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Introduction

Special education classes have been appearing in the public schools of Washington with increasing frequency. This increase can be accounted for by a number of factors: (1) the federal government has allocated more money for special education; (2) there has been increased pressure from parent groups to furnish education for all children; (3) there has been a growing amount of research in the field of special education; and (4) the needs of the retarded are not being met in the regular classes (Robinson and Robinson, 1965).

Most of the increase in the number of special education classes has been on the elementary level since a child's need for special education is usually detected while he is in elementary school. The schools have tried to meet these student's needs by providing special classes in which the curriculum has been adjusted to be more in accordance with these needs. Special education programs have also been established on the junior and senior high school levels. Many students who attend special classes in elementary school continue to need special classes throughout their public schooling. There are also other students whose need for special education classes is not detected until they reach the high school level. Various programs have been introduced
into the high schools to try to meet the needs of the student who for some reason has been unable to succeed in a regular program.

Problems

The establishment of the high school special education programs has been based largely on the belief that they are beneficial and successful. However, many of these programs have not been evaluated to determine their actual effectiveness. Stevens and Heber (1964) in their review of research on the mentally retarded, state that there has been little empirical evidence to clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of these special programs. Therefore, the purposes of the thesis were (1) to determine the amount of follow-up that has been conducted of high school special education programs in the State of Washington and (2) an evaluation of the programs in the districts in which follow-up studies have been conducted.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this thesis, the following terms were defined:

Evaluation

Evaluation was the process of determining if the special education program was successful.
Follow-up

Follow-up was an organized method of maintaining contact with former students.

Success

Success was defined as the employment of former special education students.

Related Research

There has been a large variety of research conducted on the success of former special education students. The results of this research have not been consistent in regard to the efforts to provide handicapped students with a successful future. Some of the research supports the view that the mentally handicapped child, regardless of the help he has received, will never be independently successful. Other research studies have found that the mentally handicapped can succeed and that the help they received was beneficial.

Research not supporting high school special classes.

Baller (1936) in conducting research of former special class students, found that 61% were unemployed and 83% were dependent on outside support. He thus concluded that special programs were of little value and that the mentally retarded did not have much of a chance to make a successful adjustment to society. This position is supported by Stone and Schmidt (1943) who found that
only 22.7% of the mentally handicapped girls who had received vocational training were able to find employment. In a more recent study conducted by McFall (1966) only 20% of the former special class students found steady employment.

A much more encouraging viewpoint, but still opposing special programs was held by Philps (1956) who concluded that the mentally retarded could successfully adjust even without help. Even though none of the students in this study graduated from high school, he found that 67.2% had found employment and that only 10.5% had never been employed. He also found that their earning powers were within the national average. He further concluded that the person's intelligence and not his schooling was the important factor in success. Carriker (1957) and Sorenson (1960) also support the position that success for the mentally retarded is not dependent on the services of a special program. Sorenson, however, found that the graduates achieved significantly better than the dropouts in both occupational levels and civic responsibility.

Research supporting special classes. Most of the research supported the value of special education programs. Several studies (Lord, 1933; Channing, 1932;
Detroit Public Schools, 1936; McIntosh, 1949; Carson and Arvesson, 1963; Denney and Harris, 1963) expressed support for special programs based on the percentage of the former students employed. Fairbanks (1933) found that approximately 75% of the former students classified as mentally subnormal were functioning independently. He further found that only a small portion (11%) were repeated offenders of the law and that the number of divorces and welfare cases was about the same as the national average. The opinion that the mentally retarded can be helped is also supported by Charles (1953). Charles, in following up the subjects that Baller used for his study, found that there had been a gradual improvement in the status of the participants since the original study. Charles thus concluded that the chance of successful adjustment for the mentally handicapped was much more optimistic than Baller had indicated.

This optimistic outlook was supported by Peterson and Smith (1960) who compared students of average intelligence with mentally retarded that were from the same school and socio-economic class. Although they found that the normal students excelled the mentally retarded in most areas, the mentally retarded did succeed well enough to warrant a program for them.
Waetjin and Liddle (1959) in comparing a group of slow learners receiving special instruction with a control group receiving instruction in the regular program, found that the experimental group was significantly more positive in its attitudes towards school and was better able to adjust socially. They found no significant difference in school achievement or in personal adjustment since both groups improved in these areas. No mention was made as to what this special instruction entailed.

A comparison by Cowan and Goldman (1959) of students receiving vocation training with a control group that did not receive vocational training found that the experimental group had a significantly larger number of vocational successes. They also found that this success was unrelated to the students' intelligence, past work experience, or amount of formal education. A similar comparative study was conducted by Shaw (1965) in which he found that students vocationally trained were better able to obtain jobs and that fewer were unemployed.

An extensive study was conducted by Dinger (1961) of the post school adjustment of former educable retarded students. He found that approximately 82% were self-supporting and that only 28% of those who changed jobs
were forced to do so. The average salary was $3,327
per year with almost 50% of the salaries above that of
beginning teachers. Dinger concluded from this that
the program these students had received had been beneficial.
The program had emphasized personal and social adjust-
ment, life needs (budgeting, citizenship, etc.), home
repair for the boys, home economics for the girls, and
on the job training.

Similar results were obtained by Schmidt (1947) in a
study that paired students on I.Q., years of school
experience, socio-economic status, achievement and sex.
The control group received a program similar to the
regular classes but at a slower rate. The program for
the experimental group stressed personal adjustment,
academic improvement, work habits, vocational information,
and pre-employment experience. More members of the
experimental group were employed (80%) than members of
the control group (13%), and the members of the experi-
mental group held their jobs an average of three years
longer. No member of the control group held a job above
the unskilled level while almost a third of the experi-
mental group held skilled jobs.

Traits affecting success. The following studies cited
have reported a number of the traits that seem to be
important in determining whether or not the mentally
handicapped successfully adjust.

Kidd, Cross, and Higginbotham (1967) in following-up students that had graduated from special class programs found that a person's intelligence was not a significant factor. The wages for the highest and lowest I.Q. groups studied were approximately the same. Potts (1952) in studying mentally retarded students who had received vocational rehabilitation also found that I.Q. was not an important factor. He found that personal adjustment was much more important and that job training experience was essential in helping the retarded adjust. Barrett, Rilos, and Eisele (1965) also found that I.Q. was not a significant factor. They did find, however, that the successful mentally retarded were able to think on a higher reasoning level—to think abstractly.

In a study reported by Neuhaus (1967) of a project to train mentally retarded for specific jobs it was found that the ability to get along with other workers and staff and the ability to adjust were the most important factors in job success. Cooperation with the supervisors and with other workers was also stressed by Warren (1961). Warren also found when comparing the employed with the unemployed that self-confidence and quality of work were significantly better for the employed group. Acceptance of criticism, cleanliness, safety, and being on
time were factors that were found to be important but not significant.

Personality, work skill, and general health were found to be the most important factors by McKeon (1946) in his study of former special class students. Sutter and McGee (1954) in studying mentally retarded in an institution found that the ability to function independently was more important than either attitudes or work habits for those who were successfully placed on jobs outside the institution. However, Fry (1961) found that efficiency in performance of work was the best predictor of success outside an institution. The importance of work performance and work habits was also found to be significant by Kolstoe (1961). The person's general health was another factor he found to be significant when comparing employed and unemployed mentally retarded males. Both Fry and Kolstoe found a person's personality to be an important factor but neither statistically evaluated its importance.

There are still some contradictions and confusion in the research. Most of the research has supported the need for high school special classes and that these special classes should include some actual work experience. The research has not been as definite in specifying the classroom curricula that should be taught. Most of the studies, however, agree that the classroom instruction
should be related to the work experience with emphasis on work habits, personal and social adjustment, and good general health habits.

Method

Subjects

The subjects for this thesis consisted of twenty-six districts in the State of Washington that offered high school special education programs. The schools included were taken from a list (Appendix A) supplied by Mrs. Helena Adamson, the State Supervisor of Special Education for the State of Washington.

Instruments

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was developed by the writer to be sent to each of the twenty-six districts. A questionnaire was used because this was the most feasible way to obtain the desired information. The districts were asked to check the appropriate answers to questions covering five general areas. The general areas covered were (1) the eligibility of students (2) the referral process, (3) the type of program (4) amount of follow-up, and (5) extended services provided. A closed questionnaire was used to facilitate the work of both the recipients and the investigator. Written replies were possible but not required.
Questions for an interview (Appendix C) were also developed for the purpose of obtaining further information from those districts having conducted follow-up studies. These districts were interviewed because specific information was desired as to (1) the results of their follow-up studies and (2) those things in their program which were designed to help students achieve vocational success. Questions were asked concerning both the general organization of their program and the specific curriculum to provide the answers to the second question.

Procedure

The initial step involved obtaining the list of districts that offer high school special education programs. The questionnaire that had been developed was then sent to each of these twenty-six districts. A letter (Appendix D) accompanying the questionnaire was also sent to explain the purpose of the questionnaire. The letter and questionnaire were sent January 17, 1967. A reminder letter (Appendix E) was sent February 27, 1967 to the three districts who at that time had failed to return the questionnaire.

The next step was to determine from the questionnaire those districts which had conducted follow-up studies. Officials of these districts were then interviewed during the first week of May, 1967. The information obtained
from the questionnaires and interviews was then tabulated and interpreted.

Results

Results of Questionnaire

The tabulation of the questionnaire revealed a wide variety of high school special education programs in the State of Washington. The discussion that follows presents the results of each item as it appeared in the questionnaire.

The first item revealed which students were being served by the high school special education program. The results as shown in Table 1 indicate that all but two of the twenty-six districts served the educable mentally retarded as they were defined by this study. The one district that marked "other" served the high school homebound student with tutoring services. It was also noted that some of the districts had cooperated together to serve the hard of hearing, visually handicapped, and physically handicapped.
Table 1
Number of High Schools Serving the Different Special Education Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educable</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Handicapped</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocationally Handicapped</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question dealt with the process of referral into the special programs. The results are shown in Table 2. Four of the districts that marked "other" allowed the students' parents to make the referral. One of these districts also allowed the student to refer himself. The guidance program also made referrals in two of the districts. In two of the districts the only way a student could enter the high school special education program was to have attended special classes at a lower level. No new students could enter at the high school level and in one of these districts the students did not receive a psychological evaluation before entering the program. For many of the districts, referrals could be made by all or some of the groups listed.
Table 2

How Students are Referred to Special Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred by teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred by administration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation from previous special classes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral includes psychological evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third question was concerned with the type of vocational program available to the educable mentally retarded. Two districts indicated they did not have a vocational program for the educable mentally retarded. One of these did not have any kind of vocational program at the high school level. Ten of the districts included the retarded in the regular vocational program. A special program was offered for the educable mentally retarded in twenty-one of the districts (both programs were available in seven of the districts).

Question four covered the kind of vocational program offered. Five districts indicated that they offered a vocational rehabilitation program. Sixteen of the other districts indicated that they offered a work study program, while three districts indicated they offered both.
The fifth question dealt with the schools' follow-up programs. Seven districts indicated that they had kept contact with their former students. The other nineteen districts did not have a follow-up program.

The next question determined how extensive a follow-up program had been initiated. The results showed that two districts maintained constant contact with former students, three districts maintained intermittent contact and two districts conducted one follow-up study.

The seventh question was concerned with finding out if any extended services were offered to former special education students. Eleven of the twenty-six districts checked that they had extended services.

Item eight revealed the type of extended services offered by the eleven districts. The results as summarized in Table 3 showed that three of the districts offered vocational and personal counseling to former special education students. One district offered adult education while two others provided adult education and personal counseling. Adult education, vocational services and personal counseling were offered by four of the districts with two of the districts providing these services through
the state division of vocational rehabilitation. One district indicated that extended services were available on request but did not indicate what services could be requested.

Table 3
Number of Districts Offering Extended Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Interview

The seven districts which had signified in the questionnaire that they had conducted follow-up studies were interviewed. Three of these districts were in the process of conducting their studies. They did not have any results completed at the time of the interviews. The following discussion gives the results of the interviews with the other four districts. The districts have been referred to as A, B, C, and D, in the discussion.

District A conducted its study to find out what could be done to improve its high school special program.
This was prompted because so many of the students had dropped out of the program. Although they did not follow-up every student, those they did locate had quit school to either find work, join job corps, or join the military service. Data was requested concerning both the percentage of former students employed and the average number of jobs each student had held since graduation. However, the district had not statistically evaluated the results of their follow-up studies and therefore could not supply any of the specific figures desired.

The special program for district A had consisted of providing an academic program for the educable mentally retarded. As a result of the follow-up, the district had tried to fit the retarded into an already existing distributive education program. The retarded also had difficulty succeeding in this program. District A was in the process of trying to develop a program more suited to the vocational and personal needs of the educable mentally retarded.

District B conducted its follow-up study to determine if the program was beneficial to those participating. Although they were also unable to provide the desired statistics, district B had concluded that the results indicated their program was of help to the students. However the findings did indicate that the program would
have been even more helpful if it had been less academically oriented. A more practical program was developed as a result of this follow-up study. The remedial program that originally was stressed was partially replaced with some work experience. In the work experience program the student spent approximately half the school day working either around school or in the community. The school curriculum was subject oriented, but with stress on the practical aspects. Class time was also spent in improving both the personal and social responsibilities as a citizen.

District C routinely kept contact with the students who had attended their special education program. This follow-up was designed to keep the district informed on what was happening to its former special education students so that it could adjust its program accordingly. The results of the follow-up of the 1966 graduates found that only 22 of the 74 graduates were employed on jobs. However, they also employed 16 in sheltered workshops and 2 others were in the service. This was a total of 40 former students employed in some way. Fifteen of the students were still attending some kind of school and no information was obtained on two of the students. This left only 17 or 21.6% of the former students unemployed.
The vocational success that occurred for some of these students could be attributed to the specific occupational training programs that have been developed by the district. The majority of the training was conducted in the pre-vocational school that housed most of the secondary level special education students, or in sheltered workshops. One of the changes that occurred as a result of the follow-up findings was the development of more job training in more occupational areas. The students had better success in finding employment if they had had occupational training for a number of different jobs. There was also some placement outside the school for students of 16 years of age or older who have developed some vocational skill. The possibility of community placement was determined by an evaluation from the student's special education teacher.

The classroom instruction was oriented basically toward the academic subjects and was not necessarily correlated with the job training program. Each student was expected to achieve as much academically as his abilities permitted.

The follow-up and evaluation was an intricate part of the program that had been developed by district D. Each student had been followed until he had demonstrated successful adjustment on a job. Successful adjustment was usually considered to be two or three months of
satisfactory work experience at one location. The follow-up was conducted by the state division of vocational rehabilitation which had cooperated with the district in developing the programs presently in operation. The district found through the follow-up that 59, or 68.7% of the former students had been successfully employed. Of the remaining 21 that have left the program, 5 have been institutionalized, 7 had declined any further help and 8 had moved away. One other former student had failed to find successful employment because of medical reasons.

The district felt that the primary reasons for the success they had was due to the prevocational experiences that each student had while still in school. Community work experiences were found for each student as part of his high school program. Usually the student spent about one half of the day working and the other half day in the classroom. The classroom instruction emphasized those traits that were seen as being helpful in successful adjustment on the job. Communication, human relationships, responsibilities as citizens, and occupational information were considered to be important.
Discussion

The results of the questionnaire and interview showed that many different high school special education programs were being offered in the state of Washington. It also revealed that few of the districts had evaluated their programs to determine their effectiveness. The Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education/Division of Program Operations, United States Department of Health Education and Welfare, (1965), in its guideline for the establishment of special programs emphasized that evaluation is an important part of any program. However, only 4 of the 26 districts studied had actually evaluated their programs. There were three other districts that did indicate that follow-up programs were being established and they would then be able to evaluate their programs.

The results that these districts obtained in evaluating their programs indicated that a program which included work experiences was the most profitable. The three districts that had obtained some success from their program did offer work experiences for the students. The one district that found negative results had offered only academic classroom instruction for the high school special education student. The organization of the work experience program does not appear to be as an important
issue since each of the three districts had organized their programs differently.

The findings of this study were not clear in determining what should be stressed in classroom instruction. Two of the successful districts emphasized the practical material needed for everyday living. The other successful district stressed academic learning. The unsuccessful district had also stressed the necessity of academic achievement. Possibly the classroom instruction is not as important as the work experience.

The importance of offering a work experience was apparently recognized by the majority of the districts having high school special education programs. Only two of the twenty-six districts that had high school special education programs did not have a vocational program for the educable mentally retarded.

The importance of providing extended services for the educable mentally retarded was not emphasized by most of the districts. Only eleven of the districts have implemented programs that include extended services for former students. The importance of extended services has been emphasized by both Eskridge and Partridge (1963) in evaluation of the importance of special education and Hill (1950) in evaluation of the curriculum for mentally handicapped. Both contend that the educable mentally retarded develop slower and therefore need help beyond the period of formal education.
The study was limited to the use of a questionnaire and interview. This, however, was the most feasible way to obtain the desired information. Another limitation was in restricting the study to the State of Washington. However, one of the purposes of the study was to discover what was being done in the State of Washington. Even with these limitations the writer felt that the study was of value. The results of this study were in agreement with the findings that most of the research in this area has supported. These findings were: (1) work experience was an important aspect of a high school special education program and (2) the academic material to be presented in the classroom needed to be determined. However, it was the writer's observation from interviews that the classroom instruction should be correlated with the work experience aspect of the program. This writer also felt that it was important to find out just how few districts had actually evaluated their programs. It is only through the evaluation of programs that better programs can be established.

Recommendations

The first recommendation was that more evaluation of the programs should be conducted by the school districts. This evaluation should be a continuous process to determine
whether the programs have been effective. It should also facilitate in determining what improvements should be made.

Another recommendation was that further research be conducted to determine the academic material that should be stressed in the classroom. This research could be accomplished by the school in the evaluation of their programs.

Summary

The study surveyed twenty-six districts in the State of Washington that had developed high school special education programs. These districts were surveyed to determine the amount of follow-up that had been conducted in high school special education programs and to provide an evaluation of the program in the districts in which follow-up studies have been conducted.

A closed questionnaire was developed and mailed to each district. Questions were asked concerning five general areas. These areas were: (1) eligibility of students, (2) the referral process, (3) the types of program, (4) the amount of follow-up and (5) the extended services provided. The districts that conducted follow-up studies were then interviewed to determine (1) the results of their follow-up studies and (2) the factors in their program which were designed to help students attain vocational success.
The results of this study indicated that most of the high school special education programs (1) included the educable mentally retarded, (2) included some kind of vocational experience, and (3) did not include providing extended services.

It was also concluded from the findings that the special programs should include some actual work experience for the student. However, no definite conclusion could be reached from the results of this study on what academic material should be stressed in the classroom instruction.

It was recommended that more districts evaluate their programs since the results of the study also indicated that few districts had done evaluation. It was also recommended that further research should be conducted to determine what academic material, if any, should be stressed in the classroom.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF DISTRICTS RECEIVING QUESTIONNAIRE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>S.D. No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>S.D. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>100-C</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Angeles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup</td>
<td>3-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

Name______________________________________________________________

Position__________________________________________________________

Name of district____________________________________________________

Enrollment in high school special education programs________

1. Which of these classes are offered for the high school age special education student?
   - Trainable
   - Educable
   - Social adjustment
   - Emotional
   - Hard of hearing
   - Visually handicapped
   - Physically handicapped
   - Vocational
   - Other ___________________________

2. How are students placed into the high school special education program?
   - Referred by teacher
   - Referred by administration
   - Continuation from previous special education classes
   - Referral includes psychological evaluation
   - Other ___________________________

3. What kind of vocational program is offered for the educable mentally retarded child?
   - They are not included in a vocational program
   - They are included in a regular vocational program
   - A special program is offered
4. If a high school vocational program is offered for the educable mentally retarded, it is:

Vocational rehabilitation  □  Work-study  □  Other ____________

5. Do you have a follow-up program of the former special education students after they have left school?

Yes  □  No  □

6. If yes, how extensive is your follow-up program?

Do you maintain constant contact with former students?  □
Have you maintained intermittent contact?  □
One follow-up study has been conducted  □

7. Do you provide extended services after these students have left school?

Yes  □  No  □

8. If yes, what kind of service?

Vocational services  □  Personal counseling  □
Adult education  □  Other ____________

9. If you would like a copy of this study, upon its completion, please indicate by checking here  □
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW
INTERVIEW

I. What were your objectives in doing the follow-up?

II. What were the results of your follow-up?

1. Are former students employed (percentage)
2. How many jobs since graduation?
3. To what degree have they found job success?

III. How have you used the results of your follow-up study to develop a better program?

IV. What in your program is intended to help vocation success?

1. General format of program from initial start to final departure

2. Specific curriculum
APPENDIX D

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE
A preliminary check with Helena Adamson, the State Supervisor of Special Education, has indicated that you offer a high school special education program. The enclosed questionnaire is thus being sent to you as a part of a thesis project to discover the follow-up programs that are currently being conducted of former special education students. A comparative study of high school education curriculums will be made from this and other data collected. Upon the completion of the study, the results will be available if requested.

To aid you in filling out the questionnaire some of the terms used are defined as follows:

**Educable mentally retarded.** The educable mentally retarded was defined for this study as a student with an intelligence quotient range from fifty to eighty.

**Extended service.** For this study, extended service was defined as any service provided by the school, to aid the student after he has left school.

**Follow-up.** Follow-up was defined as an organized method of maintaining contact with former students.

**Special education classes.** Special education classes are all classes offered for students who are unable to achieve success in a regular program and in which the child spends at least half of his school day in the special classroom.

The brief questionnaire may be filled out by the Director of Special Education or by some other person qualified to answer the questions. Please feel free to add any additional information which you feel would be of value to the study.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that has been provided. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Richard Beaudreau
APPENDIX E
REMINDER LETTER
Director of Special Education

Dear Sir:

This is just a reminder about your response to the Special Education Follow-up Questionnaire that was sent to your school. Your cooperation in completing and returning it as soon as possible would be greatly appreciated. If you have already completed the questionnaire, please ignore this reminder. Another copy has been included for your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Richard Beaudreau