *The Saturday Evening Post*, 232(48), pp. 32, 33, 131, 133, 134.
- Horne, R. L. (1996). *The education of children and youth with special needs: What do the laws say?* Retrieved March 20, 2006, from <http://www.aed.org/nichcy>
- Kennedy Library and Museum. (1963). *Summary of the three year Kennedy record (legislation): Health – labor*. Retrieved March 12, 2006, from http://www.cs.umb.edu/~rwhealan/jfk/jfk_leg_record3.html
- Leo, J. (1994, June 27). Mainstreaming's 'Jimmy problem'. *U.S. News and World Report*, 116(25), 22.
- McCune, L. (2003). About special education. *Education Update Online Education News Today for a Better World Tomorrow*, 5(3), p. 27.
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.). *LRE Memorandum*. Retrieved May 2, 2006, from <http://www.state.nj.us/njded/specialed/lre/lre2.htm>

- Sack, J. L. (1997, April 16). Disruptive spec. ed. students get own school. *Education Week*. Retrieved May 3, 2006, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1997/04/16/29vt.h16html?qs=special+education>
- Sergen, G. (2005). *Lessons for all of us: Protecting the right to education for persons with disabilities*. Retrieved January 21, 2006, from <http://www.ncd.gov/newsroom/publications/2005/lessons.htm>
- Shaw, L. (2005). *Humanistic and social aspects of teaching*. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://edweb:sdsu.edu/LShaw/f95syll/philos/phintro.html>
- Trotter, A. (2005, November 14). Supreme Court rules for school district in IDEA case. *Education Week*. Retrieved March 22, 2006 from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2001/11/14/12scotus_web.b25.html?qs=Schaffer+v+W
- Wright, P. W. D. (2005). *Individuals With Disabilities Education Act burden of proof: On parents or schools? Position statement*. Washington, DC: National Council on Disability.

Appendix A

Presidents of the United States, 1950–2005

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Harry S. Truman | 1945–1953 |
| Dwight David Eisenhower | 1953–1961 |
| John Fitzgerald Kennedy | 1961–1963 |
| Lyndon Baines Johnson | 1963–1969 |
| Richard Milhous Nixon | 1969–1974 |
| Gerald Rudolph Ford | 1974–1977 |
| James Earl Carter, Jr. | 1977–1981 |
| Ronald Wilson Reagan | 1981–1989 |
| George Herbert Walker Bush | 1989–1993 |
| William Jefferson Clinton | 1993–2001 |
| George Walker Bush | 2001–Present (July 2006) |

Appendix B

Students With Disabilities Served in Federally Funded Programs, 1976–2004

The following table reflects the number of students who were served in federally supported programs since the passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. It is clear that the numbers have increased each year.

*Children 3 to 21 years old served in federally supported programs for the disabled, by type of disability: Selected years, 1976-77 through 2003-04
(In thousands)*

| Type of Disability | 1976-77 | 1980-81 | 1990-91 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| All disabilities | 3,694 | 4,144 | 4,710 | 5,216 | 6,190 | 6,523 | 6,633 |
| Specific learning disabilities | 796 | 1,462 | 2,129 | 2,408 | 2,830 | 2,848 | 2,831 |
| Speech or language impairments | 1,302 | 1,168 | 985 | 1,014 | 1,078 | 1,412 | 1,441 |
| Mental retardation | 961 | 830 | 534 | 536 | 600 | 602 | 593 |
| Emotional disturbance | 283 | 347 | 389 | 414 | 468 | 485 | 489 |
| Hearing impairments | 88 | 79 | 58 | 64 | 70 | 78 | 79 |
| Orthopedic impairments | 87 | 58 | 49 | 56 | 71 | 83 | 77 |
| Other health impairments | 141 | 98 | 55 | 82 | 254 | 403 | 464 |
| Visual impairments | 38 | 31 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 29 | 28 |
| Multiple disabilities | - | 68 | 96 | 108 | 111 | 138 | 140 |
| Deaf-blindness | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Autism and traumatic brain injury | - | - | - | 24 | 80 | 159 | 186 |
| Developmental delay | - | - | - | - | 19 | 283 | 305 |
| Preschool disabled | - | - | 390 | 486 | 582 | - | - |

Adapted from *Digest of Education Statistics, 2004*, by U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2005.