

FOCUS ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Least Restrictive Environments: Instructional Implications

Edward L. Meyen and Donna H. Lehr

With passage of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, one could argue that the ultimate in legislative assurances had been achieved for handicapped children and youth. By law, the handicapped must receive a free and appropriate education. Insertion of the word *appropriate* extends the implications of the law beyond the issue of equal rights. It gives both advocates and professionals an agenda for the future as attempts are made to operationally define appropriateness and to strengthen instructional interventions.

The required individualized education program (IEP) is emerging as a useful tool (1) for focusing the attention of parents and educators on instructional needs of the handicapped, and (2) as an accountability measure in the overall issue of due process. The more significant impact of the legislation, however, may center on the response of public schools in implementing the principle of least restrictive environment (LRE). Given the specification of educational goals and short-term objectives based on individual needs of the handicapped child, the most normal appropriate instructional setting must be selected for implementation.

INFERRED MEANING OF LRE

Although PL 94-142 requires adherence to the least restrictive principle and sets forth procedures for determining compliance, it falls short in offering those responsible for implementation clear guidelines as to what constitutes least restrictiveness for particular students. In the absence of such guidelines, local districts, faced with compliance, have moved to operationalize a definition and in the process have oversimplified the principle. The consequence is an emphasis on placement options centering on retention in the regular class — popularly referred to as mainstreaming.

An explanation for this response relates to the nature of least restrictiveness as a concept. In contrast to due process procedures and the required individualized education program, the least restrictive environment principle does not lend itself to the stating of specific procedures. It is not analogous to a procedure or program. In this context it could be argued that LRE is inappropriate to be legislated as an educational practice.

Edward Meyen is a Professor of Special Education and Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Graduate Studies and Public Service, University of Kansas. Donna Lehr is an Assistant Instructor in the Department of Special Education at the University of Kansas.

The principle of least restrictiveness represents to a large extent a philosophical position. It evolves from a much broader set of societal applications documented as early as 1918 (see Kaufman & Morra, 1978) in a case involving the right of the federal government to establish a national bank. Although the principle has since been applied to a number of social issues, it was not until the 1970s that it emerged as a primary reference in legal cases pertaining to the rights of children. Educationally it is based on the premise that all children, including the handicapped, should be educated in a manner that does not inhibit their interaction with peers nor employ unusual instructional arrangements. It calls for a pattern of life as close to the expected norm as possible.

Adherence to such a philosophy makes individuals more conscious of their placement decision making regarding handicapped children and youth. It causes them to resist placement outside the regular class except when fully justified as being in the best interest of the student. This is a laudable and defensible position, but when legislated as an instructional practice, the inability to precisely define it in the form of enforceable procedures makes it vulnerable to inappropriate applications, and in some cases decisions are made that are detrimental to the best interests of the students for whom it is intended to serve.

In the absence of an operational definition of the least restrictive environment, examples from the literature that have focused on mainstreaming will be presented. References are being made to mainstreaming only because the term has come to be interpreted as synonymous with least restrictive environments in the public schools. In the context of this paper, it is an appropriate term, but in a broader discussion of least restrictiveness, it would prove to be insufficient. Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard, and Kukic (1975), in attempting to develop a conceptual framework for mainstreaming, offered the following definition:

Mainstreaming refers to the temporal, instructional, and social integration of eligible exceptional children with normal peers based on an ongoing, individually determined, educational planning and programming process and requires clarification of responsibility among regular and special education administrative, instructional, and supportive personnel (p. 41).

An analysis of this definition indicates three primary components that must be addressed in implementation: integration, educational planning and programming processes, and clarification of responsibility.

Turnbull and Turnbull (1978), in describing the history of mainstreaming as a judicial preference, have provided a useful discussion that defines and explains mainstreaming. The following has been excerpted from a more comprehensive discussion by the authors:

... Mainstreaming is a method for individualizing an exceptional pupil's education, since it prevents a child being placed in special programs unless it is first determined that he cannot profit from regular educational placement. It simultaneously addresses the requirements of an appropriate education — an individualized education — and nondiscriminatory classification. It promotes the concept that curriculum adaptations and instructional strategies tailored to the needs of exceptional children can occur in regular classrooms, as well as in special classrooms. . . (p. 140).

... Mainstreaming is also preferred because it is widely and forcefully advocated by many educators. They argue that the handicapped child will learn more, and more easily, by being educated with the nonhandicapped child. They contend that there are serious doubts about the educational efficacy of special (separate) programs; and they say that the nonhandicapped child needs the educational and experiential benefits of coming into contact with handicapped children (p. 141).

The intent of these definitions is difficult to challenge. The problem in reviewing such definitions is that one begins to assume that the practices that occur during

FOCUS ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN (*ISSN 0015-511X*) (USPS 203-360) is published monthly except June, July, and August as a service to teachers, special educators, curriculum specialists, administrators, and those concerned with the special education of exceptional children. This journal is abstracted and indexed in *Exceptional Child Education Resources*, and is also available in microfilm from Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Subscription rates, \$12.00 per year. Copyright 1980, Love Publishing Company. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or part without written permission is prohibited. Printed in the United States of America. Second class postage is paid at Denver, Colorado.

Executive and Editorial Office
1777 South Bellaire Street
Denver, Colorado 80222
Telephone (303) 757-2579

EDITORIAL BOARD

Edward L. Meyen
University of Kansas

Glenn A. Vergason
Georgia State University

Richard J. Whelan
University of Kansas Medical Center

Carolyn Acheson
Senior Editor

Stanley F. Love
Publisher

implementation are equivalent to the intent of the definition. As previously mentioned, LRE (or mainstreaming) essentially represents a philosophical position. Attempts by districts to operationalize the beliefs embedded in LRE too often result in placement decisions based on assumptions that are not sound.

For example, it is assumed that the goals and short-term objectives of an IEP combined with information on available options constitute sufficient information upon which to make a decision on the least restrictive setting for a given student. In the case of the severely handicapped, this may operate reasonably well since there is no strong expectancy that the severely handicapped should be retained in regular classes. There is, however, a support base for LRE placements appropriate to the needs of the severely handicapped using other configurations of options. For the mildly handicapped the popular logic of the least restrictive concept argues for placement in the regular class, and the weight of the IEP evidence must be exceedingly convincing to result in a placement decision other than the regular class. In other words, for the mildly handicapped the burden of proof appears to rest with those who would propose placement options other than the regular class, whereas minimal attention is given to demonstrating that the regular class does in fact meet the needs of the individual. In contrast, for the severely handicapped the burden of proof lies more directly with those who would recommend regular class placement.

LEAST RESTRICTIVENESS FOR THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED

Selection of the least restrictive environment should be based on knowledge of conditions that offer the highest probability for remedying academic performance-related deficits and not conditions that are socially least restrictive. The inclusion of social benefits for the mildly handicapped or "value" enrichment for their nonhandicapped peers is not sufficient compensation for ineffectual instruction. The thesis of this article is that many of the required conditions are currently not likely to exist in the typical regular classroom setting and by their omission the regular class becomes highly restrictive.

The position being promulgated here is that least restrictiveness for the mildly handicapped is not necessarily a temporal question. Rather, it is a question directed to the future — e.g., will intensive remedial instruction for a short duration commencing at the time of identification result in the individual's maintaining him/herself more independently in least restrictive environments in the future?

Most schools are implementing least restrictive placements in the context of a "now" orientation without giving sufficient attention to the conduciveness of the setting for the needed remediation. The authors have difficulty accepting the logic that the reality circumstances of the regular classroom will better prepare the mildly handicapped for adult life when what those individuals need to accomplish is to overcome the academic deficits they are currently experiencing. To couch the instructional needs of the mildly handicapped in the broader context of the social and developmental arena may be counter-productive. It does make the selection of the least restrictive environment easier but does not address the individual's immediate and/or long-term instructional needs. From our perspective, the goal should be to prepare the mildly handicapped for a less restrictive life. This does not necessarily mean that least restrictiveness in a social context is appropriate to remedial instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL DIFFERENCES PRESENTED BY THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED LEARNER

An obvious characteristic of students identified as mildly handicapped is the variance they reflect across most behavioral dimensions relevant to school performance. What causes a student to be classified as mildly versus moderately or severely handicapped typically depends upon the criteria applied by those responsible for making such decisions. Thus, the variability is probably accented to a degree by the inconsistency of criteria used to define these groups.

In examining eligibility criteria developed by state educational agencies, a characteristic common to most mildly handicapped individuals appears to be an inability to profit sufficiently from nonspecialized instructional programs (those regularly offered to students).

We can infer from this observation that if instructional problems of the mildly handicapped could be remedied, they would not further be considered handicapped (for school purposes) or in need of special programming. This is particularly true of the mildly learning disabled, mentally retarded, and behaviorally disordered. It excludes the speech impaired, who need treatment even though the speech problem may not interfere with academic performance. The same would be true of students with mild sensory impairments. It is reasonable to argue, however, that academic performance represents the primary factor distinguishing the majority of students considered mildly handicapped from their nonhandicapped peers. The mildly handicapped present primarily instructional problems, and decisions related to what constitutes the least restrictive environment should hinge on the type of remedial instruction required and the conditions essential to optimally benefit from such instruction. Based upon what we know about the nature of instructional problems that persist as a learner characteristic, instruction, it seems reasonable to project, must be intense if the learner's deficits are to be corrected.

In examining the literature on the mildly handicapped from the perspective of instructional implications, a small group of characteristics (each of which has been empirically researched) emerges. Upon further examination these characteristics (detailed below) translate into instructional needs which, from the perspective of the authors, are not receiving sufficient attention in implementation of the least restrictive environment concept for the mildly handicapped.

1. *Task Oriented Behavior.* A number of studies have been conducted to determine differences in task orientation between mildly handicapped students and their nonhandicapped peers. Research conducted by Bryan (1974) and Bryan and Wheeler (1972) led to the finding that learning disabled children spend significantly less time in task oriented behavior and more time in non-task oriented behavior than do average achievers. Krupski (1979) found mildly retarded students to be more distractible, spending less time on task and more time out of their seats than their nonretarded peers. It was reported, though, that these behaviors differed in relationship to the type of task presented to the child.

In a study of behaviors correlated with achievement in high and low achievers, Soli and Devine (1976) found differences between those two groups. They reported that the behaviors most highly correlated with low achievement were lack of attention, self-stimulation, playing, and complying. For the high achieving group the correlate behaviors were positive peer interaction related to the assigned task, requests for help from the teacher, in-seat behavior, and lack of production of inappropriate noise. Forness and Esveldt (1975) reported similar results when comparing the difference in attending behavior of learning disabled and non-learning disabled children.

2. *Attentional Problems.* Differences between attention patterns of mildly handicapped children and their nonhandicapped peers have been demonstrated by a number of studies. Extensive reviews of the literature can be found in Keogh and Margolis (1976), Hallahan and Kauffman (1975), and Hagen and Kail (1975). Evidence from the classroom, clinical setting, and laboratory setting support the conclusion that mildly handicapped children spend less time attending to task than do their nonhandicapped peers when matched for chronological age.

Some work has been done to determine the nature of attention and its relationship to learning. Keogh and Margolis (1976) cited studies providing evidence for the existence of several components of attention that have differing effects on learning. They reported Dykman's proposal of four components of attention: alertness, stimulus selection, focusing, and vigilance. Hallahan, Kauffman, and Ball are credited with identifying the independence of time attending and shifts in attending. Keogh and Margolis proposed the aspects of attending to be (1) coming to attention, (2) decision making, and (3) maintaining attention. They also suggested an approach to viewing the attentional characteristics which may result in differential educational interventions for the remediation of attentional problems.

3. *Peer-Social Interactions.* A growing body of literature indicates that mildly handicapped students

do not interact with nonhandicapped peers to the same extent that nonhandicapped students interact with their own peer group. Nonhandicapped students have been reported to be less responsive to initiatives from handicapped peers than from their nonhandicapped peers. Bryan (1974) found that while handicapped children were as likely to initiate interaction with their peers, they were more likely to be ignored by them when compared with the nonhandicapped. Gottlieb and Davis (1973) found that when nonhandicapped students were given the choice of handicapped or nonhandicapped peers to serve as game partners, they were more likely to choose the nonhandicapped students. Bryan and Bryan (1978) reported that handicapped peers were viewed as less popular than their nonhandicapped peers as indicated on scales of Attraction and Social Rejection. Bryan and Bryan also investigated the types of communication behaviors demonstrated by the two groups of students. They found that the handicapped peers demonstrated a significantly greater number of "nasty" statements and received a significantly greater number of rejection statements from their nonhandicapped peers.

Many hypothesize that integrating mildly handicapped children into regular classes will improve the attitude of the nonhandicapped toward their handicapped classmates. MacMillian (1977) concluded from a review of the literature that there is no support for this hypothesis and that, in fact, mildly handicapped students in segregated classes are more accepted than those in integrated programs.

4. *Pupil-Teacher Interactions.* While a major controversy surrounds the issue of effects of labeling on handicapped children, the data reported in the literature indicate that lower achievers receive differential treatment in classes. Brophy and Good (1970) found that teachers demanded better performance from students they identified as high achievers and, additionally, they more frequently provided praise to those students for their performance when compared with the perceived low achievers. Bryan (1974) also found differences in the nature of interactions between learning disabled students and their teacher and their non-

learning disabled peers and the teacher. The data from this study indicate that as much time was spent interacting with the teacher by both populations, but the learning disabled students were more likely to be ignored by the teacher; when they did receive attention, it was more likely to be of a helping nature than that received by their nonhandicapped peers. Jacobs (1978) found significantly different ratings by teachers who were told to evaluate behavioral and personality characteristics of a child labeled as learning disabled when compared to teachers rating the same child when they were told the child was "normal."

INTENSIVE INSTRUCTION

In advocating intense instruction as essential to the remediation of academic deficits characteristic of the mildly handicapped, "intense instruction" must be defined. To suggest that intense instruction can be measured as a single variable or that all learners respond alike to the same level of intensity would be presumptuous. Intensive instruction is presented as a set of circumstances that impact on the actual interaction of the learner in the instructional situation. Although the authors were unable to locate research studies focusing on the collective features they attribute to intensive instruction, considerable research exists on rate of learning and pupil-teacher ratios.

Time on task is central to the arguments presented in this article, which questions the typical regular class setting as the least restrictive environment for the mildly handicapped. Bloom (1974), in discussing time and rate of learning, built on Carroll's (1963) model of school learning, in which time is considered the critical variable. As a basis for presenting evidence in support of mastery learning strategies, Bloom utilized Carroll's concept of elapsed time as differentiated from the time the learner spends on tasks engaged in the act of learning. He cited research conducted by Anderson (1973), Arlin (1973), and Lahaderne (1967) as illustrating a strong positive relationship between time directly engaged in learning and achievement.

Although it has been widely assumed that class size is related to the effectiveness of instruction for children, few studies have led to conclusions supporting this

relationship. Since the reduced pupil-teacher ratio has long been considered a necessary ingredient for education of the mildly handicapped, conclusions drawn from the literature related to this topic are highly significant. Using meta-analysis, Glass and Smith (in Cahen and Filby, 1979) have pooled and analyzed a half century of data to investigate the relationship. The data indicate that, on the average, achievement improves as class size decreases, with a marked improvement when class size is reduced to fifteen or fewer students. Questions remain as to why this occurs. If answers are found, the implications are many for instruction in the regular class.

Porwall (in Cahen & Filby, 1979) concluded that reduction in class size enables an increase in the individualization of instruction. Cahen and Filby have described current studies designed to systematically examine the question of *how* this class size reduction affects instruction. Questions being considered include: Will there be (1) more individualization, (2) improved diagnostic procedures, (3) an increase in direct instruction, and (4) more monitoring and feedback, as a function of reduced class size?

The student's history of interaction with the set of circumstances that may be considered to be related to intensity of instruction is important in determining the most appropriate educational setting for the student. Also, our view of assessing the academic achievement of the mildly handicapped is that the exclusive emphasis given to the current functioning level of the student as determined by achievement tests is limiting. A more useful approach, in addition to establishing the student's level of performance, would be to determine the intensity of instruction per unit of time which contributed to the student's current level of functioning.

We recognize that although this is a researchable hypothesis and possibly practical as an approach in the future, it does present a variety of problems in reconstructing evidence of past instruction for purposes of determining intensity of instruction. For purposes of illustration, however, let's look at an example. We would submit that two students, both fifteen years of age and reading at the third grade level, may differ greatly if one can substantiate how each came to achieve that third grade reading level. The student who was provided intense instruction during the elementary and intermediate grades may well have a more serious problem than the peer who was subjected to a variety of

instructional approaches but for whom few expectations were held. The latter student may be considered a good candidate for further remedial instruction with optimism of overcoming specific deficits in reading, whereas the student reading at the same level but who had previously received more intense instruction might be a more appropriate candidate for an instructional program emphasizing coping skills.

The point being made is that for the mildly handicapped, emphasis must be placed on intensity of instruction — not merely elapsed time. We further speculate that for the mildly handicapped student placed in the regular class, greater proportion of time is spent in the context of elapsed time than on task and, consequently, the environment becomes restrictive from the perspective of remediation. At least, it inhibits rather than enhances the student's performance.

Intensive instruction, in summary is characterized by:

1. The consistency and duration of time on task.
2. The timing, frequency, and nature of feedback to the student based on his or her immediate performance and cumulative progress.
3. The teacher regularly and frequently communicating to the student an expectancy that this student will be able to master the task and demonstrate continuous progress.
4. A pattern of pupil-teacher interaction in which the teacher responds to student initiatives and uses consequences appropriate to the student's responses.

For intensive instruction to occur, several conditions must exist. This include low pupil-teacher ratios, teachers capable of implementing the features of intensive instruction, materials that allow for individualization, the employment of instructional management practices that incorporate the specifying of objectives and careful monitoring of pupil progress, and flexible scheduling that enables instruction to occur within varied time frames.

CONCLUSION

The authors have questioned the manner in which the least restrictive environment principle is being applied to the mildly handicapped. We have taken the position that the needs of the mildly handicapped are primarily instructional in nature and necessitate an intense approach to remediation. We have also argued that conditions in the typical classroom are not currently conducive to the provision of intense instruction, and that decisions on least restrictive placements for the mildly handicapped should be based on a determination of settings that offer the highest probability that intense instruction appropriate to the students' needs will occur. The extent to which such conditions will emerge depends greatly upon reorienting the people responsible for educational assessment and decision making regarding appropriate instruction.

Following are examples of options worth exploring.

1. Once a student is identified as mildly handicapped, consideration should be given to placement of the student in a highly intense instructional program for two to three months or until the effectiveness of remediation has been substantiated, and then begin to increase participation in the regular classroom setting. During the intensive instruction period, attention would be given to determining the kinds of conditions necessary for the student to be maximally responsive to instruction. This would aid in the selection of other placement options.
2. The pupil-teacher ratio in mainstreamed classrooms should be reduced to 15 to 1 or lower. If this is not feasible on a full-day basis, a half day might be beneficial.
3. Teachers of mainstream classrooms should be trained to employ techniques related to intense instruction — for example, feedback to students, maintaining on-task behavior, and individualizing instruction.
4. Continuous instruction should be provided; e.g., summer school remedial programs should be offered during the period of time in which the student is progressing toward a performance level that would enhance his/her performance in a regular classroom situation.
5. In making placement decisions on junior and senior high aged students, evaluators should give consideration to the nature of the student's educational history, and to the extent possible determine the intensity of instruction that contributed to the student's current level of functioning.
6. Use of paraprofessionals in mainstreamed classrooms should increase. Such persons could help implement recommendations of the special education teacher with specific students in the mainstreamed setting.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W. *Time and school learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973.
- Arlin, M. N. *Learning rate and learning rate variance under mastery learning conditions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973.
- Bloom, B. S. Time and learning. *American Psychologist*, September 1974, 682-688.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1970, 61, 365-374.
- Bryan, T. An observational analysis of classroom behaviors of children with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 1974, 7, 35-43.
- Bryan, T., & Bryan, J. Social interactions of learning disabled children. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 1978, 1, 33-37.
- Bryan, T., & Wheeler, R. Perception of learning disabled children: The eye of the observer. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 1972, 5, 484-488.
- Cahen, L. S., & Filby, N. N. The class size/achievement issue: New evidence and a research plan. *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1979, 492-495.
- Carroll, J. B. A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record*, 1963, 64, 723-733.
- Forness, S. R., & Esveldt, K. C. Classroom observation of children with learning and behavior problems. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 1975, 8, 382-385.
- Gottlieb, J., & Davis, J. Social acceptance of EMR during overt behavioral interactions. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 1973, 78, 141-143.
- Hagen, J. W., & Kail, R. V. The role of attention in perceptual and cognitive development. In W. A. Cruickshank & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Perceptual and learning disabilities in children (Vol. 2)*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1975.
- Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. Research on the education of distractible and hyperactive children. In W. M. Cruickshank & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Perceptual and learning disabilities in children (Vol. 2)*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1975.

- Jacobs, W. R. The effect of the learning disability label on classroom teachers' ability to objectively observe and interpret child behaviors. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 1978, 1, 50-55.
- Kaufman, M. J., Gottlieb, J., Agard, J., & Kukic, M.D. Mainstreaming: Toward an explication of the construct. In E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason, & R. J. Whelan (Eds.), *Alternatives for teaching exceptional children*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co., 1975.
- Kaufman, M. J., & Morra, L. J. The least restrictive environment: A major philosophical change. In E. L. Meyen (Ed.), *Exceptional children and youth*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co., 1978.
- Keogh, B. K., & Margolis, J. Learning to labor and wait: Attentional problems of children with learning disorders. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 1976, 9, 276-286.
- Krupski, A. Are retarded children more distractible? Observational analysis of retarded and nonretarded children's classroom behavior. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 1979, 84, 1-10.
- Lahaderne, A. M. *Adaptation to school settings: A study of children's attitudes and classroom behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967.
- MacMillian, D. L. *Mental retardation in school and society*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- Soli, S. D., & Devine, V. T. Behavioral correlates of achievement: A look at high and low achievers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1976, 68, 335-341.
- Turnbull, H. R., & Turnbull, A. P. *Free appropriate public education — Law and implementation*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co., 1979.

needed by families of children with emotional disorders; alternative school approaches; cooperative efforts between public schools, residential treatment facilities, state training institutions, and other agencies; training issues; exemplary personnel preparation programs; non-traditional teacher preparation models; and joint training efforts between state and local education agencies and universities.

Conference chairman is Lyndal Bullock, North Texas State University. The two-day institute series, August 11-12 — offering intensive skill development for persons working with autistic children and with delinquent secondary youth — is being coordinated by Peter Knoblock, Syracuse University.

For further information, contact The Council for Exceptional Children, Conventions and Training Unit, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091.

* * *

A new Easter Seal publication, "Bright Promise," discusses the birth defect of cleft palate. Authored by Eugene T. McDonald and Asa J. Berlin of Pennsylvania State University, the publication's purpose is to answer common questions and give reassurance about the treatment and future of children with cleft palates.

The publication, incorporating suggestions from parent groups and medical professionals, discusses factors in prenatal development, surgery and/or using a speech aid to correct the defect, and specific problems and remedies in eating, talking, and hearing. Illustrations and photographs complement the discussion.

This booklet is available at a nominal charge by writing to the National Easter Seal Society, 2023 West Ogden Avenue, Chicago, IL 60602.

ALERT

The Council for Exceptional Children will conduct a *National Topical Conference and Institute Series on Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Individuals*, August 11-15, 1980, in Minneapolis. Session topics are to include: defining serious emotional disturbance; how to teach different age groups; what supportive services are