

Summer 1971

The Impact of Establishing Group Homes on Public Schools Special Education Classes

Stewart Glen Egbert
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Egbert, Stewart Glen, "The Impact of Establishing Group Homes on Public Schools Special Education Classes" (1971). *All Master's Theses*. 1610.
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1610>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

THE IMPACT OF ESTABLISHING GROUP HOMES ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSES

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Stewart Glen Egbert

June, 1971

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Dohn A. Miller, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Dean Stinson

Sam Rust

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere thanks to:

Dr. Dohn Miller, Chairman, Dr. Dean Stinson, and Dr. Sam Rust, Jr., committee members, for their understanding, guidance, and valuable suggestions offered throughout the writing of this study;

Dr. Ted Cooper for his assistance in writing style;

My wife, Sharon, whose kind patience has helped make this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	1
PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Procedure of the Study	4
Limitations of the Study	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	4
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
DEVELOPMENT OF GROUP HOME	7
Group Home	7
POLICY	9
Group Home Policy	9
State Department of Institutions Policy	12
School Policy	14
3. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF GROUP HOMES	15
Tacoma Group Homes (Stucco and White)	15
Yakima Group Home (Badger)	18
Auburn Group Home (Century House)	19
Kent Group Home (Skyview)	22
SERVICES FOR GROUP HOMES	23
Tacoma Group Homes	23
Yakima Group Home	24

Chapter	Page
Kent Group Home & Auburn Group Home	25
4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32
APPENDIX A	33
APPENDIX B	38
APPENDIX C	39

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

PROBLEM

Introduction

In 1885 the Washington territorial legislature passed legislation to establish a residential facility to service handicapped children. This piece of legislation was a modest but significant beginning for the care of handicapped children. In 1890 the State of Washington served seven people in a residential facility; the number has now grown to approximately 4,600 residents in seven residential schools for the handicapped (3:1). Thus, the establishment of the institutions demanded the removal of the retarded child from his parents, familiar surroundings, friends, and neighbors. The placement of these handicapped children out into the community was a significant factor in the institutions' program. As of March 31, 1970, 918 residents, who had left the institutions for "placement," were residing in different types of living situations (3:3), in most cases appropriately selected for the resident's special needs (Table I). In spite of these placement programs, the problem of a waiting list for admission remained. In 1966, approximately 1,200 mentally and physically handicapped people were waiting for admission to the institutions (3:3). Out of this evolved the need for the development of more sophisticated community based programs.

The first community based incentive programs to help the

CLIENTS' ON PLACEMENT (PL) STATUS IN THE
DIVISION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN - MENTALLY RETARDED, AS OF MARCH 31, 1970
BY AGENCY, BY SEX, AND BY TYPE OF PLACEMENT

Type of Placement	AGENCY AND SEX												TOTAL
	Lakeland Village School		Rainier School		Yakima Valley School		Fircrest School		Interlake School		Division Total		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Own family, dependent	8	8	25	22	2	0	13	4	0	1	48	35	83
Own family, attends school	0	0	16	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	10	26
Own family, partial self-support	3	1	6	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	5	15
Own family, self-support	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	4	8
Foster home, dependent	8	5	21	18	0	1	5	5	0	0	34	29	63
Foster home, attends school	0	0	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	9
Foster home, partial self-support	1	2	5	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	5	12
Foster home, self-support	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7
Group care home, dependent	13	8	34	49	6	9	78	98	3	0	134	164	298
Group care home, attends school	0	1	16	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	16	14	30
Group care home, partial self-support	1	1	20	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	22	10	32
Group care home, self-support	0	0	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	7	30
Working home, farm	7	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	19
Working home, nursing or convalescent home	11	10	5	13	0	0	1	3	0	0	17	26	43
Working home, private home	0	4	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	14	14
Working home, other	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Other placements, working	0	0	12	1	3	1	7	1	0	0	22	3	25
Other placement	67	84	1	0	17	8	4	1	0	0	89	93	182
Unknown	3	0	0	2	2	4	3	3	0	0	8	9	17
TOTAL PLACEMENTS	124	124	211	162	30	24	115	124	3	1	483	435	918

TABLE I

handicapped were known as "Epton" programs, set up under the provisions of the "Epton Bill." The bill provided the Department of Institutions funds to help develop community based programs for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped. To date the appropriation has grown from \$30,000 for the biennium to \$578,000 (3:4).

Because of the need for placement programs, additional resources have been provided: day care centers, activity centers, and special education programs. To date approximately 2,500 mentally retarded people who might otherwise need institutional care are living in their own homes and communities (3:5). It was the state's goal through the use of placement programs, the manageable waiting list, and the broadened community programs to reduce the population in the institutions. In 1969 the state did not feel that the institutions were at an efficiently manageable size.

Concerned for the overcrowded institutions and the need for more community based programs, in 1969 the state launched a new dimension of service to the institutionalized mentally handicapped. An executive-supported bill popularly known as the "Group Home Bill" was introduced and enacted into law by the 1969 Washington State Legislature. This bill authorized the Director of the Department of Institutions to place residents from institutions into group homes and pay for their continued care and support in the community.

Purpose of the Study

This study had two purposes: to give a descriptive analysis of group homes, and to determine whether the establishment of group homes has had any impact on public school districts' special education classes in the State of Washington. The factors examined were: who is providing

a formal education for the residents; to what extent are group home residents receiving public services.

Procedure of the Study

The analytic procedures of the study consisted primarily of a number of oral interviews conducted with four different school districts and/or communities in the State of Washington (see Appendix A for questions). People interviewed in each district and/or community were: special education directors, County Mental Health Mental Retardation directors, group home directors, group home board chairmen, and field service representatives of the Department of Institutions. At the state level the Director of the Department of Handicapped Children was interviewed. The questions asked in the interviews varied in relationship to the role of the subject.

Further research was done by a survey of recently published information, and observations of group home environments.

An analysis of the data appears in Chapter 3. Recommendations for further study appear in Chapter 4. Appendix B provides documentation on the interviews.

Limitations of the Study

The study was somewhat limited. The primary focus was to examine the six group homes, in four different school districts or communities, which have residents of school age.

Interviews were conducted in Yakima, Tacoma, Auburn, and Kent.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are defined as used in this study.

Group Home

A residential facility capable of serving, among others, a small number of mentally or physically handicapped individuals, up to a maximum of twenty, who are able to participate in a variety of jobs, sheltered workshops, day care centers, activity centers, education facilities, or other community based programs that are meaningful for their training, rehabilitation, or general well-being (13:D1).

Special Education Director

A school administrator who coordinates all special education programming for the school district.

Residential Staff (Group Home)

A person or persons employed in the group home primarily for the care, supervision, and guidance of the residents. The staff may also serve as cook and perform maintenance duties, provided that adequate care and supervision of the resident is maintained.

Epton Bill (Washington State, Chapter 251, Laws of 1961)

An act to enable and fund the Department of Institutions to develop community based programs for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped. The initial appropriation in 1961-63 was \$30,000; at the last biennium the appropriation was \$578,000 (12:1).

County Mental Health Mental Retardation Board

An organization established by enactment of the legislature, in 1967, for coordinating local programs. A substantial number of counties have appointed administrative personnel and coordinate programs for the mentally and physically handicapped in their counties.

Field Services (Department of Institutions)

An agency, under the Department of Institutions, working closely

with the Department of Public Assistance in the maintenance of group home residents. Field services representatives are social workers responsible for the placement and welfare of group home residents.

Group Home Advisory Board

A board composed of citizens from the community, who meet at least semiannually, and advise the group home operator in regard to all matters pertaining to residential care.

Group Home Operator

A person responsible for administration of the group home. In most cases, this person owns the group home.

State School

A residential school established, operated, and maintained by the Department of Institutions for the education, guidance, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of mentally and physically deficient persons.

Mental Deficiency

A state of subnormal development of the human organism in consequence of which the individual affected is mentally incapable of assuming those responsibilities expected of the socially adequate person, such as self-direction, self-support, and social participation (13:D1).

Physical Deficiency

A state of physical impairment of the human organism in consequence of which the individual affected is physically incapable of assuming those responsibilities expected of the socially adequate person, such as self-direction, self-support, and social participation (13:D2).

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

DEVELOPMENT OF GROUP HOME

Group Home

The group home concept is not widely recognized on the West Coast. This approach has been used successfully for dependent children, delinquents, and unwed mothers in the United States and abroad. The concept of group homes is a recognized method in Europe, and particularly in Scandinavia, for the care of the mentally retarded (3:6). In the United States, group homes were established as early as 1916, first in the City of New York (6:143). Only a few states in the United States have employed the group home concept for the care of the mentally retarded. The States of Connecticut, Indiana, and New York have programs dating back only a few years (14:D4).

The group home concept is relatively new to the State of Washington. The first group home was established because of the efforts of a woman who had a retarded daughter whom she did not want sent to an institution. The determination of this mother was directed purposefully toward creating a group home for seven others who were living in institutions (3:14). Soon after the efforts of this woman, an executive-supported bill, popularly known as the "Group Home Bill," was introduced and enacted into law by the 1969 session of the Washington State Legislature. The bill was designed to give the Department of

Institutions authorization to place residents of institutions into group homes and to pay for their continued care and support. The rules and regulations for group homes were written and adopted by the state after a series of public hearings. An appropriation of \$405,000 was authorized for the biennium to carry out the program. With this appropriation, the group home program began on July 1, 1969 (3:6).

Washington State's group homes are only in the formative stages of development. A recent survey shows that approximately 1,300 residents in the various institutions within Washington would benefit from the group home program (3:7). The Department of Institutions estimated that by July, 1971, between 250 and 300 residents will be moved into group homes from the various institutions. Fourteen group homes are operating in the State of Washington in 1971. Five of the homes currently house fifty-five school age residents. A total of 178 persons are group home residents at this time (see Appendix C).

Group home concepts in the United States vary in definition, staffing patterns, and use. Some are owned and professionally staffed by public agencies and provide complete care and case work services to children in residence; others are basically foster homes in which a family offers care and supervision within its own life style to several foster children (6:143).

Group homes are located where a maximum of community resources are available to residents for use. The living area consists of a home-like atmosphere and residents take part, insofar as they are capable, in their own personal care and in the care of their quarters (3:7).

A building for a group home may be owned or leased, provided

that the building conforms to state laws and regulations. Some homes are located in apartment buildings, others in large houses which offer a pleasant and healthful environment for the residents (3:9).

The management of the group home is the responsibility either of the owner of the home or the operator, which may be a non-profit or profit organization. Homes operated for profit by a private individual are required, for approval, to be served by a "Citizens Advisory Board." The board consists of a group of people from the community interested and knowledgeable in the field of mental retardation, who do not have a beneficial interest in group homes. Most group homes have an advisory board with which they confer on matters pertaining to the home. The non-profit group home usually has an advisory board, but does not have to answer for its actions as does the profit organized home (3:8,9).

The major objective of the group home program is to provide care for residents in a home-like atmosphere, outside conventional institutions. An effort is made to place residents in or near their communities or origin (3:9).

It should be understood that the group home program is intended to be only the forerunner of other programs for the comprehensive care of the handicapped. It is hoped that the group homes will remain "homes" and thus use the community as a resource to encourage the retarded to be a part of society (3:12).

POLICY

Group Home Policy

The group home program is licensed under the Laws of the Extraordinary Session of 1969, Chapter 166, to provide for the care,

supervision, training in living skills, and education of the mentally or physically handicapped (9:1).

Following are the principal policies of group homes:

1. The group home agrees to provide personal care, training in living skills, recreation, and education at the group home or in public schools in accordance with the terms of this agreement, current rules, regulations and policies of the Division and the licensing authority of the State for Child Care Institutions. It is further understood that:
 - a. The group home will maintain a contract with a local physician or medical clinic for obtaining medical service for residents. A similar contract will be maintained for dental service.
 - b. The group home agrees that it will maintain separate accounts of residents' personal funds, and the accounts will be available for inspection at any time by the Division or representatives of the Division.
 - c. Group home personnel will be responsible for the selection and purchase of the clothing and other merchandise necessary for the well being of the resident. This will be accomplished in such a manner that the resident will have opportunity to develop his own skills.
2. In addition to room and board, the group home will provide the following personal care services to all residents:
 - a. Formulate and implement plans toward individual rehabilitation.
 - b. Establish liaison with governmental or non-governmental agencies, or voluntary or educational agencies to obtain services for residents.
 - c. Follow the "Policy Statements on Residential Care," in Standards and Guidelines for Group Homes, published by the Division of Institutions.
3. It is further agreed by the group home that it will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with applicable State laws regarding discrimination; and with Chapter 166, Laws of 1969, Ex. Sess.; and any other laws of the State of Washington, relating to the mentally and physically handicapped; and the rules and regulations formulated and adopted in implementation thereof, including, but not limited to, Chapter 275-36, Washington Administrative Code.
4. This agreement shall become effective on this date, and shall

remain in full force and effect as long as the group home has a valid license and a certificate of group home referral. Either party of this agreement has the right to cancel this agreement within thirty days written notification (8:1-3).

Group Home Advisory Board Policy

It is the responsibility of the group home director to choose persons from the community to serve on an advisory board for the group home. The advisory board consists of at least five members, plus a superintendent of a state residential school or his designate. The following positions for the advisory board are elected for a one-year term: chairman, vice chairman, and secretary. Persons chosen for the board preferably have some background of knowledge of the mentally and physically handicapped. The Advisory Board serves as a liaison between the Division of Institutions and the administrator of the group home (10:1).

The board must meet at least semiannually, keep minutes of all meetings, and advise the group home operator in regard to all matters pertaining to residential care (10:1).

B. Duties of the advisory board.

1. Board members review monthly reports of the group home administrator.
2. Board members maintain minutes of each board meeting which shall be sent to board members, institutions, and Mental Health Mental Retardation Board.
3. Board members attempt to keep abreast of all developments affecting the residential life of a group home.
4. Board members are expected to visit the group home periodically to observe operational programs.
5. Board members work in conjunction with, and in support of, the administrator and lend their experience.
6. Board members have a moral responsibility to take action

to alleviate any conditions that are in opposition to the philosophy or rules and regulations under which the group home is established.

7. Each Board member should be aware of, and see that, the administrator practices the philosophy contained in the Statement on Residential Care of the National Association for Retarded Children.
- C. Relation of Administrator to Advisory Board.
1. Administrator must prepare a monthly report to the Advisory Board on progress, programs, and problems.
 2. Administrator must report special problems.
 - a. The administrator must report to the chairman, or vice-chairman, and the superintendent of the regional institution any unusual or serious incidents detrimental to the residents or the group home.
- D. Relation of Advisory Board to Division of Institutions, MR Board, and the regional institution.
1. If changes recommended by the Advisory Board cannot be brought about through the advice to the administrator, the Advisory Board may report their concern, in writing, to the Division of Institutions, with copies to the Superintendent of the regional institution and to the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board.
 2. When membership changes in the Advisory Board, the chairman of the Board must report this change to the Division of Institutions, with copies to the Superintendent of the regional institution and the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board (10:1,2).

State Department of Institutions Policy

With the organization of the group home program, an agreement was formulated between the Department of Institutions and the Department of Public Assistance, both agencies of the State of Washington, designed to enable eligible persons presently residing in institutions to be moved to group homes approved by the Department of Institutions under State Regulations adopted for the group home program. The intent of the agreement was to maximize the resources available to the State,

so that the respective departments would maximize the services to group home residents (13:A1).

The following policies were established by State Legislature as the responsibility of the Department of Institutions:

Section 1. The Department of Institutions is authorized to pay for all or a portion of the costs of care, support, and training of residents of state residential schools for the mentally and/or physically deficient persons who are placed in group homes, as hereinafter provided.

Section 2. All payments made by the Department of Institutions in accordance with section 1 of this 1969 amendatory act shall, insofar as reasonably possible, be supplementary to payments to be made for the costs of care, support, and training in a group home by the estate of such resident of the state residential school, or from any resource which such resident may have, or become entitled to, from any public, private, federal or state agency. Payments by the department of institutions under this act may, in its discretion, be paid directly to group homes, or to counties having created community boards for mental retardation services in accordance with the provision of chapter 110, Laws of 1967, Ex. Sess.

Section 3. The Department of Institutions shall promulgate rules and regulations concerning the eligibility of residents of state schools for placement in group homes under the authority of this 1969 amendatory act, determination of ability of such persons or their estates to pay all or a portion of the cost of care, support and training, the manner and method of licensing or certification and inspection and approval of such group homes for placement under this 1969 amendatory act and procedures for the payment of costs of care, maintenance, and training in group homes.

Such rules and regulations shall include standards for care, maintenance, and training to be met by such group homes. In addition, the Department of Institutions shall be responsible for coordinating state activities and resources relating to group home placements to the end that state and local resources will be efficiently expended and an effective community-based group home program may be created.

Section 4. Whenever in the judgment of the superintendent of any state school, the treatment and training of any resident has progressed to the point that it is deemed advisable to return such resident to the community, the superintendent may grant placement on such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable after reasonable notice to and consultation with the parent entitled to custody or the acting guardian of such person.

Whenever any person who has been a resident of a state school leaves said school on placement, responsibility of the school to

provide care, support, or medical attention shall cease unless such person shall be returned to such state school or unless arrangements have been made either to assume a portion of the costs of care, support, and training for such person while on placement in a group home.

The Department of Institutions shall evaluate at reasonable intervals the adjustment of the resident to the placement to determine whether the resident should be continued in the placement or returned to the institution or given a different placement (5:1,2).

School Policy

It is the responsibility of the group home to arrange for an educational plan for each school age resident and to provide suitable study facilities. By State Law, it is the responsibility of the regular public educational agency to provide an education for the mentally retarded who are in residential care (13:F6).

Chapter 3

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF GROUP HOMES

Tacoma Group Homes (Stucco and White)

On August 1, 1970, two group homes were opened in the city of Tacoma for seventeen autistic handicapped children, under the auspices of the University of Puget Sound.

Both homes, one a stucco house and the other a white wood framed house, were located on lots approximately 50 feet by 100 feet (2:1). The houses, attractively landscaped with grass and shrubs, were older; both had an up and down stairs with up-to-date kitchen and bathroom facilities. The houses were across the street from each other, within easy access to the University of Puget Sound and a bus service which could take group home residents and staff to downtown Tacoma.

The group homes were developed to service autistically handicapped children between the ages of six and twelve years. Of the children selected, eleven were boys and six girls. The selection of the group home residents was made by the group home director and the field service representative from Rainier State School at Buckley. Twelve children were hand picked from the institution; five other children came from the community.

The group homes had a total of six full time staff. Four of the staff were married; each couple lived in the home, with a helper who lives on the upper floor of the home. After selection, the group home staff were directed to develop skills for training residents in

self-help, such as toilet training, eating, and dressing themselves. To develop these skills, the Pierce County Extension Service was called in to run a dietary and clothing workshop for the live-in-staff before the homes opened. The University was also helpful in the training of staff.

Added to the group home staff were a number of volunteer college and high school students working to develop the skills mentioned above. Some of the volunteer help did such chores as cooking, washing, and cleaning to take some of the burden off the live-in-staff so that they might give more of their attention to the children.

Both homes had developed their own community programs to meet the needs of the residents. The group home residents were integrated into community activities as they were able to cope with them. The residents were taken to the Y.M.C.A. for swimming, and to theaters, parks, stores, and restaurants.

Formal education for the residents was not provided by the Tacoma School District, as they were not asked to provide a program. The educational program was directly affiliated with the University of Puget Sound under the guidance of the group home director.

The school program was provided in the basement of a church. Because of a shortage of funds for the program, the group home director wrote a federal staffing grant for Title I funds of \$17,000. Upon receipt of the funds the director hired a certified teacher to work full time in the school program.

The program was designed to service the seventeen residents half the day in school, half the day going to their community programs. The children were divided according to their ability levels and grouped

into two separate sections, one in school in the morning, the other in the afternoon.

Modern teaching techniques, programmed learning and behavior modification, were used with the children. The most significant aspect of the school program was the one to one ratio of college students from the University of Puget Sound receiving training in education and speech therapy working with the children. The school's greatest resource was the backing it received from the University, both educationally and financially.

No plans were made to enroll any of the children into the public schools of Tacoma for the fall of 1971.

The group home was a non-profit organization. The director was in the process of forming a group home board which would consist of seven members: one member from the Board of Trustees of the University of Puget Sound, one member from the Student Body of the University of Puget Sound, and five members from the community.

The development of these two group homes was not without problems. It was felt by the management that at the state level not enough funds had been allotted for the running of a group home under the guidelines and philosophy of the state. This was one of the reasons why the group home director wrote a staffing grant. Part of the \$17,000 grant was used for the hiring of a certified teacher; part was used for the live-in-staff of the group home. Keeping well qualified staff, with limited funds to pay them, was a problem for the group homes. The group home director thought the staff was worth more than the minimum wage. The director wanted staff with a capacity to learn, and with a feeling that retarded children can learn. The director of

the homes felt that the live-in-staff held the key to the development of the group home residents, since this was a home, where the child spends most of his time and receives most of his training.

The director preferred staff who had earned a Bachelor's degree from a college or university, and wanted to pay them from \$6,000 to \$8,000 a year.

The Tacoma group home may serve as a model of the development of other group homes throughout the state.

Yakima Group Home (Badger)

On August 1, 1970, a group home for trainable and educable retarded children was opened in the city of Yakima under the guidance of the Spring Acres Corporation. The group home organization was significantly different from those opened in Tacoma.

The house was an old mansion which was remodeled inside to meet city and county regulations for housing. The house was located approximately six blocks from downtown Yakima, allowing residents easy access to community resources.

Fourteen residents ranging in age from eleven to seventeen years were selected. Of the fourteen residents, ten were considered trainable mentally retarded; the other four were educable mentally retarded. Selection of the group home residents was made by the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board under the guidance of representatives of the Department of Institutions from Lakeland Village and Rainier State School. Residents were selected on the basis of their ability to maintain themselves, not having physical disabilities that require extensive medical attention, not having behavior problems and being (mainly) residents of the county.

The group home's staff consisted of a married couple who resided in the home 24 hours a day. To assist the live-in-staff, an aide was hired to come in during the day to help with the feeding and dressing of the residents. One of the members of the live-in-staff was attending Central Washington State College, doing course work in special education. People from the community center volunteered their services to the group home. The writer questions whether the group home had enough paid staff to provide care and training for the residents.

The group home residents were bused to different community and public facilities. Unlike the Tacoma group home program, the Yakima group home was somewhat more dependent upon the public school district and the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board for services needed.

The group home had an advisory board, named the Spring Acres Corporation. Serving on the board was the superintendent of Yakima Public Schools, Director of the Mental Health Board, and five other people from the community. The board was considered a non-profit organization.

Problems arose when the group home was started in Yakima, including providing an education for group home residents and providing community programs. These services were being provided for the group home residents through the local school district and the Department of Institutions when the writer interviewed people from Yakima.

Auburn Group Home (Century House)

In contrast to the two group home programs previously described, the Auburn group home, also started in August, 1970, was a completely different approach to integration of residents of institutions into the community. The major objective of the home was to integrate residents

into any opportunities for vocational training that might be provided by the community.

The structure of the Auburn group home was considerably different from the group homes located in Tacoma and Yakima. The home was a two story apartment building, with a capacity of 60 to 80 persons, three or four to a room. The building was located near Auburn High School and close to downtown Auburn.

Selection of the group home residents was done by the field service representative from Rainier State School and the group home director. The institution used a placement list, stressing suitability for employment in the community and competence in self-help skills. Twenty-three residents were selected for the group home, ranging in age from 18 to 50, and in ability from low mild to high moderate retarded.

The unique difference from the other group homes was the integration of the twenty-three group home residents with forty patients of a nursing home under the same management. This situation has worked out very well for the management of the home and its residents. For example, many of the group home residents took the nursing home patients for walks and visited with them. Examination revealed that the situation was an effective ego builder for the young adults; their feeling of importance was enhanced as they were able to help others. The integration of the group home residents had considerable impact on the rehabilitation of the nursing patients, also.

The primary objective of the Auburn group was to place residents into community work experiences. This was handled largely by the field service representative from Rainier State School, who was responsible for finding jobs and placing the residents in them. Of the twenty-three

residents, twenty-one were working, of whom eight were paid the legal minimum wage or more. The program was so successful with two of the residents that the field service representative began negotiations with the Department of Public Assistance to place these two individuals out of the group home in an apartment of their own, completely independent of the Department of Institutions.

The staff of the home consisted primarily of the group home director, who was a registered nurse, and two aides who came in during the day to care not only for the group home residents, but for the nursing home patients, also.

Several problems confronted the Auburn group home. Transportation to and from work and to the activity center in Kent was one of the major problems; residents had to pay for their own transportation. Another problem was one found common to most group homes, the problem of untrained staff. The field service representative indicated that the Rainier State School was willing to train staff for the group homes. However, the aides were paid only \$1.65 an hour. Group homes are bound to have problems of untrained staff and turnover if the operators do not make the jobs more worthwhile.

Another problem was pointed out by the field service representative. Residents were not allowed to do any cooking or any preparation of meals in the kitchen, under regulation set by the Health Department. It was hoped that this problem could be worked out, since the residents needed the opportunity to learn to prepare their own meals.

The Auburn group home was an operation of the Kay-Lee Corporation, a profit organization. The head of the advisory board was an Auburn lawyer, assisted by five other members of the community.

Kent Group Home (Skyview)

The Kent group home was opened in November, 1970. The home was for children of school age, housed in a structure very similar to that of the Auburn home.

The structure of the group home was a single story apartment building, with four apartments on one side that opened independently to the outdoors and a paved parking area. Facing the four residents' apartments were four apartments remodeled as kitchen facilities, storage, recreation, and an apartment for the live-in-staff. The four residents' apartments housed up to five persons each. The home was located close to the city of Kent, making it possible for residents to have easy access to community resources.

Twenty residents were living in the home. They were selected on the basis of their ability to care for themselves and not having major behavior problems. Also taken into consideration were their school habits and interest in school.

The residents were selected from Rainier State School by the Director of Special Education for the Kent School District, the field service representative, and the group home director. The children selected were seven to sixteen years old, ranging in ability from moderately to mildly retarded. Three of the children came directly from the community.

The group home had a live-in-staff of two, and three other staff members who worked consecutive eight hour shifts. Field services handled the training of staff members.

The Skyview home was under the same advisory board as the Century House in Auburn.

SERVICES FOR GROUP HOMES

Tacoma Group Homes

The Tacoma group home program operated independently of the Tacoma School District and the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board. The school district of Tacoma has not been asked to furnish an educational program for any of the group home residents. The school district would be more willing to provide a program, if sufficient notice is given by the director of the group home so that the school district may budget for state funds to service seventeen more children. Through the efforts of the group home director and the University of Puget Sound formal education is provided as mentioned in chapter 2.

The Mental Health Mental Retardation Board was not approached by the group home director to provide any community programs for the residents. If the board had been asked, it would have had a difficult time finding funds to develop programs. However, Epton funds might be appropriated by the State to provide for programming.

The school district did feel that the placement of more group homes in Tacoma would make a definite impact on special education classes. The State Department of Education was in the process of cutting back the budget for special education programs by 15 to 20 percent. Tacoma already had a small waiting list in Tacoma of children needing special education classes. The establishment of more group homes would compound the problem, unless special funding was provided.

The Tacoma School District and the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board suggested that the Department of Institutions and the State Department of Education define their respective roles in more detail.

Yakima Group Home

The opening of the Badger group home in Yakima was disorganized from the standpoint of services provided for the home. The fourteen school age children placed in the home were entitled, by State Law, to a formal education provided by the school district. Under State regulations for group homes, no home for school age children can be opened until the school district guarantees that a program will be provided immediately upon placement of the residents.

The Superintendent of the Yakima School District sat on the advisory board of the Badger group home, yet did not know of the placement of school age residents in the home. For the months of September and October, no formal education was provided, because the school district was not given the necessary time to budget for the school year of 1970-71 for fourteen more handicapped children. It was not until November 1 that an educational program was provided through the efforts of the school district, the Department of Institutions, and the Department of Education. A total of \$12,000 in emergency funds was provided by the Department of Institutions and the State Department of Education to the school district to provide a program for residents of the Badger group home.

The children then were bused to Robinson school, where a two hour program was provided. Following the school program, the children spent the rest of the day in community programs organized by the Spring Acres Corporation and funded reluctantly by the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board with Epton funds from the State. Interestingly, when emergency funds were allotted by the State, the school district used the funds also to provide a program for twenty-five children who were

on a waiting list to be served by the district.

The community programs in Yakima were in what was called the Green House and the Ruth Child School. The Green House was primarily for the older children. The Green House contracted work from the community and had the children complete the contracts and receive pay for their work, and also allowed group home residents to do some work in ceramics. The Ruth Child School was primarily an activity center where the children went to do arts and crafts projects.

The school district pointed out that school records on the group home residents were insufficient. This made the development of a school program difficult. The school district also felt that it should have been contacted directly by the Department of Institutions on placement of the residents. Communication among the Spring Acres Corporation, the school district, and the Department of Institutions was inadequate.

Kent Group Home & Auburn Group Home

The educational services provided for the Kent group home were a direct contrast to those provided in Yakima. The communications between the State Department of Institutions, the group home director, and the Kent School District were very efficient. The school district and the field service representative played a part in the selection of the residents for the group home. The special education director was involved in the selection, because he was responsible for providing a program. It was his priority to pick individuals who were best suited for the Grandview School. The Grandview program was essentially a sheltered workshop designed for the moderately retarded. The facility now services five different school districts, enrolling 120 students.

The school district did express concern that if they had not had

this facility, the residents would have made a large impact on the district, because the State did not give enough notice to budget for the twenty residents arriving at the group home. The district stated that a formal education for group home residents should be the responsibility of the State Department of Public Instruction and not the Department of Institutions.

The Mental Health Mental Retardation Board for King County has been very receptive to the development of community programs for the group homes both in Auburn and Kent. The board has met with the group home directors and people from the community in an effort to establish recreational and vocational programs for group home residents. Programs were to be provided by Title 16 funds for the South King County Activity Center. The center was designed similar to a workshop setting, in which thirty adults from group homes would participate. The center was designed for the resident who was unable to be placed in community work experience. The aim of the program was to develop vocational skills for the less competent group home resident. The Mental Health Mental Retardation Board also was investigating with the Seattle Park Department and the Auburn Park Department a program to develop vocational skills for adults and to provide recreational programming for all group home residents. They were planning to develop such programs through the use of federal funds allotted to the park departments.

The Mental Health Mental Retardation Board did point out the problem of transportation for the Auburn group home residents. If the program at the Kent Activity Center was to survive on federal funds, it must have the numbers.

The Kent Recreation Department also has been working closely

with the field service representative to create recreational programs for the residents of Skyview. Programs in bowling and swimming were provided.

Generally, all the group homes were being serviced. The question is how long will this service be provided without more specific legislation to provide for programs.

Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because institutions were overcrowded and understaffed, an intensified non-institutional placement program was desired. The group home program was designed to meet the need to give institutional residents a chance to be integrated into a community. The major objective of the group home program was to provide care for the resident, educationally, vocationally, and socially with his contact with the community.

The first years of the group home program have been relatively successful. However, group homes have not been without their problems. One was the noticeable impact on Special Education classes because of the breakdown in communication among the State Department of Institutions, the school districts, and the group home directors. A prime example was the situation in Yakima mentioned in chapter 3. As the study of the group home programs revealed, the general consensus of school districts was that they were not given time to budget for residents of group homes coming into their districts. The district said they need nine to twelve months notice.

The formal education of group home residents again was questioned by the Kent School District, which asked the following questions, answered by the State Department of Public Instruction:

Q. Can the school district collect basic costs for these children and subsequent excess costs for them?

A. Yes, the school district can collect basic costs for these children and also is eligible for excess costs.

Q. Can the school district charge the district from which the child was sent as a participating district?

Q. No, the school district cannot charge the district from which the child was sent as a participating district.

Q. Can the school district refuse to serve children placed in their district under these circumstances?

A. No, the school district cannot refuse to serve children placed in their school district under these circumstances.

The problem still exists within the state of funding for educational programs. With the recent cut backs in educational funding, the failure of school levies, and the layoff of teachers, can the State Department of Public Instruction provide more funds for more children being placed out of institutions into group homes? The problem directly affects school districts in their funding of special education programs; the placement of group homes with school age residents in a district increases the budget demand. It should be the responsibility of the Department of Public Instruction, not the Department of Institutions, to fund programs in school districts for the group home resident.

The staffing for group homes was a persistent problem. The majority of staff of the group homes are underpaid and untrained. Group homes need to provide training programs for staff, perhaps through the Department of Institutions, and will have to pay more than the minimum wage for adequately trained personnel. A possible means to funded training is through a federal staffing grant. Directors of group homes perhaps should get assistance in writing proposals for staffing grants.

Public Services were being provided for group home residents. The Mental Health Mental Retardation Boards are instrumental in setting up programs, such as the activity center in Kent. Many of the local organizations, such as the YMCA and park departments, have been helpful in providing recreational and vocational programs for group home residents.

Further, from the writer's observations, supervision of the group homes by field service representatives is inadequate; however, the problem is caused in large part by the excessive work load carried by the field services. The supervision problem could be mediated perhaps, if advisory boards met monthly with directors, field service representatives, and school district representatives.

The most effective program studied was the Tacoma program. The group homes in Tacoma have used the University of Puget Sound. They have used students in speech therapy to work with the autistically handicapped children, and other students to help meet general staffing needs. The group homes received a federal staffing grant to help build up needed staffing. The director of the group home took part in the selection of residents who might be best suited for his program. Similarly, the Director of Special Education for the Kent School District was instrumental in the selection of residents who would benefit most from the educational facilities the district had to offer. The Tacoma and Kent programs did not have the communication problems found elsewhere, and seemed to be running smoothly.

Given the rapid growth of group homes throughout the state, and the problems discovered from this study, the question should be asked, Is the State Department of Institutions concerned more for quantity or

quality in its program? It is recommended that additional research be done to evaluate the effectiveness of the group home program in terms of residents' performance both academically and socially as compared to their performance level in the institution.

The group home program is only the forerunner of other programs for the comprehensive care of the handicapped. It is not yet a fully successful program. Nevertheless, it is a major effort to meet a need for social services for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped in the State of Washington.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Department of Institutions. Its Almost Just Like Home. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1969).
2. Division for Handicapped Children. Application for a Group Home. Department of Institutions. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1970).
3. Division for Handicapped Children. Group Home Movement in the State of Washington. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1970).
4. Division for Handicapped Children. Rate of Payments to Group Homes for Children. Department of Institutions. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1969).
5. Lynch, and others. House Bill No. 465. Committee on Public Institutions and Youth Development. House of Representatives, State of Washington, 1969.
6. Pearson, John W. "A Differential Use of Group Homes for Delinquent Boys." Children, 17:143, 1970.
7. Staples, Alice. "New Housing Brings Young Adults One Step Closer to World." The Seattle Times, November 1, 1970, p. B-16.
8. State Department of Social and Health Services. Agreement with Group Homes for Children. Department of Institutions. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1970).
9. Washington Administration Code. Minimum Licensing Requirements for Group Homes. Chapter 388-64. Department of Public Assistance.
10. Washington State Documents (comp.). Advisory Board. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1970).
11. Washington State Documents (comp.). Analysis of the Drop in Washington State Mental Hospital Resident Population 1954-1957. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1958).
12. Washington State Documents (comp.). The Epton Bill. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1961).
13. Washington State Documents (comp.). Standards and Guidelines for Homes for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped. (Olympia, Wa.: Government Printing Office, 1970).
14. Wolverton, Joan. "Retarded Find Bright Spot." The Seattle Times, November 1, 1970, p. D-4.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

By Title of Subject

Field Services, Department of Institutions

1. What group homes have you been working with?
2. What qualifications are set for children to obtain admission into a group home?
3. Whose responsibility is it for the placement of a child into a group home?
4. What number of residents are in the group home?
5. What is the handicap of the majority of the residents?
6. Does the community support the group home program?
7. What kinds of services have been offered or provided by the community?
8. What institutions were the residents placed from?
9. Is the present group home staff efficient enough to run the home?
10. Who has provided for the formal education of the group home resident?
11. Where is the funding coming from for the formal education of group home residents?
12. Has there been any progress with the group home you are working with? If so, where?
13. What do you see as the future for group homes?

County Mental Health Mental Retardation Board (Director)

1. What is the function of the Mental Health Mental Retardation Board?
2. What is the board's function in relation to group homes?
3. Is the board receiving any funds from the state for:
 - a) educational and vocational training for group home residents?
 - b) recreation for group home residents?
4. Is the board at the present working with group home residents in any way?
5. What are the schools doing for group home residents in your county?
6. As for the group home which is made up of primarily school age children, do you see any impact or foresee any impact on school districts as to the placement of these individuals into special education classes? If so, why?
7. From the group homes located in your county can you see any progress being made?
8. What do you see as the future for the group home program?

Special Education Directors

1. How many group homes are located in your district?
2. When were the group homes established in your district?
3. How many school age children are in your district?
4. Did the district have any voice as to the placement of children into the group home?
5. What is the school district's responsibilities to the resident of a group home?
6. Is there a program being provided at this present time for the group home residents? If so, when was it started?
7. What kind of program have you established for the group home

resident?

8. Where are the funds coming from for the program?
9. Is the school district budgeting for the coming school year for the formal education of group home residents?
10. What do you feel would be an adequate program for the education of the group home residents?
11. Who do you feel should be responsible for the formal education of group home residents within your school district?
12. What department should be responsible for the funding for a formal education for group home residents?
13. Do you in your district have a waiting list of students to be served in special education classes?
14. What do you see as the function of a group home?
15. What do you see as the future of group homes?
16. As for the placement of group homes, would you say there has been a definite impact upon the school district? If so, why?

Group Home Advisory Boards

1. What provisions are used for the selection of board members?
2. Are any board members paid for their services?
3. Is the board affiliated with a profit or non-profit organization following state regulations?
4. What is the role of the group home board?
5. Is the board affiliated in any way with the County Mental Health Mental Retardation Board in the running of the group home?
6. Who does the board feel should be responsible for the formal education of school age group home residents?
7. What have you seen as the function of a group home?

8. Who is the board accountable to as a functioning body?
9. Does the board have any drawbacks as to its function in overseeing the group home program?
10. Does the community support the group home? If so, in what way?
11. Have the communication channels between the group home, State Department of Handicapped Children, and the school districts been effective? Why?
12. What does the board see as the future of group homes in the community?

Department of Handicapped Children (Director)

1. What is the Department of Institution's role as to the establishment of group homes?
2. What department is responsible for the management and control of group homes?
3. What is the state's philosophy behind the development of group homes?
4. Do you see this philosophy being carried out in the State of Washington? Why is it? Why not?
5. The formal education of group home residents is the responsibility of whom?
6. Where are the funds coming from for the formal education of group home residents?
7. Do you see any funding changes in the future for the formal education of a group home resident?
8. What department do you see as being responsible for the funding of a formal education for group home residents?
9. Are funds allocated for education and recreation outside the public

schools for the group home resident? If so, where do they come from?

10. Can you give me an example as to where the funds are being used and who is controlling these funds?
11. What is the role of the County Mental Health Mental Retardation Boards as to the development of group homes within their counties?
12. Keeping the state's philosophy in mind, have you seen substantial progress made by the group home program? Why?
13. What do you see as the future for group homes in the State of Washington?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWS

All interviews were conducted between October 17, 1970 and April 14, 1971. Locations and titles of subjects follow:

- Tacoma: Field services representative, Rainier State School, Buckley.
Mental Health Mental Retardation Board, King County.
Special Education Director.
Group Home Advisory Board.
- Yakima: Field services representative, Yakima Valley School, Selah.
Mental Health Mental Retardation Board, Yakima County.
Special Education Director.
Group Home Advisory Board.
- Auburn: Field services representative, Rainier State School, Buckley.
Mental Health Mental Retardation Board, King County.
Special Education Director.
Group Home Advisory Board.
- Kent: Field services representative, Rainier State School, Buckley.
Mental Health Mental Retardation Board, King County.
Special Education Director.
Group Home Advisory Board.

APPENDIX C

LOCATION OF GROUP HOMES

	<u>NUMBER OF RESIDENTS</u>
BARGER GROUP HOME (Spring Acres, Inc.) -----	14
children	
CAMELOT CENTER FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN -----	6
children	
CENTURY HOUSE GROUP HOME (Kay-Lee Corp.) -----	20
adults	
CLOSSER BOARDING HOME -----	12
young adults	
HARRAH GROUP HOME (Spring Acres, Inc.) -----	6
adults	
KAMIAKIN GROUP HOME (Spring Acres, Inc.) -----	12
adults	
NELLIE GOODHUE GROUP HOME, INC. -----	7
adults	

Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to copyright.

OUTLOOK INN (Clallam County Hostelries, Inc.) -----	18
adults	
PINE VIEW GROUP HOME -----	20
adults	
SPRING ACRES, INC. -----	8
adults	
TWIN FIRS GROUP HOME, INC. -----	20
adults	
UPS GROUP HOME - EDUCATION PROJECT -----	9
children	
UPS GROUP HOME - EDUCATION PROJECT -----	8
children	
SKYVIEW HOME - KAY-LEE CORP. -----	20
children	