

A SURVEY OF STATE CERTIFICATION  
REQUIREMENTS AND TEACHER PREP-  
ARATION OF THE SECONDARY  
LEARNING DISABILITIES  
TEACHER

By

EMILY JEANNE SPILLMAN  
"

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
July, 1977

Thesis  
1977  
5756s  
Cop.2



A SURVEY OF STATE CERTIFICATION  
REQUIREMENTS AND TEACHER PREP-  
ARATION OF THE SECONDARY  
LEARNING DISABILITIES  
TEACHER

Thesis Approved:

*Lloyd R. Kinnison*

Thesis Adviser

*Judith E. Dobson*

*Londal L. Gamble*

*Norman D. Huster*

Dean of the Graduate College

989269

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to those people who have contributed to the success of this study. I am especially indebted to my thesis adviser, Dr. Lloyd R. Kinnison, whose helpful guidance has been a constant source of inspiration. My committee members, Dr. Rondal Gamble and Dr. Judy Dobson, have given valuable suggestions for the improvement of this study.

I would also like to thank my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Spillman, who have supported me with their love and encouragement throughout all of my educational endeavors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM. . . . .                          | 1    |
| Introduction . . . . .                                    | 1    |
| Objectives of the Study. . . . .                          | 5    |
| Definition of Learning Disabilities. . . . .              | 6    |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .                     | 7    |
| Introduction . . . . .                                    | 7    |
| Need for Teachers. . . . .                                | 7    |
| Need for Differential Curriculum . . . . .                | 9    |
| Differential Teacher Training and<br>Preparation. . . . . | 13   |
| Teacher Certification Studies. . . . .                    | 17   |
| Summary. . . . .  | 19   |
| III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE. . . . .                        | 21   |
| Introduction . . . . .                                    | 21   |
| Development of Questionnaire . . . . .                    | 21   |
| Data Collection. . . . .                                  | 22   |
| Analysis of Data . . . . .                                | 22   |
| IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. . . . .                         | 23   |
| Results. . . . .  | 23   |
| Legislation. . . . .                                      | 23   |
| Certification. . . . .                                    | 25   |
| Differential Teacher Education . . . . .                  | 35   |
| Staffing Patterns and Future Manpower<br>Needs. . . . .   | 38   |
| Priorities for Teacher Functions . . . . .                | 49   |
| V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .                      | 51   |
| Introduction . . . . .                                    | 51   |
| Summary of Findings. . . . .                              | 53   |
| Conclusions. . . . .                                      | 55   |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .              | 57   |
| APPENDIXES . . . . .                          | 61   |
| APPENDIX A - SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .   | 62   |
| APPENDIX B - SAMPLE COVER LETTER. . . . .     | 68   |
| APPENDIX C - SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP LETTER. . . . . | 71   |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Status of Legislation for the Education of the Learning Disabled. . . . .             | 24   |
| II. State Department Prescribed Certification for Secondary Personnel . . . . .          | 26   |
| III. Approved Certification for Secondary Classroom Teachers . . . . .                   | 28   |
| IV. Approved Certification for Work-Study Specialists. . . . .                           | 30   |
| V. Requirements for Secondary Certification for Teaching the Learning Disabled . . . . . | 32   |
| VI. Suggested Competencies for Secondary Learning Disability Certification. . . . .      | 37   |
| VII. Current Numbers of Teachers Reported . . . . .                                      | 39   |
| VIII. Estimated Numbers of Personnel Needed. . . . .                                     | 44   |
| IX. Priorities for Teacher Functions . . . . .   | 50   |

## CHAPTER I

### THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

#### Introduction

Awareness of the problems of children categorized as learning disabled has experienced dramatic growth and expansion since 1960 (Hammill & Bartel, 1971; Arena, 1970). The child with a learning disability has been recognized as both a "social reality and an educational challenge" (Arena, 1970, p. 143). The professional literature in the early 1960's reflected great concern for the child with average intelligence who was besieged with learning problems. The formation of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (ACLD) in 1963 provided the formal verification of this new field of special education (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1976). During the following years, over seven thousand professionals have been attracted to the field of learning disabilities. A major spurt of growth followed the passage of the "Learning Disabilities Amendment" to Title VI legislation in 1969. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped provided funds for research projects and teacher preparation programs in 1971, with



major emphasis aimed toward the elementary aged child (Wiederholt, 1975).

Several authors note the development of a majority of programs for the learning disabled at the elementary level (D'Alonzo & Miller, 1977; Goodman, 1975; Hammill, 1975; Wiederholt, 1975; Minskoff, 1971). According to Martin (1972, p. 523), "From two-thirds to three-fourths of all special education programs are at the elementary school level." Scranton and Downs (1975) report the results of a nationwide survey of the level of development of elementary and secondary learning disability programs. Forty percent of the school districts reported programs at the elementary level, and only nine percent offered programs at the secondary level.

During the five year period of 1970-1975, the growth rate of elementary learning disabilities programs has exceeded 250% in certain states (Yearbook of Special Education, 1975-76). Lerner (1976) points out that the development of secondary learning disability programs has been at a much slower rate than the rapid growth of programs for the elementary aged child.

The educational goals for children with learning disabilities have been to identify and remediate the learning deficit during the elementary grades (Deshler, 1975b; Strother, 1971; Kronick, 1970). Special educators have realized that all learning disabilities cannot be remediated by the time a child reaches the secondary grades. As

elementary learning disabled students move into junior and senior high schools, there is a demand for more special emotional needs of the learning disabled adolescent. The learning disabled adolescents, who have already been identified in the elementary grades, together with the secondary student whose learning problems have not been recognized, represent a population of secondary handicapped students who need special programs at the secondary level (Goodman, 1975).

The impact of adolescence on the learning disabled teenager accentuates the stress encountered during this period. The adolescent is faced with the disabling factors of his handicap in addition to the developmental changes in self and environment (Giffin, 1971; Thompson, 1970). Characteristics common to this group which make life so difficult are their impulsivity, suggestibility, short tempers, impaired self-direction, low self-esteem, short sightedness and poor social skills (Thompson, 1970).

Minskoff (1971) advocates creation of specific programs for the learning disabled at the secondary level. A major stimulus for the development of effective secondary programs has been the funding of Child Study Development Centers by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (Vasa, 1975). Twenty-five percent of the model demonstration projects funded by Title VI, Sec. 661 of Public Law 91-230, were designed to work primarily with

the secondary school systems (Catalogue of Child Service Demonstration Centers, 1975-76).

D'Alonzo and Miller (1977) state that:

. . . within the existing secondary programs, appropriate instructional and management procedures are lacking and results of the existing programs are not verifiable (p. 58).

The teachers who are placed in the secondary classrooms come from elementary learning disability training or secondary level training with little preparation in special education (D'Alonzo & Miller, 1977).

The growth of secondary learning disability programs will require the preparation of teachers who are qualified to provide appropriate educational experiences for the learning disabled adolescent (Deshler, 1975b). Lee (1970) stated that there is a need for organized training programs. Zigmond (1975) states that current nonstandardization of teacher training programs is an indication that professionals in the field of learning disabilities have not clearly identified roles and expectations of the secondary learning disabilities teacher.

Growth in the development of learning disability programs has been rapid at the elementary level. Concern for the educationally handicapped adolescent has come about only recently. Early identification and remediation has failed to alleviate all academic problems for the learning disabled student. The academic failure experienced by the learning disabled student compounds the turmoil of

adolescence. The existing secondary programs are lacking research to validate their effectiveness (D'Alonzo & Miller, 1977; Deshler, 1975a). Consequently, teachers who are going to serve the adolescent with learning disabilities should be adequately prepared for the challenge.

The purpose of this study was to survey the state departments of education to determine certification requirements, present and future manpower needs, staffing patterns and priorities of teacher training as they relate to secondary teachers of learning disabled students.

#### Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the extent of mandated special education legislation, including secondary level learning disabilities programs.
2. To determine current certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher.
3. To determine if differential teacher education is required between elementary and secondary learning disabilities teachers.
4. To determine the staffing patterns and manpower needs of secondary learning disabilities programs in the United States.
5. To determine expressed priorities of teacher functions.

## Definition of Learning Disabilities

The following definition of learning disabilities is used for the purposes of this study.

Children with special learning disabilities exhibit a disorder in one or more psychological processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written languages. These may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic. They include conditions which have been referred to as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, developmental aphasia, etc. They do not include learning problems which are due primarily to visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or to environmental disadvantage (National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, p. 4).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Professionals in the field of learning disabilities express growing concern for the secondary learning disabled student. The present study is an investigation of mandated special education legislation, current certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher, differential teacher education, staffing patterns and manpower needs of secondary learning disability programs and expressed priorities for teacher functions. The concern for the learning disabled adolescent leads to a review of literature indicating a need for more learning disabilities teachers, the need for appropriate curriculum development, and a need for adequate teacher training experiences.

#### Need for Teachers

Evidence of the need for more qualified learning disabilities teachers is indicated by the following data compiled by the United States Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Aid to States Branch (1976).

Thirteen percent of the school age population identified as learning disabled were being served as of March, 1976. Eighty-seven percent of this population is in need of appropriate educational services.

Further indications of the need for more learning disability teachers is indicated by Scranton and Downs (1975) who conducted a survey of elementary and secondary learning disability programs in the fifty states. The purpose of their study was to determine the level of development of both elementary and secondary learning disability programs. A second purpose was to seek reactions from state special education officials concerning any existing discrepancies in these programs. Questionnaires were mailed to the special education section of each state department of education in the United States. The findings reported reflected programs in 10,358 school districts in 37 states. Incompatible data classification systems were used by the remaining states. There were 4,139 districts reported to be offering programs at the elementary level (40% of the total); and 975 secondary level learning disability programs (9% of the total). Justification for the lack of secondary programs varied from state to state. A general lack of readiness in terms of available technology, trained personnel, and educational materials were reasons cited for the discrepancy. In addition, the respondents indicated that through early identification and

intervention in elementary learning disability programs, the need for secondary programming would be eliminated.

Scranton and Downs (1975, p. 398) point out that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has stated as one of its goals "that every handicapped child is receiving an appropriately designed education by 1980." The authors concluded, on the basis of the material reported, that district programs must grow at an approximate rate of 12% per year at the elementary level and at approximately 22% per year at the secondary level to reach 85% of the government expectations by 1978.

The data reported indicates a great need for more learning disability teachers in the near future, particularly at the secondary level.

#### Need for Differential Curriculum

The increased concern for the learning disabled adolescent has resulted in rash decision making in the development of secondary programs. Many secondary learning disability programs have been only an extension of the remedial models used for elementary children (Deshler, 1975a). The accepted teaching methods and program structure used at the elementary level may not be appropriate for the population of secondary learning disabled students (Deshler, 1975b; Goodman, 1975; Vasa, 1975). The curricular emphasis at the secondary level should shift from



weaknesses to strengths in order to effectively serve the learning disabled adolescent (Goodman, 1975; Williamson, 1974). Provision of appropriate educational services for the adolescent with learning difficulties is contingent upon a knowledge of characteristics of the learning disabled adolescent and the nature of the secondary school environment. Considerations which should be made of the school setting and the student are proposed by Deshler (1975a):

1. Generally, a change of emphasis is noted at the secondary level from basic skill acquisition to content acquisition.
2. Several investigators (Deshler, 1975c, Siegel, 1974) have emphasized that a learning disabled adolescent is often beset with secondary emotional problems, a lower self-concept, social immaturity and poor social perception.
3. The relevance of the secondary curriculum in preparing students for the world of work has been questioned.
4. High schools today contain a rich supply of resources, in terms of personnel and facilities, which represent a significant potential for serving learning disabled students. These sources often remain untapped (p. 22).

Brown (1975) states that secondary learning disability programs should not be implemented by superimposing elementary models upon the secondary schools. Differential characteristics of the student, school organization, curriculum, and teacher training are elements of secondary education which must be considered when designing secondary programs.

Wilcox (1970) reports that secondary schools are not ready for students with neurological handicaps. One of the factors which may contribute to this lack of readiness is the short period of time in which professionals have concerned themselves with the problems of the adolescent with learning difficulties. Also, there seems to be a lack of communication between the individuals who plan and administer the programs and the teachers who actually work with the adolescents.

Minskoff (1971) suggests the creation of specific programs for learning disabled adolescents at the secondary level. The heterogeneity of this population of students must be considered in program development. A continuum of curricular alternatives may benefit these students who have many different kinds of learning problems. The first curriculum suggested by Minskoff is the Sheltered Workshop approach designed to serve the severely learning disabled and emotionally disturbed. Training in social learning that is needed for successful employment would be emphasized, as well as training for specific types of jobs. The second curriculum is vocational education. The student with average intelligence who may have learning disabilities in perceptual or academic areas would be trained for jobs that would utilize his learning strengths and aptitudes. A third curriculum that is needed is pre-college. This program would serve the student who is

intellectually superior but has a learning disability. Areas of weakness would be taken into consideration and circumvented. It is extremely important that adequate assessment of the adolescent's strengths and weaknesses take place in the areas of social integration, language, reading problem solving, perception, motor skills, and arithmetic.

Williamson (1974) makes statements regarding the implementation of career education programs at the secondary level for the learning disabled. Curricular emphasis should move from remediation of deficits to capitalizing on the areas of strength. The secondary program should be geared toward helping the student adapt to the stresses of daily living and working. Basic literacy skills should be taught within the framework of career education. Emphasis should be placed on the development of decision making abilities, problem solving techniques, and personal growth so that the student will be able to adapt to numerous career opportunities.

It is evident that several authors strongly suggest comprehensive programming for the secondary learning disabled student. The elementary models are questionable in their appropriateness when superimposed on the secondary schools. Career education and vocational education are suggested alternatives. Teacher preparation for these curricula must be adequate in order to be successful.

## Differential Teacher Training and Preparation

Lee (1970) indicates a need for well organized and developed training programs for teachers of secondary special education programs. Teachers must exhibit sensitivity and empathy toward the special needs of the adolescent with learning disabilities. The secondary special education teacher needs highly effective communication skills in order to work effectively with the adolescent. In the development of a program for the secondary learning disabled, the teacher must be "imaginative, innovative, and creative" (Lee, 1970, p. 82).

College course work for the training of future secondary teachers should include knowledge in the areas of "learning, motivation, perception, small-group dynamics, the teaching of reading, and associated remedial techniques" (Lee, 1970, p. 82). Lee (1970) makes the following statement in regard to teacher certification in the state of California:

In California there is no special credential required for teaching the educationally handicapped, which is to say that there is no special training required. Credential restrictions, by themselves, are certainly not the solution to what is essentially a training problem. More colleges and universities responsible for teacher training must begin to recognize the need in this area of secondary education, and develop relevant teacher-training programs (p. 82).

Innovations in teacher training programs at the secondary level are described by Pearl (1971). The Educational Professional Development Act provided funding for a nine-month program designed to train twenty people with bachelor's degrees to become secondary learning disabilities teachers in the state of Minnesota. The first half of the program consisted of lectures, sensitization experiences, demonstrations and field trips. Direct instruction in remedial academics, curriculum preparation, and in feed-back sessions from supervisors were an important part of the program. The second half of the program involved on-site screening, testing and diagnosis, and teaching in the secondary schools. Trainees who worked together as a team or those who had excellent communication within their school developed the most relevant and flexible programs to meet the needs of their students.

Deshler (1975b) states that teacher training programs must be designed to provide the secondary learning disabilities teacher with skills and abilities to meet the needs of the adolescent and the structure of the secondary school setting. In relating to the adolescent, a teacher should have skills in

surface counseling, serving as a change agent and student advocate, modifying materials in content areas, interacting with content/career/vocational education staff members and resources and participating in career evaluation and guidance (Deshler, 1975b, p. 6).

It is also recommended that successful regular class teaching in the secondary schools should be required before receiving certification in the area of secondary learning disabilities.

Zigmond lists tasks that secondary learning disabilities teachers should be able to perform:

1. Know about and deal with educational, social, and affective implications of a learning problem;
2. Informally and formally assess the academic skills of students;
3. Write educational prescriptions utilizing assessment information;
4. Be proficient at teaching in all areas, particularly in the skill areas of reading and math;
5. Be familiar with instructional programs at all levels;
6. Create age appropriate teaching materials;
7. Be familiar with and able to modify the high school curriculum where necessary to accommodate learning disabled students;
8. Be proficient at testing readability levels of textbooks;
9. Demonstrate effective classroom management strategies;
10. Be effective in communicating with other teachers;
11. Assume the role of child advocate and interact effectively on behalf of the child with other members of the staff;
12. Know the functions of community and governmental agencies and volunteer and non-profit groups which provide support services to learning disabled adolescents;

13. Provide career orientation within the program and help students decide on goals (Zigmond, 1975, pp. 213, 214).

Teacher training institutions must provide the educational experiences for the teacher of the learning disabled adolescent. Deshler (1975b) suggests a teacher training program leading to competence in the following areas:

1. The psychology of exceptional students, including exposure to research and principles of learning and learning deviations as they apply to adolescents with learning problems;
2. The characteristics of learning disabled adolescents, including discussions of non-academic (affective domain) as well as academic related characteristics;
3. Methods and materials which are appropriate for use with LD students at the secondary level;
4. Vocational and career planning, including reading and discussion of career education, the world of work, and work evaluation and guidance;
5. Management and intervention techniques that are appropriate for use with secondary students in one-to-one and in group settings such as: problem solving, transaction analysis, behavior management;
6. An understanding of the factors involved when LD students must interact with significant others such as peers, parents, counselors, employees, teachers, etc.;
7. An understanding of factors that facilitate and impede staff interactions and ability to apply different models/techniques available for improving interdisciplinary communications;

8. Organizing and making operational an LD service which, in a secondary setting, includes the interfacing of the service with other school resources and staff members and providing in-service training and consultation to staff members;
9. Remedial reading, remedial arithmetic and remedial practice in social studies;
10. Secondary school curriculum, including special education concerns in the development of secondary curriculum alternatives (pp. 6, 7).

#### Teacher Certification Studies

Previous research in the area of learning disability teacher certification was conducted by Schwartz (1969). A letter of inquiry was sent to the teacher certification office in state departments of public instruction. From the state surveys, letters were sent to the colleges and universities mentioned requesting information relating to teacher training programs. The programs for children with learning disabilities varied greatly between states. The existing programs were classified under different areas, including learning disabilities, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed/socially maladjusted, orthopedically handicapped, multiple disabilities/otherwise handicapped, and speech pathology/deaf. Of the forty-five states and nine provincial departments of public instruction in the United States and Canada, 62% reported certification or endorsement requirements in the above areas. No differentiation between elementary and secondary programs was noted at this time.



McGrady and Atchison (1971) report the results of a survey of teacher certification standards for learning disability teachers. Letters were sent to each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia requesting information on the current status of the state's requirements. The data reported represented 100 percent response and is presented in four major categories:

1. Seven states required only a provisional or standard state approved teaching certificate.
2. Four states require some course work in addition to an approved teaching certificate.
3. Nine states require a special education teaching certificate.
4. Twenty-two states require a specific special education certificate, which can be further organized into these three specific areas:
  - (a) Four states require certification in teaching the physically handicapped.
  - (b) Two states require dual certification in teaching the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled.
  - (c) Sixteen states require certification in specific learning disabilities (p. 220).

A study of the teacher certification requirements of the secondary teacher of the mentally retarded was reported by Oliverson (1970). Results supported the assumption that more secondary teachers were needed in the area of mental retardation. The results of the study relating to certification, suggest that state certification policies

have not kept up with the growth of secondary special education programs for the mentally retarded. The Oliver-son (1970) study was conducted by sending a questionnaire to the person responsible for mental retardation programs in each state.

### Summary

It is apparent from the preceding review of literature that there is a need for more qualified teachers for disabled learners. This need is the greatest at the secondary level. Appropriate educational programs must be designed to adequately serve the learning disabled adolescent (Clark, 1975; Goodman, 1975; Minskoff, 1977). The structure of the secondary school and characteristics of the adolescent are two important factors which must be considered when designing these programs. At present, research is lacking to verify the effectiveness of existing program models (Deshler, 1975a). Qualified teachers are needed to work within this secondary setting. Competencies of the secondary learning disabilities teacher have been proposed by various special educators. There is an immediate need to identify the present status of certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher to ensure the effectiveness of the increasing number of secondary programs. This study was done with the intent of obtaining relevant data concerning

certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher in each of the fifty states.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to survey the state departments of education to determine the extent of mandated special education legislation, current certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher, differential teacher education, staffing patterns and manpower needs of secondary learning disability programs, and expressed priorities for teacher functions.

In order to obtain the information necessary for this study, a questionnaire was mailed to the state director of special education in each of the fifty states. Four weeks later a follow-up letter, accompanied by a second questionnaire, was sent to those states which had not responded. The information obtained was tabulated and recorded.

#### Development of Questionnaire

The questionnaire was adapted from a study, "A Survey of State Certification Requirements and Teacher Preparation of the Secondary Teacher of the Mentally Retarded"

(Oliverson, 1970, pp. 46-48) (Appendix A). Due to the vast geographical area needed to be covered in order to obtain the necessary information it was felt that the questionnaire method would be the fastest, least expensive and most informative means of obtaining the data.

#### Data Collection

The questionnaire was mailed to the director of special education at each state department of education. The names and addresses of these individuals were obtained from the Directory of State Education in Special Education Personnel. Individually addressed letters were mailed to each director explaining the purpose and extent of the study and requesting their participation (Appendix B).

The questionnaire was mailed on February 28, 1977. Twenty-five states (50%) responded. A follow-up letter, a second copy of the questionnaire and the original cover letter was mailed to the 25 outstanding states on March 28, 1977 (Appendix C). This mailing resulted in an additional 17 responses. Thus, 42 (84%) of the states responded which comprise the data for this study.

#### Analysis of Data

As completed questionnaires were returned, their responses were counted on a tabulation sheet. After all the responses were received, percentages were computed to provide a descriptive analysis of the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Results

Forty-two states responded to the questionnaire. Eight states did not respond. The results were tabulated on data sheets and percentages were figured. The results will be presented according to the five objectives of the study: legislation, certification, differential teacher education, staffing patterns and future manpower needs, and priorities for teacher functions.

#### Legislation

Thirty-nine states gave information to all or part of the following question:

Has your state mandated legislation for the learning disabled which includes educational provisions for secondary and/or work-study programs?

The respondents checked blanks marked "none," "mandatory," or "permissive" for both secondary and work-study programs. Table I is a summary of the responses.

Six states (14.2%) reported no legislation for secondary learning disability programs, 29 states (69%) indicated

that mandatory legislation was in effect, and four states (9.5%) reported secondary programs as being permissive. Three states (7.1%) did not respond to this portion of the question. Ten states (23.8%) reported no legislation for secondary work-study programs for the learning disabled, five states (11.9%) reported mandatory legislation for such programs and 19 states (45.2%) reported secondary work-study programs being allowed. Eight states (19%) did not respond to this portion of the question.

TABLE I  
STATUS OF LEGISLATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE LEARNING DISABLED

|             | <u>Secondary</u> |      | <u>Work-Study</u> |      |
|-------------|------------------|------|-------------------|------|
|             | N                | %    | N                 | %    |
| None        | 6                | 14.2 | 10                | 23.8 |
| Mandatory   | 29               | 69   | 5                 | 11.9 |
| Permissive  | 4                | 9.5  | 19                | 45.2 |
| No Response | 3                | 7.1  | 8                 | 19   |

The data obtained in this study, when compared with Oliverson's (1970) survey of legislation for the secondary mentally retarded, indicate an increasing number of

states reporting mandatory legislation for secondary learning disability programs. Work-study programs for the learning disabled are not as prevalent as for the mentally retarded at the time of the above mentioned study. This finding is in contrast to the review of literature, which suggested career and vocational education alternatives as being important for a total curriculum for the learning disabled adolescent.

#### Certification

Information on prescribed programs of certification was obtained through the following item:

Check the areas in which your State Department of Education prescribes a program of certification for secondary personnel.

Thirty-one states responded to this question and their responses are reported in rank order in Table II. Twenty-three states (54.7%) indicated they had a prescribed program for the secondary educable mentally retarded teacher. Twenty-three states (54.7%) also indicated a certification program for the secondary learning disabilities teacher. Certification for a generic teacher in special education at the secondary level was reported by thirteen states (30.9%). Two states (4.7%) reported a certification program for the educable mentally retarded work-study specialist, and two states (4.7%) reported a program for the generic work-study specialist.



TABLE II  
STATE DEPARTMENT PRESCRIBED CERTIFICATION  
FOR SECONDARY PERSONNEL

| Area of Certification                               | N  | %    |
|---|----|------|
| Educable Mentally Retarded-Teacher                  | 23 | 54.7 |
| Learning Disabled Teacher                           | 23 | 54.7 |
| Generic Teacher in Special Education,<br>Secondary  | 13 | 30.9 |
| Educable Mentally Retarded-Work-Study<br>Specialist | 2  | 4.7  |
| Generic Work-Study Specialist                       | 2  | 4.7  |
| No Response   | 11 | 26.1 |

Additional comments on this question included the following: One state indicated that the certification program for the learning disabled teacher was combined with that of the teacher of the emotionally disturbed and was classified as the educationally handicapped. Another state indicated that the generic teacher in special education required endorsements in various exceptionality areas. One state indicated proposals were being made for a generic teaching certificate. Non-categorical programs (K-12) were indicated by three states. Four states reported none of the responses were applicable.

The results indicate that state departments do prescribe specific certification to teach at the secondary

level in classes for the learning disabled. The number of states prescribing such certification is equal to that for the secondary educable mentally retarded. State departments have progressed in their recognition of learning disabilities as a separate area of exceptionality since the reporting of findings by Schwartz (1969). At that time, learning disability certification was obtained through certification or endorsement requirements in many various areas of exceptionality, and no differentiation between elementary and secondary was evident.

The literature indicated many secondary learning disability teachers received an elementary oriented training sequence. Therefore, the states were asked to report approved certification for their state to teach in secondary classes for the learning disabled.

The state departments were asked the following question:

What type(s) of professional certificate is/are approved by your state for secondary classroom teachers? (May be more than one.)

Table III gives the rank order of the states' responses.

The data indicated that a person certified in special education may be approved to teach secondary level classes for the learning disabled regardless of the level of preparation. The most commonly approved kinds of certification are Special Education only (K-12) (26 states, 61.9%), Elementary and Special Education (K-12) (18 states, 42.8%),

and Secondary Education and Special Education (K-12) (16 states, 38%). Six states (14.2%) gave other responses to this question. Out of the six responses, three states indicated specific certification in learning disabilities. One state had a special education specialist certificate. Another state reported non-categorical certification, while another accepted regular elementary or secondary certificates.

TABLE III  
APPROVED CERTIFICATION FOR SECONDARY  
CLASSROOM TEACHERS

| Type of Certification                            | N  | %    |
|--|----|------|
| Special Education Only (K-12)                    | 26 | 61.9 |
| Elementary and Special Education (K-12)          | 18 | 42.8 |
| Secondary Education and Special Education (K-12) | 16 | 38   |
| Secondary Education and Special Education (6-12) | 8  | 19   |
| Elementary Education and Special Education (K-8) | 7  | 16.6 |
| Other  | 6  | 14.2 |
| Special Education Secondary Only (6-12)          | 5  | 11.9 |
| Special Education Elementary Level Only          | 3  | 7.1  |
| Special Education Secondary Only (9-12)          | 2  | 4.7  |

Brown (1975), referred to in the review of literature, stated that effective programming for the learning disabled adolescent cannot be derived from the superimposition of elementary models. Deshler (1975d) indicates that methods and program structure used at the elementary level may very well be inappropriate for the secondary curriculum. With a majority of the reporting states allowing K-12 certification, there is an indication of disagreement between state department policies and what is suggested by various educators.

The findings of this study correlate with Oliverson (1970), where the three most common types of certification for the secondary mentally retarded were identical to those in the present survey of learning disabilities certification.

Work-study programs have played an important part in curriculum development for the secondary handicapped student. The state departments were asked what types of professional certificates were approved for persons who devote their time to these programs.

What type of professional certification does your state approve for work-study specialists?

Thirty-nine states (92.8%) responded to this question and their responses are given in rank order in Table IV.

The most common response checked by state department officials was "None," with 20 states (47.6%) indicating there are no existing certification requirements for work-study personnel. Seven states (16.6%) wrote in their

individual responses. Three of the seven states required vocational education and special education backgrounds to be qualified as a work-study specialist. One state reported certification for pre-vocational counselors. Another state required counseling courses for work in this area, and one state required only an elementary or secondary certificate with endorsement in one area of special education.

TABLE IV  
APPROVED CERTIFICATION FOR WORK-  
STUDY SPECIALISTS

| Type of Certification  | N  | %    |
|--|----|------|
| None (No Certification Requirements)                         | 20 | 47.6 |
| Other(s)   | 7  | 16.6 |
| Combination Special Education and<br>Secondary Certification | 5  | 11.9 |
| Secondary Education  | 4  | 9.5  |
| Special Education and Vocational<br>Education                | 4  | 9.5  |
| Special Education Only (Elementary<br>and/or Secondary)      | 3  | 7.1  |
| Elementary Education   | 0  | 0    |
| No Response  | 3  | 7.1  |

The importance of career and vocational education as seen by Minskoff (1971), Clark (1975) and Williamson (1974) has not had a great influence on state departments' approval of work-study specialists certification. There was only a slight decrease in the number of states reporting no certification for this area since the reporting of Oliverson's study in 1970.

To further clarify certification requirements, the state departments were asked to indicate requirements for secondary certification on a check list provided and to add specifics which were not listed.

Please indicate the requirements for secondary certification for teaching the learning disabled in your state. (Check all applicable.)

Table V is a summary of the requirements listed in rank order of their occurrence.

A valid teaching certificate was required by 35 states (83.3%). Eighteen states (42.8%) indicated that an elementary certificate was required and 21 states (50%) reported secondary certification as a requirement. Course work in the study of the exceptional child was required by 30 states (71.4%). A student teaching or practicum was needed for certification in 29 states (69%). General methods and materials for teaching was reported by 27 respondents (64.2%). Elementary teaching methods courses were required in 14 states (33.3%), while 18 states (42.8%) required course work in secondary methods courses. A

TABLE V  
 REQUIREMENTS FOR SECONDARY CERTIFICATION  
 FOR TEACHING THE LEARNING DISABLED

| Requirement   | N  | %    |
|---|----|------|
| Valid teaching certificate  | 35 | 83.3 |
| Elementary - 18 (42.8%)   |    |      |
| Secondary - 21 (50%)  |    |      |
| Study of exceptional children and<br>the field of special education                                     | 30 | 71.4 |
| Student teaching or practicum   | 29 | 69   |
| General methodology and materials<br>for teaching   | 27 | 64.2 |
| Elementary - 14 (33.3%)   |    |      |
| Secondary - 18 (42.8%)  |    |      |
| Study of learning disabilities--medical,<br>psychological and sociological aspects                      | 27 | 64.2 |
| Tests and measurements  | 21 | 50   |
| Psycho-educational assessment   | 20 | 47.6 |
| Remedial reading  | 18 | 42.8 |
| Behavior management techniques  | 18 | 42.8 |
| Secondary methodology and curriculum<br>for the learning disabled                                       | 15 | 35.7 |
| Survey of language and speech disorders<br>in childhood   | 13 | 30.9 |
| Remedial arithmetic   | 12 | 28.5 |
| Psychology of adolescence   | 10 | 23.8 |
| Study of the home, school and community<br>relations of exceptional children                            | 9  | 21.4 |
| Secondary school curriculum development   | 8  | 19   |
| Knowledge and skills in techniques of<br>interviewing and counseling parents<br>of exceptional children | 7  | 16.6 |
| Others  | 7  | 16.6 |
| Vocational and career planning  | 6  | 14.2 |
| Prior teaching experience   | 4  | 9.5  |
| Mental Hygiene  | 4  | 9.5  |

course in the different aspects of learning disabilities was required by 27 states (64.2%). Other states listed their individual requirements for secondary certification. Among these responses were child growth and development, counseling and group processes, multi-cultural education, prescriptive programming and mental retardation/emotional disturbances. One state required special education certification with concentration in learning disabilities.

Deshler (1975b) proposed a teacher training program for secondary teachers of the learning disabled leading to competence in the following areas:

1. The psychology of exceptional students, including exposure to research and principles of learning and learning deviations as they apply to adolescents with learning problems.
2. The characteristics of learning disabled adolescents, including discussion of non-academic related characteristics.
3. Methods and materials which are appropriate for use with LD students at the secondary level.
4. Vocational and career planning, including readings and discussion of career education, the world of work, and work evaluation and guidance.
5. Management and intervention techniques that are appropriate for use with secondary students in one-to-one and in group settings such as problem solving, transaction analysis, behavior management and active listening.
6. An understanding of the factors involved when LD students must interact with significant others such as peers, parents, counselors, employers, teachers, etc.



7. An understanding of factors that facilitate and impede staff interactions and ability to apply different models techniques available for improving interdisciplinary communications.
8. Organizing and making operational an LD service which, in a secondary setting, includes the interfacing of the service with other school resources and staff members and providing inservice training and consultation to staff members (pp. 6, 7).

Zigmond (1975) also supports several of the above mentioned skills as important for the secondary learning disabilities teacher. In addition, assessment of academic skills followed by writing educational prescriptions are considered important.

The present study found a variety of courses required in a variety of states, some of which conform to the program elements above. Those requirements seen at less than 50% occurrence were psycho-educational assessment (47.6%), remedial reading (42.8%), behavior management techniques (42.8%), secondary methodology and curriculum for the learning disabled (35.7%), survey of language and speech disorders in childhood (30.9%), remedial arithmetic (28.5%), psychology of adolescence (23.8%), study of the home, school, and community relations of exceptional children (21.4%), secondary school curriculum development (19%), knowledge and skills in techniques of interviewing and counseling parents of exceptional children (16.6%), vocational and career planning (14.2%), prior teaching experience (9.5%) and mental hygiene (9.5%). The requirements for secondary certification in learning disabilities

found in less than half of the reporting states correspond closely to the proposed training programs of Deshler (1975b) and Zigmond (1975). This indicates that state departments have not kept pace with recent trends in education.

#### Differential Teacher Education

In order to determine if states are planning to develop separate training programs for the secondary learning disabilities teacher the following question was asked:

If your state does not have specific requirements are there plans to initiate differentiation between elementary and secondary?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

Eight states (19%) indicated that there were plans to initiate a separate training program. Fifteen states (35.7%) responded by checking "No." Nineteen states (45.2%) did not respond to the question.

In order to determine approximate time lines for differential training between elementary and secondary, the following question was asked:

If yes, when will it be required? (Date.)

Thirty-eight states (90.4%) did not respond to this question. Three states (7.1%) responded to the question. Three states (7.1%) indicated the date had not been determined, and one state (2.3%) reported a proposed date of 1978. This information indicates that specific plans for teacher education is underdeveloped at this time.

Information concerning skills and competencies considered important by state department officials was obtained through the following question:

If your state does not have specific requirements for secondary learning disabled teachers, please indicate those skills and/or competencies you feel should be required.

A summary of the responses to this question is given in rank order in Table VI.

Ten states (23.8%) reported vocational and career planning and guidance as important for the secondary teacher. Ten states (23.8%) felt that general methods and curriculum for learning disabilities should be required. Psychology of adolescence was indicated by nine states (21.4%) and guidance, counseling and human relations skills was reported by eight states (19%). Behavior management techniques and secondary methods and curriculum for learning disabilities were each suggested by seven states (16.6%). These competencies suggested by state department officials correspond closely to those suggested by Deshler (1975b) and Zigmond (1975). This indicates that professionals responsible for developing teacher certification standards recognize the necessary areas of skill or competency, but the present certification requirements do not reflect this awareness.

TABLE VI  
SUGGESTED COMPETENCIES FOR SECONDARY  
LEARNING DISABILITY CERTIFICATION

| Competency  | N  | %    |
|---|----|------|
| Vocational and career planning and guidance                     | 10 | 23.8 |
| General methods and curriculum for learning disabilities        | 10 | 23.8 |
| Psychology of adolescence                                       | 9  | 21.4 |
| Guidance, counseling and human relations skills                 | 8  | 19   |
| Behavior management techniques                                  | 7  | 16.6 |
| Secondary methods and curriculum for learning disabilities      | 7  | 16.6 |
| Secondary curriculum and methods                                | 6  | 14.2 |
| Psychoeducational assessment                                    | 5  | 11.9 |
| Language and speech disorders                                   | 5  | 11.9 |
| Student teaching or practicum                                   | 5  | 11.9 |
| Developmental language arts (reading, spelling, writing)        | 3  | 7.1  |
| Vocational education, work-study and survival skills            | 3  | 7.1  |
| Prior teaching experience                                       | 2  | 4.7  |
| Study of the exceptional child and field of special education   | 2  | 4.7  |
| General methodology and materials for teaching                  | 2  | 4.7  |
| Study of learning disabilities                                  | 2  | 4.7  |
| Remedial reading  | 2  | 4.7  |
| Remedial arithmetic   | 2  | 4.7  |
| Tests and measurements  | 2  | 4.7  |
| Interviewing and counseling of parents                          | 2  | 4.7  |
| Study of the home, school and community of exceptional children | 2  | 4.7  |

TABLE VI (Continued)

| Competency                       | N | %   |
|----------------------------------|---|-----|
| Mental hygiene                   | 1 | 2.3 |
| Child development                | 1 | 2.3 |
| Current trends and issues        | 1 | 2.3 |
| Sensory-psycho-motor functioning | 1 | 2.3 |

### Staffing Patterns and Future Manpower Needs

In order to determine the number of persons teaching learning disabilities classes at each level, the following question was asked:

According to your records, please list the current number of persons teaching at each level in the area of learning disabilities.

The data is presented in Table VII.

Twenty-eight of the 42 responding states (66.6%) answered this question. Nine states (21.4%) did not respond to the question and nine states (21.4%) indicated this information was not available. Three states reported all available data as being non-categorical. The current number of teachers reported by the responding states totaled 10,899 at the elementary level. There were 993 teachers reported at the junior high level and 556 at the senior high level. Seven states who gave figures that did not

TABLE VII  
CURRENT NUMBERS OF TEACHERS REPORTED

| State       | Elementary | Jr. High | Sr. High | No Differ-<br>entiation<br>in Second-<br>ary | K-12 | Nos. Not<br>Available | No Response<br>to Question | No Response<br>to Ques-<br>tionnaire |
|-------------|------------|----------|----------|--|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Alabama     |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Alaska      |            |          |          |  |      |                       | X                          |                                      |
| Arizona     |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Arkansas    |            |          |          |  | 3590 |                       |                            |                                      |
| California  |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Colorado    | 670        |          |          | 330  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Connecticut |            |          |          |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Delaware    |            |          |          |  | 415  |                       |                            |                                      |
| Florida     |            |          |          | 130  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Georgia     |            |          |          |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Hawaii      | 168        | 48       | 39       |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Idaho       |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Illinois    |            |          |          | 2335   |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Indiana     |            |          | 469      |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |

TABLE VII (Continued)

| State         | Elementary | Jr. High | Sr. High | No Differ-<br>entiation<br>in Second-<br>ary | K-12 | Nos. Not<br>Available | No Response<br>to Question | No Response<br>to Ques-<br>tionnaire |
|---------------|------------|----------|----------|--|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Iowa          | 500        | 200      | 80       |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Kansas        | 379        | 47       | 28       |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Kentucky      | 420        | 110      | 70       |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Louisiana     |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Maine         |            |          |          |  |      |                       | X                          |                                      |
| Maryland      |            |          |          |  |      |                       |                            | X                                    |
| Massachusetts |            |          |          |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Michigan      |            |          |          |  | 995  |                       | X                          |                                      |
| Minnesota     |            |          |          |  | 3000 |                       |                            |                                      |
| Mississippi   | 211        | 16       | 7        |  |      |                       |                            |                                      |
| Missouri      |            |          |          |  |      |                       |                            | X                                    |
| Montana       |            |          |          |  | 562  |                       |                            |                                      |
| Nebraska      |            |          |          |  |      |                       | X                          |                                      |
| Nevada        |            |          |          |  | 224  |                       |                            |                                      |
| New Hampshire |            |          |          |  |      | X                     |                            |                                      |
| New Jersey    |            |          |          |  |      |                       | X                          |                                      |

TABLE VII (Continued)

| State          | Elementary | Jr. High | Sr. High | No Differentiation in Secondary | K-12 | Nos. Not Available | No Response to Question | No Response to Questionnaire |
|----------------|------------|----------|----------|---------------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| New Mexico     |            |          |          |                                 |      | X                  |                         |                              |
| New York       |            |          |          |                                 |      | X                  |                         |                              |
| North Carolina | 400        | 30       | 20       |                                 |      |                    |                         |                              |
| North Dakota   |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    |                         | X                            |
| Ohio           | 1000       | 65       | 35       |                                 |      |                    |                         |                              |
| Oklahoma       | 624        | 120      | 56       |                                 |      |                    |                         |                              |
| Oregon         |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    |                         | X                            |
| Pennsylvania   |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    | X                       |                              |
| Rhode Island   |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    |                         | X                            |
| South Carolina |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    |                         | X                            |
| South Dakota   |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    | X                       |                              |
| Tennessee      |            |          |          |                                 |      | X                  |                         |                              |
| Texas          | 4800       |          | 2300     |                                 |      |                    |                         |                              |
| Utah           |            |          |          |                                 |      |                    |                         | X                            |



TABLE VII (Continued)

| State         | Elementary | Jr. High | Sr. High | No Differ-<br>entiation<br>in Second-<br>ary | K-12   | Nos. Not<br>Available | No Response<br>to Question | No Response<br>to Ques-<br>tionnaire |
|---------------|------------|----------|----------|--|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Vermont       |            |          |          |  |        | X                     |                            |                                      |
| Virginia      | 580        | 117      | 44       |  |        |                       |                            |                                      |
| Washington    |            |          |          |  |        |                       |                            | X                                    |
| West Virginia | 213        | 3        | 44       | 30   |        |                       |                            |                                      |
| Wisconsin     | 840        | 237      | 133      | 68   |        |                       |                            |                                      |
| Wyoming       | 94         |          |          | 62   |        |                       |                            |                                      |
| TOTALS        | 10,899     | 993      | 556      | 3,412  | 11,121 |                       |                            |                                      |

differentiate between junior and senior high totaled 3,412 teachers currently placed. Seven states gave figures for learning disabilities program (K-12). The number reported in this category totaled 11,121 teachers.

The total number of teachers reported for grades (9-12) is 4,961 teachers, disregarding the figures given for programs (K-12). This does not equal half of the number of teachers reported at the elementary level, which was 10,899 teachers. This data supports the statements of various specialists regarding the majority of learning disability programs currently at the elementary level (D'Alonzo & Miller, 1977; Goodman, 1975; Hammill, 1975; Wiederholt, 1975; Minskoff, 1971).

In order to determine the projected need for teachers, the following question was asked:

What is the total number of personnel needed in your state for providing education and training for secondary learning disabled youth for the 1977-78 academic year? (Give projections or estimates based on the number of programs anticipated for Fall, 1977.)

A summary of the responses is reported in Table VIII. Twenty-four (57.1%) of the responding states answered this question. Seven states (16.6%) indicated this information was not available, and 18 states (42.8%) did not respond to the question. The estimated numbers of teachers needed totaled 1226 for junior high programs, 1389 for high school programs and 300 for work-study programs. States reporting figures for combined junior

TABLE VIII

## ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF PERSONNEL NEEDED

| State       | Jr. High | High School | Work-Study | Jr. & Sr. High | High School & Work-Study | Jr.-Sr. High & Work-Study | K-12 | Nos. Not Available | No Resp. to Ques. | No Resp. to Questionnaire |
|-------------|----------|-------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Alaska      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Arizona     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Arkansas    |          |             |            |                |                          | 240                       |      |                    |                   |                           |
| California  |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| Colorado    |          |             |            | 410            |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Connecticut |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Delaware    |          |             |            | 110            |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Florida     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Georgia     |          |             |            | 175            |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Hawaii      | 55       | 44          |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Idaho       |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Illinois    |          |             |            |                |                          |                           | 2500 |                    |                   |                           |
| Indiana     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Iowa        | 240      | 400         | 100        |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |

TABLE VIII (Continued)

| State         | Jr. High | High School | Work-Study | Jr. & Sr. High | High School & Work-Study | Jr.-Sr. High & Work-Study | K-12 | Nos. Not Available | No Resp. to Ques. | No Resp. to Questionnaire |
|---------------|----------|-------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Kansas        | 50       | 75          |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Kentucky      | 200      | 180         | 180        |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Louisiana     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| Maine         |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Maryland      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| Massachusetts |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Michigan      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| Minnesota     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Mississippi   | 35       | 15          |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Missouri      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| Montana       |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Nebraska      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Nevada        |          |             |            |                |                          |                           | 250  |                    |                   |                           |
| New Hampshire |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| New Jersey    |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| New Mexico    |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| New York      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |

TABLE VIII (Continued)

| State        | Jr. High | High School | Work-Study | Jr. & Sr. High | High School & Work-Study | Jr.-Sr. High & Work-Study | K-12 | Nos. Not Available | No Resp. to Ques. | No Resp. to Questionnaire |
|--------------|----------|-------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| No. Carolina | 217      | 95          |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| No. Dakota   |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| Ohio         |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Oklahoma     | 170      |             |            |                | 106                      |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Oregon       |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| Pennsylvania |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Rhode Island |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| So. Carolina |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| So. Dakota   |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Tennessee    |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    | X                 |                           |
| Texas        | 0        | 0           | 0          |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   |                           |
| Utah         |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |
| Vermont      |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| Virginia     |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      | X                  |                   |                           |
| Washington   |          |             |            |                |                          |                           |      |                    |                   | X                         |

TABLE VIII (Continued)

| State       | Jr. High | High School | Work-Study | Jr. & Sr. High | High School & Work-Study | Jr.-Sr. High & Work-Study | K-12  | Nos. Not Available | No Resp. to Ques. | No Resp. to Questionnaire |
|-------------|----------|-------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| W. Virginia |          |             |            |                |                          | 40                        |       |                    |                   |                           |
| Wisconsin   | 350      | 496         |            |                |                          |                           |       |                    |                   |                           |
| Wyoming     | 100      | 84          | 20         |                |                          |                           |       |                    |                   |                           |
| TOTALS      | 1,226    | 1,389       | 300        | 1,390          | 106                      | 280                       | 2,550 |                    |                   |                           |

and senior high school programs totaled 1390 teachers. Numbers of teachers needed in both high school and work-study programs was 106 teachers. Two states reported figures for junior high, senior high and work-study programs combined, with a total number of 280 teachers needed. Two states gave figures for programs (K-12), and the estimated need was 2550 teachers.

The data from this survey indicates a great need for learning disability teachers at the secondary level. This supports the view of Scranton and Downs (1975) that learning disability programs must grow in order to meet the goal by 1980, set by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

In order to determine whether learning disabled students are being served by "special needs" programs through vocational education, the following question was asked:

Are secondary learning disabled students also served by "special needs" programs sponsored by vocational education? (Special needs students are those for whom the traditional education program must be modified to meet their specific needs. They may or may not meet special education criteria.)

Thirty-two states (76%) checked "Yes," indicating that the learning disabled adolescent is being served through vocational education. Seven states (16.6%) checked "No." Three states (7.1%) did not respond to the question.

In addition, the following question was asked:

If yes, please indicate the number of students involved in "special needs" programs.

Eight states (19.2%) responded to this question. The numbers reported by seven of the states totaled 9154 students. One state reported 30,826 students involved in all special needs programs in the state.

#### Priorities for Teacher Functions

The literature has pointed to a variety of roles that a secondary teacher of the learning disabled must perform. States were asked to rank order their priorities for teacher training.

If your state department could establish priorities for teacher training institutions to consider in determining secondary teacher training emphasis, what would your position be? Indicate by rank ordering the following alternatives. We would prefer:

Table IX gives a summary of the rank order for each of the four roles as presented to state departments. The data indicates that the majority of state departments would prefer a secondary teacher who spends part of the day in the classroom and part of the day in work-study programs. Twenty states chose this as their first priority. The second and third ranked priority was for one who concentrates his time on vocational evaluation, training and work placement. Nine states ranked this as their second priority, and ten states chose this as their third priority. The



importance of adequately preparing teachers for the vocational education emphasis for the handicapped adolescent is indicated by this data. The least desirable choice was the teacher whose primary function was that of a vocational counselor. Seventeen states selected this item as their fourth priority. One state identified two alternatives as priorities but did not differentiate numerically, so the response was recorded as a no response. It appears that the role of the secondary learning disabilities teacher should be defined as one who should be flexible and knowledgeable about the classroom and the world of work.

TABLE IX  
PRIORITIES FOR TEACHER FUNCTIONS

| Function  | Rank: | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4  | N  |
|---|-------|----|---|----|----|----|
| Spends his time teaching all day  |       | 12 | 6 | 6  | 2  | 26 |
| Spends part of the day in the classroom and part of the day in work-study |       | 20 | 5 | 4  | 1  | 30 |
| Concentrates time on vocational evaluation, training, and work placement  |       | 3  | 9 | 10 | 2  | 24 |
| Functions primarily as a vocational counselor                             |       | 10 | 3 | 2  | 17 | 22 |

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Introduction

As the entire field of special education has grown, so has the area of learning disabilities. The growth rate for this newest facet of special education has been most rapid at the elementary level. A growing concern for the learning disabled adolescent is beginning to emerge. Early diagnosis and remedial teaching techniques have not always been effective in alleviating the academic failure met by these students. Qualified teachers are needed to fulfill the demand brought about by newly developing secondary programs. Educational institutions are preparing trained teachers to work with the handicapped adolescent. Certification standards outlined by state departments are quite varied (Zigmond, 1975).

It appears from the scarcity of literature that little research has been reported dealing specifically with education and training of secondary teachers for the learning disabled. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to survey the state departments of education in this country:

1. To determine the extent of mandated special education legislation, including secondary level learning disabilities programs.
2. To determine current certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher.
3. To determine if differential teacher education is required between elementary and secondary learning disabilities teachers.
4. To determine the staffing patterns and manpower needs of secondary learning disabilities programs in the United States.
5. To determine expressed priorities of teacher functions.

To obtain the information needed, questionnaires were sent to the director of special education in every state department of education in the United States requesting information on the following areas: legislation, certification requirements for the secondary learning disabilities teacher, differential teacher education, staffing patterns and future manpower needs and priorities for teacher functions.

Twenty-five states responded to the initial questionnaire. A follow-up letter and duplicate questionnaire was sent to the 25 outstanding states. Seventeen additional states responded to this letter. These forty-two

states (84%) comprise the data used in this study. The findings are presented below.

#### Summary of Findings

1. The greatest percentage of the states have mandatory legislation for secondary learning disability programs accompanied by permissive work-study programs.
2. Over half of the responding states have prescribed certification for secondary teachers of the educable mentally retarded and learning disabled. Close to one-third of the states prescribed a program of certification for a generic teacher in special education at the elementary level, but few states reported programs for work-study specialists.
3. In most states, a person certified in special education may be approved to teach secondary level classes for the learning disabled regardless of the level of preparation.
4. Approximately half of the states responding indicate no certification requirements for a work-study specialist.

5. The most commonly reported requirements for secondary learning disabilities teachers are: A valid teaching certificate, study of exceptional child and the field of special education, student teaching or practicum, general methodology and materials for teaching, a study of learning disabilities--medical, psychological and sociological aspects, and tests and measurements.
6. Only eight states reported no plans to initiate differentiation between elementary and secondary teacher training. One state reported a proposed date of implementation of a differential teacher training program.
7. More than half of the numbers of learning disabilities teachers reported are at the elementary level.
8. The number of junior high, senior high and work-study specialists is expected to increase based on the projections for the 1977-78 academic year.
9. Eight of the 42 states reported that the learning disabled adolescent was being served through "special needs" programs sponsored by vocational education.

10. Most states prefer a secondary teacher of the learning disabled who spends part of the day in the classroom and part of the day in work-study. The respondents indicated a priority for a person who is competent in educational assessment procedures, methods and materials, classroom management techniques, vocational evaluation, and work-study options.

### Conclusions

As a result of this study, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. If a trend toward mandatory programs for the secondary learning disabled persists, more teachers will be required to fill these positions. The implications of this for state departments of education and teacher training institutions is great. Public school administrators must fill these positions with teachers who are qualified to work with adolescents. This requires specific training, including skills and competencies that are appropriate for the secondary school setting and the secondary learning disabled student.

2. The requirements for secondary learning disability teacher certification have not been firmly established and vary greatly from state to state. It would appear to be of great benefit for state departments of education to reevaluate the certification requirements for the secondary learning disability teacher.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arena, John. A hand on the present with an eye to the future. In L. E. Anderson (Ed.), Helping the adolescent with the hidden handicap. San Rafael, Calif.: Academic Therapy Publications, 1970.
- Brown, V. Curriculum and materials for secondary learning disabilities programs: What we have and what we need. In M. DeBrosse (Ed.), Learning disabilities in the secondary school: A review of the literature. Intermediate Unit 23, Norristown, Pa., 1975.
- Catalogue of child service demonstration centers, 1975-76. Merrimac, Mass.: National Learning Disabilities Assistance Project, 1976.
- Clark, G. M. Vocational alternatives for the adolescent with learning disabilities. In L. R. Kinnison, P. A. Hoernicke, & C. E. Traugh (Eds.), The adolescent with learning disabilities. Symposium proceedings, College of Education, Wichita State University, Wichita, Ks., 1975.
- D'Alonzo, B. J., & Miller, S. R. A management model for learning disabled adolescents. Teaching Exceptional Children, Spring, 1977, 9, 58-60.
- Deshler, D. D. A service delivery model for learning disabled adolescents: A combined approach. In L. R. Kinnison, P. A. Hoernicke, & C. E. Traugh (Eds.), The adolescent with learning disabilities. Symposium proceedings, Wichita State University, Wichita, Ks., 1975a.
- Deshler, D. D. Meeting the needs of learning disabled adolescents: Issues and challenges. In L. R. Kinnison, P. A. Hoernicke, & C. E. Traugh (Eds.), The adolescent with learning disabilities. Symposium proceedings, College of Education, Wichita State University, Wichita, Ks., 1975b.



- Deshler, D. D. Psycho-social characteristics of learning disabled adolescents. In L. Goodman and L. Mann (Eds.) Learning disabilities in the secondary schools. Norristown, Pa.: Title III, E.S.E.A. (Project No. 74-74006H-46-23-01-13-(1)), 1975c.
- Deshler, D. C. Strategies and approaches in teaching the secondary learning disabled student. In L. R. Kinnison, P. A. Hoernicke, & C. E. Traugh (Eds.), The adolescent with learning disabilities. Symposium proceedings, College of Education, Wichita State University, Wichita, Ks., 1975d.
- Giffin, M. How does he feel? In E. Schloss (Ed.), The educator's enigma: The adolescent with learning disabilities. San Rafael, Calif.: Academic Therapy Publications, 1971.
- Goodman, L. Survey of secondary programs for the learning disabled. In DeBrosse, M. (Ed.), Learning disabilities in the secondary school: A review of the literature. Intermediate Unit 23, Norristown, Pa., 1975.
- Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. Introduction to learning disabilities: A psycho-behavioral approach. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
- Hammill, D. D. Adolescents with learning disability: Definition, identification, and incidence. In M. DeBrosse (Ed.), Learning disabilities in the secondary school: A review of the literature. Intermediate Unit 23, Norristown, Pa., 1975.
- Hammill, D. D., & Bartel, N. R. (Eds.). Educational perspectives in learning disability. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Kronick, D. What about me? The LD adolescent. San Rafael, Calif.: Academic Therapy Publications, 1975.
- Lee, W. How the public school can help. In L. Anderson (Ed.), Helping the adolescent with the hidden handicap. Los Angeles: California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children, 1970.
- Lerner, J. W. Children with learning disabilities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.
- Martin, E. W. Individualism and behaviorism as future trends in educating handicapped children. Exceptional children, 1972, 38, 517-525.

- McGrady, H. J., & Atchison, M. Teacher certification in learning disabilities. In J. Arena (Ed.), The child with learning disabilities: His right to learn. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference, ACLD, Chicago, Ill., 1971.
- Minskoff, J. G. Learning disabled children at the secondary level. In J. Arena (Ed.), The child with learning disabilities: His right to learn. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference, ACLD, Chicago, Ill., 1971.
- National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children. Special education for handicapped children. First Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, January 31, 1968.
- Oliverson, B. J. A survey of state certification requirements and teacher preparation of the secondary teacher of the mentally retarded. (Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Kansas, 1970.)
- Pearl, S. Description of a secondary SLD teacher-training program and its clientele. In J. Arena (Ed.), The child with learning disabilities: His right to learn. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference, ACLD, Chicago, Ill., 1971.
- Scranton, T. R., & Downs, M. C. Elementary and secondary learning disabilities programs in the U.S.: A survey. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1975, 8, 394-399.
- Siegel, E. The exceptional child grows up. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1974.
- Strother, C. R. Who is he? In E. Schloss (Ed.), The educator's enigma: The adolescent with learning disabilities. San Rafael, Calif.: Academic Therapy Publications, 1971.
- Thompson, A. Moving toward adulthood. In L. Anderson (Ed.), Helping the adolescent with the hidden handicap. Los Angeles: California Association for the Neurologically Handicapped, 1970.
- United States Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Aid to States Branch. Washington, D.C., March, 1976.
- Vasa, S. Matching learning styles to the curriculum in the secondary school. In L. R. Kinnison, P. A. Hoernicke, and C. E. Traugh (Eds.), The adolescent

with learning disabilities. Symposium proceedings, College of Education, Wichita State University, Wichita, Ks., 1975.

Wiederholt, J. L. Adolescents with learning disabilities: The problem in perspective. In DeBrosse, M. (Ed.), Learning disabilities in the secondary school: A review of the literature. Intermediate Unit 23, Norristown, Pa., 1975.

Wilcox, E. Identifying characteristics of the neurologically handicapped adolescent. In L. Anderson (Ed.), Helping the adolescent with the hidden handicap. Los Angeles: California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children, 1970.

Williamson, A. P. Career education: Implications for secondary learning disabled students. Academic Therapy, 1974-75, 10, 193-200.

Yearbook of special education. Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1975-76.

Zigmond, N. Preparing teachers for secondary learning disabilities programs. In M. DeBrosse (Ed.), Learning disabilities in the secondary school: A review of the literature. Intermediate Unit 23, Norristown, Pa., 1975.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE DEPARTMENT SURVEY OF SECONDARY  
LEARNING DISABILITY TEACHER  
PREPARATION

Please check the items appropriate to give a description of your program. Space has been provided for those items which require a brief narrative. Feel free to make additional comments where you feel they are appropriate.

1. Has your state mandated legislation for the learning disabled which includes educational provisions for secondary and/or work-study programs?

Secondary

- a None  
 b Mandatory  
 c Permissive

Work-Study

- a None  
 b Mandatory  
 c Permissive

2. Check the areas in which your State Department of Education prescribes a program of certification for secondary personnel.

- a Educable Mentally Retarded - Teacher  
 b Educable Mentally Retarded - Work-Study Specialist  
 c Learning Disabled Teacher  
 d Generic Work-Study Specialist  
 e Generic Teacher in Special Education, Secondary

3. What type(s) of professional certificate is/are approved by your state for secondary classroom teachers of the learning disabled? (May be more than one.)

- a Elementary and special education (K-12)  
 b Special education, elementary level only (K-8)  
 c Special education only (K-12)  
 d Special education secondary only (6-12)  
 e Special education secondary only (9-12)

- f Secondary education and special education  
(K-12)
- g Elementary education and special education  
(K-8)
- h Secondary education and special education  
(6-12)
- i Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. According to your records please list the current number of persons teaching at each level in the area of learning disabilities in your state.

- a Elementary level only (primary and intermediate)
- b Junior high school only
- c Senior high school only
- d No differentiation in level of secondary assignment

5. Please indicate the requirements for secondary certification for teaching the learning disabled in your state. (Check all applicable.)

- a Valid teaching certificate
  - 1 Elementary                       2 Secondary
- b Prior teaching experience
- c Student teaching or practicum
- d Study of exceptional children and the field of special education
- e Study of the home, school, and community relations of exceptional children
- f Knowledge and skills in techniques of interviewing and counseling parents of exceptional children
- g General methodology and materials for teaching
  - 1 Elementary                       2 Secondary
- h Secondary school curriculum development
- i Study of learning disabilities - medical, psychological, and sociological aspects

- j Secondary methodology and curriculum for the learning disabled
- k Survey of language and speech disorders in childhood
- l Remedial reading
- m Remedial arithmetic
- n Tests and measurements
- o Psycho-educational assessment
- p Mental hygiene
- q Psychology of adolescence
- r Behavior management techniques
- s Vocational and career planning
- t Other \_\_\_\_\_

6. a If your state does not have specific requirements, are there plans to initiate differentiation between elementary and secondary?  Yes  No
- b If yes, when will it be required?  
Date \_\_\_\_\_
- c If your state does not have specific requirements for secondary learning disabled teachers, please indicate those skills and/or competencies you feel should be required.

---



---



---



---



---



7. What type(s) of professional certification does your state approve for work-study specialists?

- a None
- b Elementary education
- c Secondary education
- d Combination special education and secondary certification
- e Special education only (elementary and/or secondary)
- f Special education and vocational education
- g Other(s) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Are secondary learning disabled students also served by "special needs" programs sponsored by vocational education? (Special needs students are those for whom the traditional education program must be modified to meet their specific needs. They may or may not meet special education criteria.)

- a Yes
- b No

If yes, please indicate the number of students involved in "special needs" programs.

\_\_\_\_\_

9. What is the total number of personnel needed in your state for providing education and training for secondary learning disabled youth for the 1977-78 academic year? (Give projections or estimates based on the number of programs anticipated for Fall, 1977.)

- a Junior high school teachers
- b High school teachers
- c Work-study specialists

10. If your state department could establish priorities for teacher training institutions to consider in determining secondary teacher training emphasis, what would your position be? Indicate by rank ordering the following alternatives.

We would prefer:

- a Training for one who spends his time teaching all day
  - b Training for one who spends part of the day in the classroom and part of the day in work-study
  - c Training for one who concentrates his time on vocational evaluation, training, and work placement
  - d Training for one who functions primarily as a vocational counselor
- Check if you would like to have summary of results.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE COVER LETTER



*Oklahoma State University*

APPLIED BEHAVIORAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074  
310 NORTH MURRAY HALL  
(405) 624-6636

The Department of Applied Behavioral Studies at Oklahoma State University is attempting to determine the extent to which secondary learning disability personnel are being trained. The survey will include all state directors of special education in the United States. The findings of this survey may be of value in determining the direction this university and other universities should take in this training area.

The enclosed survey is, for the most part, a checklist of items relating to certification, staffing and skills needed by individuals training to be secondary learning disability teachers. This survey will investigate differential training of the elementary and secondary learning disability teacher. The survey will operate on the following definitions. The secondary teacher is primarily an educator. He teaches and provides his school team counterpart, the work study specialist, with information necessary for effective vocational planning. His functions are teaching and evaluation and his total responsibility is to the school.

One of the questions included requests a short narrative answer from you. If you feel additional narrative is needed where no space has been provided, please feel free to comment on the back of the questionnaire.

Because this survey has a national scope, the results should reflect national and regional trends. Thus incomplete data from your state program will significantly effect the results for your region. The return of the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience would be appreciated.

We assure you that all results will be confidential and the findings will be reported in a general way with no specific mention of any state without permission.

Emily Jeanne Spillman  
Research Assistant

Lloyd R. Kinnison, Ed.D.  
Associate Professor  
Applied Behavioral Studies

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP LETTER



*Oklahoma State University*

APPLIED BEHAVIORAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074  
310 NORTH MURRAY HALL  
(405) 624-6036

Perhaps you've forgotten about it, or perhaps your son dropped his peanut butter sandwich all over our questionnaire. Did your secretary spill her coffee on it? Regardless, we've enclosed another one for your convenience and hope you will answer as quickly as possible. We've also enclosed a copy of the original cover letter as an explanation of the study.

Secondary learning disability programs are changing rapidly in personnel requirements and curricular emphasis thus requiring teacher training institutions to change accordingly. We are interested in how each state changes or views the changes. Although fifty states seems like quite a few, each outstanding state may make a significant change in our data. Please respond. We will be glad to send you the results of this study when it is completed if you so desire. We're sure you would find it extremely interesting.

Lloyd R. Kinnison, Ed.D.  
Associate Professor  
Applied Behavioral Studies

Emily Jeanne Spillman  
Research Assistant

VITA

Emily Jeanne Spillman

Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: A SURVEY OF STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS  
AND TEACHER PREPARATION OF THE SECONDARY  
LEARNING DISABILITIES TEACHER

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Shawnee, Oklahoma, July 29,  
1952, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles R.  
Spillman.

Education: Graduated from Purcell High School,  
Purcell, Oklahoma, in May, 1970; received  
Bachelor of Science degree in Special Edu-  
cation from Oklahoma State University in  
1974; completed requirements for the Master  
of Science degree at Oklahoma State Uni-  
versity in July, 1977.

Professional Experience: Teacher in elementary  
special education class for the educable  
mentally retarded, Chandler Public Schools,  
Chandler, Oklahoma, 1974-76; graduate teach-  
ing assistant, Oklahoma State University,  
Department of Applied Behavioral Studies,  
1976-77.