



1957

The loss ratio as a factor in the present financial support and future development of classes for exceptional children in the central and central coast counties of the state of California

August Frank Blanchard
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blanchard, August Frank. (1957). *The loss ratio as a factor in the present financial support and future development of classes for exceptional children in the central and central coast counties of the state of California*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1342

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

THE LOSS RATIO AS A FACTOR IN THE PRESENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT
AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSES FOR EXCEPTIONAL
CHILDREN IN THE CENTRAL AND CENTRAL COAST
COUNTIES OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
College of the Pacific

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

by
August Frank Blanchard
...
August 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM, OBJECTIVES, DEFINITIONS OF	
TERMS, AND METHODOLOGY	1
The problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Types of special education	2
Objectives of the study	3
Definitions of terms used	4
Method of gathering the data	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Literature concerning the physically	
handicapped	9
Literature concerning the mentally	
retarded	13
Literature concerning the gifted	14
III. ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC DATA	16
Basic information for all the counties	16
Organizational levels of the special	
education program	21
Comparison of costs and losses for various	
types of special education	28
Corrective speech	28

	111
CHAPTER	PAGE
Individual instruction	32
Cerebral palsy	36
Deaf	39
Blind	41
Mentally retarded	42
Severely mentally retarded	44
Gifted	52
IV. DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT TRENDS IN CLASSES FOR	
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN	56
Physically handicapped	59
Mentally retarded	61
Gifted	62
V. REVIEW OF THE 1957 LEGISLATIVE SESSION	66
Senate Bills	68
Assembly Bills	72
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Summary	75
Conclusions	79
Recommendations	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Total A.D.A. and Total Special A.D.A. for Eleven Counties Studied, 1955-1956	17
II. Cost of the Programs of Total Education and Special Education, by County, 1955-1956 . . .	18
III. Average Cost, and Cost Ratio for Eleven Counties Studied, Total and Special Education Programs, 1955-1956	20
IV. Total A.D.A., and Current Expense, and Average Cost, and Total Loss for Entire Special Education Program by County, 1955-1956 . . .	22
V. A.D.A., and Cost, and Loss Factors for Special Classes Operated by Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956	24
VI. A.D.A., and Cost, and Loss Factors for Special Classes Operated by County Superintendents for Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956 .	25
VII. A.D.A., and Cost, and Loss Factors for Special Classes Operated by Unified School Districts, 1955-1956	26
VIII. A.D.A., and Cost, and Loss Factors for Special Classes Operated by Secondary School Districts, 1955-1956	27

TABLE

PAGE

IX.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Loss Factors for Special Classes Operated by County Superintendents for Secondary School Districts, 1955-1956 . . .	29
X.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Corrective Speech Classes Operated by Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956. . . .	30
XI.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Individual Instruction Operated by County Superintendents for Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956.	33
XII.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Individual Instruction Operated by County Superintendents for Secondary School Districts, 1955-1956.	34
XIII.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Individual Instruction Operated by Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956. . . .	35
XIV.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Individual Instruction Operated by Secondary School Districts, 1955-1956	37
XV.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Individual Instruction Operated by Unified School Districts, 1955-1956	38

TABLE

PAGE

XVI.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956 . . .	43
XVII.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by County Superintendents for Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956	45
XVIII.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by Secondary School Districts, 1955-1956 . . .	46
XIX.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by Unified School Districts, 1955-1956	47
XX.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Severely Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by County Superintendents for Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956	50
XXI.	A.D.A., and Cost, and Ratio Factors for Severely Mentally Retarded Classes Operated by Elementary School Districts, 1955-1956 .	51
XXII.	Total Number of Classes and/or Teachers for All Types of Special Education in the Eleven Counties Studied, 1955-1956	57

TOTAL

PAGE

XXIII.	Total Number of Classes and/or Teachers for All Types of Special Education in the Eleven Counties Studied, 1956-1957	59
XXIV.	The Number of Children on Waiting Lists for All Types of Special Education in the Eleven Counties Studied, June, 1957	67

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM, OBJECTIVES, DEFINITIONS OF TERMS, AND METHODOLOGY

During the last decade the responsibility for the education of exceptional children has very rapidly become a function of the public schools. With the inflationary spiral that the economy of the nation has faced during this same period it has become increasingly more difficult for school districts to assume the financial burden that these classes place upon them.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of the study being considered in this paper was a realistic analysis and consideration of the cost of supporting special education, with particular emphasis on the ratio of the cost of special education, and the losses involved, to the cost of the education of the normal child in the regular classroom. All financial data used in this paper was gathered for the year 1955-1956, and was the result of a study conducted in eleven California counties, including: Fresno County, Kern County, Kings County, Madera County, Mariposa County, Merced County, Monterey County, San Benito County, San Luis

Obispo County, Santa Cruz County, and Tulare County.

The scope of the problem included 454 school districts in the eleven counties: 385 elementary, 56 secondary, and 13 unified. In the school year 1955-1956 there were 275,160 average daily attendance in the 454 school districts. Students in juvenile halls, hospitals, and emergency county schools and classes were not included. There were 2,998 A.D.A. of the 275,160 enrolled in the various kinds of special education which was 1.09 per cent of the total educational program.

Types of special education. Three types of special education classes are considered in the data gathered: classes for the physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, and the gifted child. Under the designation "physically handicapped" the costs of the services include those for speech therapy for individuals with speech defects, those for individual instruction for children with orthopedic handicaps, and those children with lowered organic vitality, as well as other illnesses and physical handicaps, the cerebral palsied, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the blind, and the partially sighted (as defined by Education Code, Section 9601, 9601.1, and 9601. 2).

The classes set up, either by school districts or county superintendents under sections 9801.1 and 9801.2 in the Education Code were classes for those mentally retarded children legally designated as "educable" and those mentally retarded children legally designated as "trainable." The educable mentally retarded are called Point One children, and the trainable Point Two after the numerical listing of the legislation which made such classes possible.

Classes for the gifted child were included in order to ascertain the amount of activity in pilot studies of the special education of the gifted child in classes which were set up by school districts, or enriched curricula for the exceptionally bright child within the regular classroom.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study were to investigate the following aspects of the problem:

1. Is the special education program in Central California growing larger, or is it being curtailed, or was it actually smaller in 1956-1957 than it was in 1955-1956?

2. Were these losses or loss ratios as reported by the Fresno City Unified School District, at the hearing

of the Senate Interim Committee on the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults in Los Angeles on October 10th and 11th, 1956, duplicated in other school districts in Central California?

3. Was there any relationship between the amount of money lost in the support of special education and the possible development of new classes in the future?

4. Was one type of organizational level of instruction able to offer special education more economically or more efficiently than another level of instruction?

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The term "loss ratio" as it is used in this study means the relationship of total losses being borne by counties and school districts in maintaining classes for special education in ratio to the cost of supporting the total educational program.

The waiting lists of children were for the school year 1956-1957 and were furnished by the directors of special education of the various cities and counties. These children were completely tested and certified for a certain kind of special education but were not in a class.

The estimates of the number of children not being cared for by special education were made by the directors

of special education. These surmises were based on a very intimate knowledge of their individual counties and should be relatively accurate.

The term "per unit" refers to a unit of average daily attendance.

IV. METHOD OF GATHERING THE DATA

Developing the background and gathering the data for the study required a close association with the county superintendents of each county, or with the person in charge of special education, to discuss in detail the special education program of each particular county. Attention was given to questions that would indicate a general attitude toward the whole program. Specific problems in the support of certain types of special education were discussed. A set of basic information cards for each county was developed so that notes could be taken at the interviews.

The major portion of the financial data was taken from (1) the California State Department of Education Form No. J-22, School District Report of Certain Expenses for Special Training Schools and Classes; (2) the comparable Form J-22.1 which the county superintendent files for classes operated by the county; and (3) the

annual report of the county superintendents of all financial transactions for each school district.

From the J-22 reports a card was filled out to tabulate the district's A.D.A. for each type of special education, the current expenses, the average cost, and the total transportation cost. Totals were then made for each level of instruction, and comparisons were made between the cost of the total educational program and the special education program, the ratio between the two, and the total losses in the support of special education.

The cost of transportation is not considered in this study because it was found, after exhaustive investigation and extensive interviewing of county superintendents and directors of special education in the counties concerned, that the present transportation allowances are sufficient to reimburse school districts and counties fully for their expenditures on transportation for children in special education classes. Therefore, transportation is not a factor in the computation of the losses incurred in support of special education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the problem considered in this study is one of the financial investment made and the monetary losses suffered by school districts and county offices in supporting special education services, the primary sources for research have been state publications, state reports, Senate Interim Committee reports, and the published financial reports of the various counties and school districts being considered in this study.

There is, however, a large body of literature on the subject of the education of exceptional children. Many articles in periodicals, such as the American Journal of Mental Deficiency and Exceptional Children, and books by authorities in the various fields of atypical children contribute an understanding of the problems inherent in the education of the deviate child, an understanding which could not possibly be gained from any financial report, however detailed and excellently compiled. Among the books which were studied for this background of understanding, not only of the problems but of the emotional climate of special education, Special Education for the Exceptional by Frampton and Gall, Speech in the Elementary

School by Ogilvie, Cerebral Palsy, Its Individual and Community Problems by Cruickshank and Hous, and Teaching the Cerebral Palsied Child, A Handbook for Teachers by Gore and Stoddard were all excellent.

An outstanding new reference work was published in 1955 with complete material for the total program for the exceptional child.¹ It was edited by Dr. Merle E. Frampton of the New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, and Elena D. Gall, with twenty-four leading educators as contributing authors, and published in three volumes.

Volume I is Introduction and Problems and gives the historical background and defines special education.

Volume II is The Physically Handicapped and Special Health Problems. It discusses the blind, the partially sighted, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the speech defective, the orthopedically handicapped, the cardiopathic, and special health problems, such as the multiple handicapped, muscular dystrophy, tuberculous, and the homebound. Volume III is entitled Emotional and Mental Deviates and Special Problems. This covers the intellectually gifted, the brain injured child, the cerebral palsied child, the hemiplegic, the epileptic, the emotionally disturbed, the

¹Merle E. Frampton and Elena D. Gall (eds.), Special Education for the Exceptional. 3 Vols. (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1955).

juvenile delinquent, the mentally retarded, the aged, the narcotic addict, and the alcoholic.

I. LITERATURE CONCERNING THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Any consideration of the education of the physically handicapped, and any research on the problems inherent in this area, necessitates the consideration of speech therapy. Speech therapy is an integral part of the training of teaching of the physically handicapped, particularly of the cerebral palsied. According to the 1955 Report of the Senate Interim Committee on the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults, 5 per cent of the children in the public schools suffer from some kind of speech defect.² This percentage includes children whose speech is affected by organic defects of speech organs, as well as those individuals whose speech organs are normal but who have formed incorrect habits of using their speech mechanism with a resultant functional speech difficulty.

Ogilvie wrote:

²Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report. On the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults (Sacramento: Senate, California State Legislature), p. 105.

A child has a special difficulty when his speech attracts attention to itself. In general, the teacher can try to understand the child as a whole, accept him as he is, create a classroom atmosphere that invites communication, build good human relationship with and among his students, and reinforce the teaching of the correctionist.³

In this statement the author merely underlines the fact that the teacher must be part of a team, and must learn how and when to make referral to a special speech service to secure aid for the child.

The problems of the education of the cerebral palsied child in the public schools are enormously complex. The degree of involvement in these children is so varied that they can scarcely be described as a group.

Cruikshank and Raus define it as,

Cerebral palsy should be defined as an aggregate of handicaps, i.e., emotional, neuromuscular, special sensory and peripheral sensory, caused by damaged or absent brain structures.⁴

And Gore and Stoddard write,

The area of the brain that has been damaged determines the types of cerebral palsy. The commonly recognized types are spasticity, athetosis, rigidity, atoxia, and tremor. About sixty per cent of all cerebral palsied children are spastic, the others are athetoid, rigidity or tremor types. Since each type of cerebral palsy causes certain problems in education

³Mardel Ogilvie, Speech in the Elementary School (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954), p. 227.

⁴William M. Cruickshank and George M. Raus, Cerebral Palsy, Its Individual and Community Problems (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1955).

it is necessary for the teacher to be familiar with each of the types.⁵

Special classes for the deaf and the hard of hearing attempt to break down the barrier of silence that prevents these children from making normal progress in growth of the communication skills. Deaf children cannot acquire an understanding of oral language, or any language whatever, until they have had special instruction. This is true because language is almost entirely a child's imitation of the speech of those about him. The child who cannot hear, therefore, cannot imitate and so does not learn to speak.

Watson writes in his state bulletin regarding the education of the deaf child in the public schools,

At one time practically all deaf children in the United States were trained to 'talk on their hands.' This entailed teaching them to arrange their fingers or hands in different shapes or positions to represent letters of the alphabet or whole words. The former constitutes 'finger spelling,' the latter 'signing.' 'Manual education of the deaf' refers to this type of training for communication.⁶

Today the trend is toward oral education of deaf children which entails training in speaking and lip reading. This requires instruction in articulation and

⁵Beatrice S. Gore and Jane Stoddard, Teaching the Cerebral Palsied Child, A Handbook for Teachers, Vol. XXIII, Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, November, 1954, pp. 1-2.

⁶Charles W. Watson, A Guide to the Education of the Deaf in the Public Schools of California, Vol. XXIV,

phonation, using visual, tactual, and kinesthetic methods. Speech reading or lip reading is training in the visual identification of words and expressions as seen on the lips and faces of people.

Manual education restricts communication to other persons with similar training while oral education allows the deaf child to understand any person.

Fiedler,⁷ in her book, accounted an experiment in the training of deaf children in association with normally hearing children. In most of the case histories the normal children were the siblings of the exceptional children. This was the very best type of association because it was the most natural climate in which the deaf child could be taught this oral education.

The special program for the blind and the partially sighted was not a significant part of the study because only one class was operated in a public school in the eleven counties studied. It was an institutional responsibility rather than a public school responsibility.

Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, August, 1955, p. 1.

⁷Miriam Forster Fiedler, Deaf Children in a Hearing World (New York: The Ronald Press, 1952).

II. LITERATURE CONCERNING THE MENTALLY RETARDED

The majority of books read concerned the education of the mentally retarded, since this area of special education was that most emphasized in the study. Morris and Miriam Pollock in their book, New Hope for the Retarded, which was published in 1953, wrote about the education of these children in a hopeful and encouraging tone, as shown by the following list of statements taken from Chapter II:

1. Mentally retarded children are born to parents of all social and economic classes.
2. The mentally retarded child is not an unfavorable reflection on his parents.
3. Normal children who play with mentally retarded children do not become "dull" from associating with them.
4. The mentally retarded is not a dangerous child.
5. The mentally retarded child is neither overly affectionate or unaffectionate.
6. It is not difficult to satisfy the mentally retarded child.
7. The mentally retarded child can enjoy life as much as the normal child.
8. Teaching mentally retarded children is not more difficult than teaching those of normal intelligence, but the problems involved are different.
9. The mentally retarded child is not lazy.
10. The mentally retarded child should be taught the tool subjects before he is introduced to the social studies.

11. The mentally retarded are capable of religious devotion.

12. The mentally retarded child can "amount to something."⁸

III. LITERATURE CONCERNING THE GIFTED

The education of the gifted is fast becoming a very important part of the public school program and many pilot studies have been going on in various parts of the country. D. A. Worcester has written about an interesting study in the education of children of above-average mentality.⁹ He contended that it has been wrong to start all children in the public schools at a certain age. He feels that children should be admitted to kindergarten on the basis of mental age and not on the chronological age basis which has long been in use almost everywhere in the United States. He shows tables which tend to support his idea.

Theodore Hall has written a report of the Cleveland Story.¹⁰ This gifted child program has been going on for

⁸Morris P. Pollack and Miriam Pollack, New Hope for the Retarded (New York: Porter Sargent, 1953).

⁹D. A. Worcester, The Education of Children of Above-Average Mentality (Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1956).

¹⁰Theodore Hall, Gifted Children, The Cleveland Story (New York: World Publishing Company, 1956).

thirty-five years and has been tremendously successful. It was an idea of Roberta Holden Bole and was initially developed and sponsored by the Womens' City Club of Cleveland. These classes have been called Major Work Classes and there were more than 1,600 children in the Cleveland Public Schools with intelligence quotients of 125 or higher who were in these special classes in 1955.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC DATA

I. BASIC INFORMATION FOR ALL THE COUNTIES

The basic data for the study are contained in the first three tables which follow. Table I contains the basic information for the eleven counties of the comparison of the total A.D.A. for each county to the total special education A.D.A. for the school year 1955-1956. It lists the counties and shows the total A.D.A. for elementary, secondary, and unified districts. The A.D.A. for special education was 2,998 which was 1.09 per cent of the eleven county total of 275,160 A.D.A. in the 454 school districts.

Elementary A.D.A. accounted for 62 per cent of the total program and 78 per cent of the special education. Secondary A.D.A. was 22 per cent of the total and only 10 per cent of the special education. Unified was 16 per cent of the total and 12 per cent of the special A.D.A. The elementary districts and the elementary classes in unified districts educated a greater percentage of their potential exceptional children than did the secondary schools.

Table II, page 18, is actually two tables on one page for the purpose of illustrating the relationship of

TABLE I

TOTAL A.D.A. AND TOTAL SPECIAL A.D.A. FOR ELEVEN COUNTIES STUDIED, 1955-1956

County Column 1	Total a.d.a. 1955-1956				Total special a.d.a. 1955-1956				% Spec.Ed. to Total Education	Total No. of Sch. Dist.
	Elem. 2	Secun. 3	Unif. 4	Total 5	Elem. 6	Sec. 7	Unif. 8	Total 9		
Fresno	31,789	10,218	33,998	76,005	290	2	264	556	.73	101
Kern	44,836	16,911	2,726	64,473	700	92	18	810	1.26	59
Kings	8,485	2,522	none	11,007	112	none	none	112	.98	19
Madera	7,245	2,003	none	9,248	65	5	none	70	.76	27
Mariposa	none	none	789	789	none	none	(.15)	(.15)	.0002	1
Merced	13,162	4,152	968	18,282	104	none	16	120	.66	32
Monterey	19,058	7,853	3,837	30,748	265	39	42	346	1.23	49
San Benito	2,414	688	none	3,102	53	29	none	82	2.64	26
San Luis Obispo	8,411	2,852	none	11,263	138	6	none	144	1.23	44
Santa Cruz	8,207	3,679	850	12,736	212	12	12	236	1.85	19
Tulare	25,935	9,713	1,859	37,507	406	115	1(.39)	522	1.39	77
Totals	169,542	60,591	45,027	275,160	2,345	300	353	2,998	1.09%	454

TABLE II

COST OF THE PROGRAMS OF TOTAL EDUCATION AND SPECIAL
EDUCATION, BY COUNTY, 1955-1956

Total Education Costs				
County	Elementary	Secondary	Unified	Total
Column 1	2	3	4	5
Fresno	\$ 8,753,756	\$ 5,221,535	\$ 9,564,355	\$23,539,646
Kern	13,923,145	8,073,490	1,155,096	23,151,731
Kings	2,474,106	1,164,245	none	3,638,351
Madera	2,007,609	904,587	none	2,912,196
Mariposa	none	none	341,020	341,020
Merced	3,072,836	1,694,994	307,940	5,075,770
Monterey	5,328,641	3,586,177	1,252,217	10,167,035
San Benito	532,382	371,717	none	904,099
San Luis Obispo	2,209,647	1,545,748	none	3,755,395
Santa Cruz	2,042,041	1,431,731	271,512	3,745,284
Tulare	6,576,329	3,995,375	561,059	11,132,763
Totals	\$ 46,920,492	\$27,989,599	\$13,453,199	\$88,363,290

Special Education Costs					
County	Elementary	Secondary	Unified	Total	% Spec. Ed. to Total Ed.
Column 1	2	3	4	5	6
Fresno	\$ 132,846	\$ 1,202	\$243,326	\$ 377,374	1.60
Kern	509,481	56,307	12,142	577,930	2.50
Kings	64,909	none	none	64,909	1.78
Madera	51,579	4,993	none	56,572	1.94
Mariposa	none	none	130	130	.0004
Merced	57,336	none	7,766	65,102	1.28
Monterey	174,640	14,053	20,998	209,691	2.06
San Benito	20,531	19,973	none	40,504	4.48
San Luis Obispo	129,894	2,814	none	132,708	3.53
Santa Cruz	121,223	9,027	4,829	135,079	3.61
Tulare	249,387	63,871	246	313,504	2.82
Totals	\$1,511,826	\$172,240	\$289,437	\$1,973,503	2.23%

the costs of the total educational program to the special education program. The top table shows the costs of the entire educational program for elementary, secondary, and unified school districts, and the grand total for each county. The bottom table gives the special education costs for each level, and the grand total for each county. It also shows the ratio of the cost of special education to regular education.

The support of these special education classes cost \$1,973,503, which was 2.23 per cent of the total budget of \$88,363,290. The average cost per unit for special education was more than double the amount for regular education. As a result, county superintendents and school districts spent more than they received from the state. These losses had to be made up with funds from the total program, which deprived other children of a part of their education.

Table III shows the comparative costs per A.D.A. for regular and special education. The average cost per A.D.A. for elementary was \$277, secondary was \$463, and unified was \$299, with the eleven county average per A.D.A. for all levels of instruction at \$322. These figures were for a total of budget classifications one through seven and do not include auxiliary services, community services, and capital outlay.

TABLE III

AVERAGE COST, AND COST RATIO FOR ELEVEN COUNTIES STUDIED,
TOTAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 1955-1956

County Column 1	Average cost per a.d.a. Total Education Program				Average cost per a.d.a. Special Education Program				Cost Ratio Spec. Education Total Program
	Elem. 2	Sec. 3	Unif. 4	Tot. 5	Elem. 6	Sec. 7	Unif. 8	Tot. 9	
Fresno	\$275	\$511	\$281	\$310	\$458	\$601	\$922	\$679	2.19-1.00
Kern	311	477	424	359	728	612	675	713	1.99-1.00
Kings	292	462	none	331	579	none	none	579	1.75-1.00
Madera	277	452	none	315	794	999	none	808	2.57-1.00
Mariposa	none	none	426	426	none	none	867	867	2.03-1.00
Merced	234	408	317	278	551	none	485	543	1.95-1.00
Monterey	280	457	326	331	659	360	500	606	1.83-1.00
San Benito	221	540	none	291	387	689	none	494	1.70-1.00
San Luis Obispo	263	542	none	333	948	469	none	922	2.77-1.00
Santa Cruz	249	389	319	294	572	752	402	572	1.94-1.00
Tulare	257	417	307	301	614	555	603	601	2.00-1.00
Averages	\$277	\$463	\$299	\$322	\$645	\$574	\$820	\$658	2.04-1.00

In comparison the average costs per A.D.A. for special education were \$645 for elementary, \$574 for secondary, \$820 for unified, with an average of all counties of \$658.

The ratio of special education to regular education was 2.04 to 1.00.

Table IV gives a summary of the basic information for all the counties studied. It shows A.D.A., and total cost, and average cost per unit, and total net loss for each county, and the net loss per unit of special education for each county. The 2,998 units of special education had a cost of \$1,973,503 for an average of \$658 per unit. The losses totaled \$510,360 which were 26 per cent of the total cost. The average net loss per unit for all the counties was \$170.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The special education program was divided into five types of organization in the eleven counties. The largest classification was the group of classes operated by the elementary districts. The county superintendents operated the second largest group for elementary age children, the unified districts the third largest, the

TABLE IV

TOTAL A.D.A., AND CURRENT EXPENSE, AND AVERAGE COST, AND TOTAL LOSS
FOR ENTIRE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM BY COUNTY, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educ.	Total Net Loss for Special Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Special Educ.
Fresno	556	\$ 377,374	\$679	\$ 86,417	\$156
Kern	810	577,930	713	211,213	261
Kings	112	64,909	579	11,819	100
Madera	70	56,572	808	22,938	328
Mariposa	.15	130	867	none	none
Merced	120	65,102	543	9,989	83
Monterey	346	209,691	606	48,864	141
San Benito	82	40,504	494	1,017	13
San Luis Obispo	144	132,708	921	29,925	205
Santa Cruz	236	135,079	572	23,158	98
Tulare	522	313,504	601	65,020	125
Totals	2,998	\$1,973,503	\$658 aver.	\$510,360	\$170 aver.

secondary schools the fourth, and the classes operated by county superintendents for secondary schools were the smallest group.

Elementary districts, as shown in Table V, had an A.D.A. of 1,533, and a budget of \$941,645, and an average cost per unit of \$614. The net loss for these classes was \$319,845, or an average of \$209 per unit.

The county superintendents operated classes which took care of 815 units of A.D.A. in all categories of special education. The expense of operating these classes was \$570,181, or \$700 per unit. Table VI, page 25, shows that county offices spent \$77,565 of their funds for which they were not reimbursed by an allocation of state school funds, and that this amounted to a loss of \$95 per unit.

Unified districts had an average daily attendance of 351 and expenses of \$289,437 with an average cost of \$824 per unit. They lost \$83,928 in supporting these classes for an average loss per unit of \$239. The complete Table VII can be found on page 26.

Secondary districts had a special education program, as Table VIII, page 27 will show, with 290 A.D.A., expenses of \$165,007, and an average cost of \$568. Because their average was much closer to their total education average, their losses were only \$99 per unit, and the total net loss was \$26,623.

TABLE V

A.D.A., AND COST, AND LOSS FACTORS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES
OPERATED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educ.	Total Net Loss for Special Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.
Fresno	123.04	\$ 57,560.40	\$443.44	\$ 11,178.06	\$ 90.85
Kern	585.66	402,356.47	867.01	161,665.36	276.04
Kings	52.86	26,181.74	495.30	7,629.55	144.34
Madera	40.64	36,364.45	894.79	20,121.30	495.13
Mariposa					
Merced	55.62	29,953.53	541.78	8,616.81	154.92
Monterey	188.93	117,312.76	619.98	36,854.93	195.07
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	19.51	15,801.99	809.94	8,201.99	420.40
Santa Cruz	170.31	90,474.28	531.26	19,607.75	115.13
Tulare	296.18	165,639.61	558.34	45,968.87	152.20
Totals	1,532.75	\$941,645.23	\$614.35 aver.	\$319,844.62	\$208.67 av.

TABLE VI

A.D.A., AND COST, AND LOSS FACTORS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES OPERATED BY COUNTY
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educ.	Total Net Loss for Special Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.
Fresno	166.76	\$ 75,284.17	\$444.79	\$ none	\$ none
Kern	114.62	107,125.00	934.61	35,430.24	309.11
Kings	54.41	38,727.34	628.17	4,189.40	70.52
Madera	24.80	15,214.99	612.27	1,088.65	43.40
Mariposa		(County Unified District)			
Merced	49.01	27,382.27	558.71	556.75	11.36
Monterey	76.60	57,327.89	748.42	4,499.22	58.74
San Benito	53.33	20,531.44	384.99	685.42	12.85
San Luis Obispo	118.48	114,092.09	895.89	21,074.85	177.88
Santa Cruz	41.97	30,748.40	733.68	744.12	17.70
Tulare	110.06	83,747.11	760.92	9,296.71	84.47
Totals	815.04	\$570,180.70	\$699.56 aver.	\$77,565.36	\$ 95.14 av.

TABLE VII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND LOSS FACTORS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES OPERATED
BY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educ.	Total Net Loss for Special Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.
Fresno	263.60	\$243,326.24	\$923.09	\$74,827.09	\$283.87
Kern	17.60	12,142.06	689.89	4,207.19	228.82
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa	.15	130.00	886.67	none	none
Merced	15.76	7,765.65	492.74	815.05	51.72
Monterey	42.03	20,997.53	499.58	3,971.93	94.50
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz	11.88	4,829.06	417.02	106.91	9.23
Tulare	.39	246.48	632.00	none	none
Totals	351.41	\$289,437.02	\$824.35 aver.	\$83,928.17	\$238.83 av.

TABLE VIII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND LOSS FACTORS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES OPERATED
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.	Total Net Loss for Spec. Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.
Fresno	91.74	\$56,306.89	\$611.80	\$9,910.30	\$ 21.74
Kern					
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey	38.62	14,053.23	363.88	3,537.60	91.60
San Benito	28.33	19,972.81	713.31	331.59	11.70
San Luis Obispo	3.93	1,775.43	451.76	390.00	99.24
Santa Cruz	11.81	9,027.52	764.40	2,698.97	228.45
Tulare	115.37	63,870.81	553.62	9,754.14	84.55
Totals	289.80	\$165,006.69	\$568.00 aver.	\$26,622.60	\$ 99.46 av.

Special classes for secondary students operated by county superintendents were the smallest group. Table IX shows that three counties had a program, but the total A.D.A. was only 9. The cost was \$7,233 for an average of \$831. They lost \$2,399 for an average of \$276 per unit.

III. COMPARISON OF COSTS AND LOSSES FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Corrective speech. The corrective speech program had an A.D.A. of 410. Using the national average of 5 per cent of the total A.D.A. of 275,160, there should have been 13,758 children in special training classes. An A.D.A. of 410 means that a bare 3 per cent of the children who needed help were being served.

Only the County Superintendent of San Luis Obispo County operated a program for elementary children who could not get speech therapy in their own school districts. There was an A.D.A. of 9, with expenses of \$7,508, for an average of \$817 per unit.

Elementary districts accounted for 322 units of the speech program as shown in Table X, page 30, with costs of \$255,696 and an average of \$798 per unit. Districts in every one of the nine counties lost money, and the total was \$124,212 which was 24 per cent of the total

TABLE IX

A.D.A., AND COST, AND LOSS FACTORS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES OPERATED BY COUNTY
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Education	Total Net Loss for Spec. Educ.	Net Loss per a.d.a. Spec. Educ.
Fresno	1.95	\$1,202.00	\$ 621.54	\$ 412.00	\$210.77
Kern					
Kings					
Madera	4.80	4,992.57	1,040.12	1,728.47	360.10
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey					
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	1.95	1,038.32	532.47	258.32	132.47
Santa Cruz					
Tulare					
Totals	8.70	\$7,232.89	\$ 831.37 aver.	\$2,398.79	\$275.71 av.

TABLE X

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR CORRECTIVE SPEECH CLASSES OPERATED
BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Educ. to Regular
Fresno	29.69	\$ 19,662.19	\$ 662.25	\$275.37	2.41-1.00
Kern	78.07	89,762.50	726.67	311.00	2.34-1.00
Kings	19.69	14,762.92	749.77	291.59	2.57-1.00
Madera	16.76	14,990.85	1,004.30	277.10	3.62-1.00
Mariposa					
Merced	15.68	11,987.25	764.49	233.59	3.27-1.00
Monterey	33.31	30,211.14	906.97	279.57	3.24-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	8.49	8,620.64	1,016.56	262.71	3.87-1.00
Santa Cruz	56.72	27,804.80	491.99	248.81	1.97-1.00
Tulare	63.72	37,893.25	594.68	256.44	2.32-1.00
Totals	322.13	\$255,695.54	\$ 798.25 aver.		

losses for the whole special education program. Breaking it down on an A.D.A. basis, the loss was \$386 per unit. Expansion of the speech program was not a strong possibility when losses were the rule. The \$400 excess cost allowance per unit covered half of the actual cost of operation.

The secondary program operated by school districts was extremely limited. Three counties had districts with programs. They all represented isolated children who were taught by a teacher who was doing another job as a primary responsibility. The costs were high, but they were based on so few children that they may not have been valid. The total A.D.A. was 8, with \$7,042 expenses for a cost of \$870 per unit.

Four counties had programs in unified school districts with 71 units of A.D.A. The costs were high and the losses were also considerably above the allowance granted by the state for excess costs for the support of a speech program. With expenses of \$60,534 they had an average cost of \$851 per unit.

It was interesting to note how similar the average current expenses were for the four levels of operation; \$817 for the county program, \$798 for the elementary districts, \$870 for the secondary districts, and \$854

for the unified districts.

In comparison with the regular educational program, the ratio was arranged from a low of 1.97 to 1.00 to a high of 3.81 to 1.00. Four counties had a ratio of 3.00 to 1.00 or higher.

Individual instruction. Individual instruction for the orthopedically handicapped, those with lowered organic vitality, and other illnesses and physical conditions, accounted for 283 units, or 9 per cent of the total special education program in the eleven counties. All five organizational levels furnished the program to those who needed it.

Six county superintendents employed teachers for individual instruction at the elementary level for a total A.D.A. of 44 and an average cost of \$875. Table XI has the complete data for this instruction. Three counties had teachers for individual instruction for 9 units at the secondary level at an average cost of \$831 per unit. This is shown in Table XII, page 34.

School districts in seven counties employed teachers at the elementary level to teach 134 units of A.D.A. at an average cost of \$728 as shown in Table XIII, page 35.

Secondary districts had 45 units of A.D.A. with an average cost of \$769 per unit. This program was carried

TABLE XI

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION OPERATED BY COUNTY
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	17.74	\$13,582.00	\$ 765.61	\$275.37	2.78-1.00
Kern					
Kings					
Madera	8.54	5,210.64	610.15	277.10	2.20-1.00
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey	6.48	4,137.51	638.50	279.57	2.28-1.00
San Benito	2.33	2,409.48	1,034.11	220.54	4.68-1.00
San Luis Obispo	4.92	8,229.42	1,672.65	262.71	6.37-1.00
Santa Cruz	4.06	4,975.61	1,282.72	248.81	4.93-1.00
Tulare					
Totals	44.07	\$38,544.66	\$ 874.62 aver.		

TABLE XII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION OPERATED BY COUNTY
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	1.95	\$1,202.00	\$ 511.01	\$621.54	1.22-1.00
Kern					
Kings					
Madera	4.80	4,992.57	1,040.12	451.62	2.30-1.00
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey					
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	1.95	1,038.32	532.47	541.98	.98-1.00
Santa Cruz					
Tulare					
Totals	8.70	\$7,232.89	\$ 831.37 aver.		

TABLE XIII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION OPERATED
BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno					
Kern	53.32	\$46,038.89	\$876.64	\$311.00	2.82-1.00
Kings	1.17	600.15	512.95	291.59	1.76-1.00
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced	10.56	6,278.35	594.54	233.59	2.55-1.00
Monterey	15.96	10,663.54	668.14	279.57	2.39-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	11.02	7,181.35	651.66	262.71	2.48-1.00
Santa Cruz	4.86	2,696.27	517.74	248.81	2.16-1.00
Tulare	37.42	24,385.14	651.66	256.44	2.50-1.00
Totals	134.31	\$97,843.69	\$728.49 aver.		

on in five counties and the complete data is shown in Table XIV.

Unified districts had an A.D.A. of 51 with an average cost of \$1,043 per unit as shown in Table XV, page 38.

The costs for this instruction ran from a low of \$728 per unit to a high of \$1,043 with an average for the 283 units of \$818. This was very necessary and justifiable instruction, but districts and county superintendents have had to use funds that should have been used for other purposes in order to absorb the losses in the support of these teachers.

Cerebral palsy. A total A.D.A. of 190 children were in cerebral palsy classes in the eleven counties. Five county superintendents operated one elementary class each, with a total A.D.A. of 36 for the five classes. The average cost was \$951 per unit, and ran from a low of \$519 to a high of \$1,283 per unit. Three elementary districts had classes with a total A.D.A. of 106 and an average cost of \$941, which was very comparable to the average cost of the county superintendents' classes. The low was \$895 and the high was \$1,231. The Fresno City Unified School District had an A.D.A. of 48 at an average cost of \$1,321 per unit, which was almost \$400 more than the average of the other two levels. Total losses for the three levels

TABLE XIV

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION OPERATED
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno					
Kern	21.44	\$16,315.45	\$760.98	\$477.41	1.59-1.00
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey	4.01	3,152.92	786.26	456.66	1.72-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo	3.93	1,775.43	451.76	541.98	.83-1.00
Santa Cruz	1.43	758.88	530.69	389.15	1.39-1.00
Tulare	14.60	12,936.09	886.03	416.91	2.13-1.00
Totals	45.41	\$34,938.77	\$769.41 aver.		

TABLE XV

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION OPERATED
BY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	44.94	\$49,452.47	\$1,100.41	\$284.87	3.86-1.00
Kern	1.47	933.40	634.96	424.00	1.50-1.00
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa	.15	130.00	866.67	426.02	2.03-1.00
Merced	1.00	610.90	610.90	317.00	1.93-1.00
Monterey	2.33	1,304.49	559.83	326.35	1.41-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz	.52	322.15	619.52	342.52	1.81-1.00
Tulare	.39	246.48	632.00	283.42	2.23-1.00
Totals	50.80	\$52,999.89	\$1,043.30 aver.		

ran to \$74,888 for an average of \$394 per unit. Ratios ran as high as 5.16 to 1.00 compared with regular education.

The accepted rate of incidence for cerebral palsied children was 0.24 per hundred in 1955.¹ The 190 units was only 0.07 per 100 children for the 275,160 A.D.A. in the eleven counties. There must be many children who are either in private schools, in hospitals or institutions, or have not been in school at all, since a rate of incidence of 0.24 would produce 651 children to attend these classes. Great distances to attendance centers in rural areas make it almost impossible to educate all the children who need special training. However, it would be logical to assume that more progress would be made in the establishment of classes if a greater amount of the basic costs were guaranteed by special grants for these excess costs.

Deaf. The special education of the deaf child accounted for 114 A.D.A. and was 4 per cent of the total program. With a national rate of incidence per hundred of

¹Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report. On the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults (Sacramento: Senate, California State Legislature), p. 97.

0.25 for the severely hard-of-hearing and 0.08² for the deaf, there could have been 908 children in need of special instruction.

Three county superintendents operated classes at the elementary level with a total A.D.A. of 34. The losses amounted to \$11,196, which was \$329 per unit. The high was \$1,657 per unit, and the low was \$947, with an average cost per unit of \$1,186.

Three elementary districts had classes for the deaf with an A.D.A. of 44 and an average cost of \$788. The high was \$912 per unit and the low was \$639.

One district, at the secondary level, had a physically handicapped class with an A.D.A. of 15 that was basically for the hard-of-hearing, but also contained boys and girls with other handicaps. The very low cost of \$287 per unit indicated that this was primarily a product of programming rather than the creation of a good learning situation. There was not any loss; in fact, they did not even apply for \$1,632 that they were entitled to for operating this class.

The Fresno City Unified School District had a program with an A.D.A. of 21 and an average cost of \$1,014

²Ibid.

per unit. The total loss for the eleven counties was \$36,749 which was \$322 per unit. The ratios ran from a low of .69 to 1.00 to a high of 4.81 to 1.00.

Blind. The program for the blind had an A.D.A. of 9 children, with one class in one unified district out of the total of 454 school districts. The national rate of incidence of blindness is 0.04^3 per hundred children. Estimates predicated on this national figure should theoretically produce 110 children needing special instruction in classes for the blind.

The number of physically handicapped children in need of special day classes should be 8,862 children. In the four categories of individual instruction for the orthopedically handicapped, cerebral palsy, deaf, and blind there were 596 units of A.D.A., which means that 2,866 more children need to be offered a chance for an education in these special classes.

Mentally retarded. The greatest number and the most accepted special education classes in the public schools are for mentally retarded children who come under

³Ibid.

the provisions of Education Code, Section 9801.1. They are usually classified on the basis of intelligence test scores that fall between 50 and 75 I.Q. They are "moderately retarded" and the California Education Code defines this child as "one who may be expected to benefit from special educational facilities designed to make him economically useful and socially adjusted."⁴

The A.D.A. in the districts and counties being considered in this study for the mentally retarded was 1,829, or 61 per cent of the total A.D.A. These children were in 125 different classes of which 57 were operated by elementary districts, 43 by county superintendents for elementary children, 10 by unified districts, and 15 by secondary districts.

The elementary districts, with 857 units and an expense of \$401,122, had an average cost of \$468 per unit as shown in Table XVI. Their losses were \$77,056, which was \$90 per unit of A.D.A.

Classes for elementary children operated by county superintendents earned an A.D.A. of 598. Total expenses were \$375,308 at an average cost of \$628. Their losses

⁴Education Code, 1955 (Sacramento: Documents Section, Printing Division), Section 9801.0, p. 515.

TABLE XVI

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES OPERATED
BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educ.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	83.40	\$ 32,919.71	\$394.72	\$275.37	1.43-1.00
Kern	316.82	150,440.91	474.85	311.00	2.16-1.00
Kings	32.00	10,818.67	338.08	291.59	1.16-1.00
Madera	23.88	21,373.60	890.57	277.10	3.11-1.00
Mariposa					
Merced	29.38	11,687.93	397.71	233.59	1.70-1.00
Monterey	122.94	55,508.52	451.51	279.57	1.61-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz	87.88	40,816.41	464.46	248.81	1.87-1.00
Tulare	160.92	77,555.94	481.95	256.44	1.88-1.00
Totals	857.22	\$401,121.69	467.93 aver.		

totaled \$52,471 or an average of \$88 per unit. The complete data can be found in Table XVII.

Secondary districts in five counties had programs with an A.D.A. of 221 and expenses of \$116,658. Their average cost was \$537 and the loss ratio was negligible because the costs were so favorably comparable to regular secondary education. The losses were \$7,384 or \$33 per unit. The data can be seen in Table XVIII, page 46.

The unified districts in four counties operated classes for 153 units of A.D.A. with costs of \$84,486 and an average of \$553 per unit. The losses were \$17,438 and averaged \$112 per unit. This data is shown in Table XIX, page 47.

The loss ratios were predominantly between 1.00 to 1.00 and 2.00 to 1.00. A few ranged between 2.00 to 1.00 and 3.00 to 1.00, and in San Luis Obispo County seven classes operated by the county office had a ratio of 3.17 to 1.00. At that figure the losses were high and amounted to \$9,638 for 75 units of A.D.A.

Severely mentally retarded. Classes for the severely mentally retarded have been very slow in developing for several reasons. It has been difficult to get qualified teachers because of the highly specialized

TABLE XVII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES OPERATED
BY COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educ.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	149.02	\$ 61,702.17	\$414.11	\$275.37	1.50-1.00
Kern	95.08	86,894.00	914.67	311.00	2.94-1.00
Kings	39.18	19,935.72	508.82	291.59	1.74-1.00
Madera	8.47	5,957.40	705.95	277.10	2.54-1.00
Mariposa					
Merced	30.36	15,168.05	505.60	233.59	2.16-1.00
Monterey	49.75	39,056.22	781.12	279.59	2.79-1.00
San Benito	51.00	18,121.96	352.70	220.54	1.59-1.00
San Luis Obispo	75.38	62,866.38	833.99	262.71	3.17-1.00
Santa Cruz	30.51	18,472.10	603.86	248.81	2.83-1.00
Tulare	69.23	47,133.83	680.83	252.00	2.70-1.00
Totals	597.98	\$375,307.83	\$627.63 aver.		

TABLE XVIII

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES OPERATED
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educ.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno					
Kern	64.87	\$ 37,078.08	\$570.43	\$477.41	1.19-1.00
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey	33.00	8,115.63	245.93	456.66	.55-1.00
San Benito	28.33	19,972.81	713.31	540.14	1.32-1.00
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz	9.33	6,924.50	769.39	389.15	1.98-1.00
Tulare	85.57	46,566.94	544.21	416.91	1.31-1.00
Totals	221.10	\$118,657.96	536.67 aver.		

TABLE XIX

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES OPERATED
BY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Spec. Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educ.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	113.00	\$62,632.47	\$554.27	\$284.87	1.95-1.00
Kern	11.15	7,062.00	642.00	424.00	1.51-1.00
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced	14.76	7,154.75	604.15	317.00	1.50-1.00
Monterey	13.80	7,636.36	545.45	326.35	1.67-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz					
Tulare					
Totals	152.71	\$84,485.58	553.24 aver.		

course, as shown by the state statistics of only 133 credentialed teachers in this field in the entire state.⁵ It has been a permissive rather than a mandatory program. It has been difficult for county superintendents to secure classrooms.

The lack of schoolhouse facilities for special training classes operated by county school superintendents constitutes a serious impairment to the program of special education for the physically and mentally handicapped children throughout California. County school superintendents who operate such classes are almost unanimous in emphasizing the seriousness of this situation.

Education Code, Section 9807 (a), requires the county superintendent to operate such special training classes for mentally handicapped pupils under certain circumstances, while Section 9807 (b) similarly permits the county superintendent to operate such classes for severely handicapped children.

It goes without saying that no school program can be carried on without adequate housing and equipment. Yet, the Legislature which enacted and re-enacted the mandatory requirements for operation of these classes left to the very groups which opposed such action the right to decide whether or not adequate housing for the classes would be provided. It is no surprise that there now exists an almost complete lack of adequate housing for county-operated special training classes throughout the State.⁶

Children who are severely retarded and who qualify for special education under the provisions of Education

⁵Statistic from Bureau of Special Education, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1957.

⁶Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report, pp. 95-96.

Code, Section 9801.2, usually have test scores that yield an I.Q. below 50. This is commonly referred to as the "Point 2 Program." The Code describes him as one,

. . . who may be expected to benefit from special educational facilities designed to educate and train him to further his individual acceptance, social adjustment, and economic usefulness in his home or within a sheltered environment.⁷

Classes operated by county superintendents had an A.D.A. of 93 with expenses of \$73,670 for an average of \$790. The present program of state aid for excess costs comes very close to supporting the program. Total losses were only \$3,080 or \$33 per unit. The data is shown in Table XX.

Table XXI, page 51, shows that in three counties there were seven classes operated by elementary districts with an A.D.A. of 69. The expenses were \$52,750 for an average of \$712 per unit. Losses were \$14,103, or \$204 per unit. The loss ratios ranged from a low of 1.53 to 1.00 up to a high of 3.91 to 1.00.

None of the other three levels had any program for the severely retarded. The total A.D.A. was 162 for the

⁷Education Code, 1955, Section 9801.2, p. 516.

TABLE XX

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR SEVERELY MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES
OPERATED BY COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS,
1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Educa.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno					
Kern	11.17	\$ 6,358.00	\$ 578.00	\$311.00	1.86-1.00
Kings	11.90	8,613.74	508.82	291.59	2.48-1.00
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced	12.00	6,980.00	581.69	233.59	2.49-1.00
Monterey	20.37	14,134.16	706.71	279.57	2.53-1.00
San Benito					
San Luis					
Obispo	15.74	18,757.62	1,028.32	262.71	3.91-1.00
Santa Cruz					
Tulare	22.05	18,826.16	853.79	252.00	3.39-1.00
Totals	93.23	\$73,669.68	\$ 790.19 aver.		

TABLE XXI

A.D.A., AND COST, AND RATIO FACTORS FOR SEVERELY MENTALLY RETARDED CLASSES
OPERATED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1955-1956

County	Special Education a.d.a.	Current Expense of Special Education	Average Cost per a.d.a. Special Educa.	Average Cost per a.d.a. Regular Edu.	Ratio of Special Ed. to Regular
Fresno	9.95	\$4,978.50	\$500.35	\$275.37	1.82-1.00
Kern	49.43	40,768.35	824.77	311.00	1.53-1.00
Kings					
Madera					
Mariposa					
Merced					
Monterey					
San Benito					
San Luis Obispo					
Santa Cruz					
Tulare	9.89	7,002.80	700.28	256.44	2.73-1.00
Totals	69.27	\$52,749.65	\$761.51 aver.		

eleven counties. With a national incidence of 0.23 per hundred,⁸ there could be as many as 633 severely retarded children in this geographical area. Even taking into consideration the extensive private program for the severely retarded in the cities of Fresno and Bakersfield, there are probably still many children who are not accounted for. This reluctance on the part of school district to maintain these classes will continue until this type of special education is required for all school districts.

Gifted. Pilot studies for the gifted child were found in eight counties in this area. With no additional state support, the district assumed the extra costs of an enriched program. Many districts seemed willing to pay their own way, and have developed some excellent educational opportunities for these children.

At the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Kern County, there were four special classes for gifted children in 1956-1957. The movement to establish these classes began in 1952 with the formation of a committee to study the organization of a class for the gifted child.

⁸Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report, p. 105.

The following year the Kern County Schools Office joined the study, along with the Parent-Teachers Association, a parent representative from each school, and the principal of each school. In 1954, "The Special Projects Class" was initiated at the seventh and eighth grade level. One class has been added each year and now there are classes for grades seven, eight, nine, and ten. The classes enroll twenty-five pupils or less, and the I.Q. for eligibility is 130 or over. The Kern County Union High School District has continued the program into the Burroughs High School as the youngsters have completed elementary school at China Lake, and the cooperation has been outstanding. Some of the methods of obtaining their objectives are stated as follows:

These classes are democratic in nature; free from regimentation. The mastery of fundamental skills plus enriched experiences will form the basis for the program. The China Lake program stresses the use of community resources.⁹

The Tulare City Schools District (elementary) has just completed the first year of a two year study of rapid learners; this project was made possible by a grant from

⁹Gifted Children in the China Lake Elementary School District, Sylvia P. Tillitt, Director, A Monograph, p. 3.

the Joseph Fels Foundation of New York. The primary emphasis of the study has been the exploring of ways of meeting the needs of rapid learners within the regular classroom environment. The purpose of the study has been the consideration of a variety of practical classroom instructional techniques, experimentation with them, and an attempt to evaluate their effectiveness. The possibilities of working with children in "cluster groups" is also being considered.

The study has been unique in that it takes place in a relatively small school system which is semi-rural. The aim is to determine what small communities with limited vocational and cultural resources can do to meet the needs of these children.

Fresno has an outstanding county program in which the county staff has taken the leadership in the development of an enriched curriculum for "The Especially Capable Learner." Through a testing program using a referral system in grades three through twelve, and regularly giving I.Q. tests in grades three, six, eight, and ten, the staff members have found eighty-five children, in thirty different classes, in twenty-four different school districts, whom they consider to be especially capable learners. A child must have an I.Q. of 130 on a

group test, or sometimes as low as 122 on an individual Binet or Wechsler, if he is particularly gifted in some specific area.

The county library has cataloged books for the children's use and is in the process of developing a professional book list for the teachers. This is a completely individual program of enrichment within the regular class. The teacher keeps anecdotal records on each child, and every child has at least one consultant from the county staff who notes his progress. Parents are brought into the program by the school principals and are encouraged to participate in the project. A wide use is made of field trips and of community resources. Special kits of material for participating teachers are called "Power-Plus Packets." The costs are minimum and most of them are borne by the county. The plan has been in operation for four years and is proving to be very beneficial in a rural area where the grouping of gifted children into special classes would be almost impossible except in a population center the size of the city of Fresno.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT TRENDS IN CLASSES FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

In spite of the rather serious financial losses incurred by county offices or by school districts in 1955-1956, the data indicates that effort was made to maintain at least the same program, and to add the classes and teachers that were most urgently needed. In fact, the special education program in each of the eleven counties had the same number of classes and teachers, or had increased in number during the school year 1956-1957 as compared with the school year 1955-1956.

Table XXII shows all the classes for 1955-1956.

The elementary program was the largest with 242 classes, the secondary had 28 classes, and the unified 46 classes, for a grand total of 316 for all types of special education.

Table XXIII, page 59, shows that the 316 classes expanded to 363 classes or teachers during the school year 1956-1957, which was a 15 per cent increase over the preceding year. The elementary classes increased to 274, the secondary raised to 36, and the unified went up to 53.

Pilot studies for the gifted were operating at the county level in two counties and in thirteen different

TABLE XXII (continued)

Counties		Fresno	Kern	Kings	Madera	Mariposa	Merced	Monterey	San	Benito	San Luis	Colispo	Santa Cruz	Tulare	Total
Level of Class	Type of Class														
CLASSES BY SCHOOL DIST. FOR SECOND.	S.&L.R.		1					1					1		3
	I.I.		2					1			2		1	4	10
	C.P.														
	D.													1	1
	B.														
	M.R.		2					2	2				1	5	12
CLASSES BY SCHOOL DIST. FOR UNIFIED	S.M.R.														
	P.S.G.														
	S.&L.R.	4	1					5					1		11
	I.I.	12	2			1		1					1		17
	C.P.	5													5
	D.	2													2
FOR UNIFIED	B.	1													1
	M.R.	8	1					1							10
	S.M.R.														
County Total	P.S.G.														
		64	78	9	9	1	7	42	7	23	26	50	316		

NOTE: Abbreviations used in Tables XXII and XXIII:

S.&L.R. - Speech and Lip Reading
 I.I. - Individual Instruction
 C.P. - Cerebral Palsy
 D. - Deaf
 B. - Blind
 M.R. - Mentally Retarded
 S.M.R. - Severely Mentally Retarded
 P.S.G. - Pilot Study for the Gifted

TABLE XXIII

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES AND/OR TEACHERS FOR ALL TYPES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION IN THE ELEVEN COUNTIES STUDIED,
1956-1957

C O U N T I E S		Fresno	Kern	Kings	Madera	Mariposa	Merced	Monterey	San Benito	San Luis Obispo	Santa Cruz	Tulare	Total
Level of Class	Type of Class												
CLASSES BY COUNTY SUPT. FOR ELEMEN.	S., & L., R.									1			1
	I. I.	2			3			1	3	2	1		12
	C. P.			1	1					1	1		4
	D.		1							1		3	5
	B.												
	M. R.	13	7	3	2		1	6	3	7	4	8	54
	S. M. R.		1	1			1	2		2	1	2	10
	P. S. G.	*						*					
CLASSES BY COUNTY SUPT. FOR SECOND.	S., & L., R.												
	I. I.				1					1			2
	C. P.												
	D.												
	B.												
	M. R.	2											2
	S. M. R.												
	P. S. G.												
CLASSES BY SCHOOL DIST.	S., & L., R.	17	13	1	1		1	6		2	8	8	57
	I. I.		10	1			1	5		4	2	10	33
	C. P.		7				1	2				2	12
	D.		1								1	2	4
	B.											1	1
	M. R.	6	25	5	2		1	13			7	12	71
	S. M. R.	1	6	1								2	10
	P. S. G.	#	#				#	#		#	#	#	

TABLE XXIII (continued)

COUNTIES		Fresno	Kern	Kings	Madera	Mariposa	Merced	Monterey	San Benito	San Luis Obispo	Santa Cruz	Tulare	Total
Level of Class	Type of Class												
CLASSES BY SCHOOL DISTRS. FOR SECOND.	S.&L.R.		1					1			1		3
	I.I.		2					1		2	1	4	10
	C.P.												
	D.												
	B.												
	M.R.		5				1	2	2	1	2	6	19
CLASSES BY SCHOOL DISTRS. FOR UNIFIED	S.M.R.												
	P.S.G.		#						#	#		#	
	S.&L.R.	6	1					5			1		13
	I.I.	15	2			1		1			1		20
	C.P.	5											5
	D.	2											2
COUNTY TOTAL	B.	2											2
	M.R.	9	1					1					11
	S.M.R.												
	P.S.G.	#											
County Total		80	83	13	10	1	7	46	8	24	31	60	363

* County Study
 # District Study

school districts.

I. PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Trends clearly indicated that the speech program was the responsibility of the school district and not the county office. Only one county employed a speech therapist for a program in 1956-1957 at the elementary level and none was employed at the secondary level. In school districts, 57 speech therapists were employed at the elementary level and 13 in the unified districts, for a total of 70. The county offices, in some instances, cooperated in finding a speech therapist to fulfill the needs of several districts and arranged the contract and the financial details. In Kern County the superintendent's office had a staff of "Cooperative Personnel," which included six speech therapists who were employed by school districts on a sharing basis, but worked as part of the staff of the County Office.

The individual instruction for the orthopedically handicapped, lowered organic vitality, or any other affliction which kept children at home seemed to be everyone's responsibility. In most cases substitute teachers were used and many people were involved in the program. Most of the figures in Table XXII, page 57, and

Table XXIII, page 59, for individual instruction were speculative because no one kept accurate data on the number of people employed to staff this type of instruction.

Classes for cerebral palsied children operated by county offices decreased in number and, it would appear, the trend will be for the districts to take over the program wherever possible, except where a single class serves a whole county.

The program for the deaf and the hard of hearing was about evenly divided at the elementary level between districts and county offices. In population centers, the classes were operated by districts. However, in rural areas where a whole county was served by one class, it was, and probably will continue to be, operated by a county office.

Classes for the blind and the partially sighted were primarily a responsibility of the Blind School in Berkeley. There were only three classes for the partially sighted in these 464 school districts; two operated by the Fresno City Unified School District, and one by the Tulare County Office. Two of these three were established during the 1956-1957 school year. The Fresno City classes for the cerebral palsied, deaf, and blind also care for the

children of Fresno County in cooperation with the Fresno County Superintendent of Schools.

II. MENTALLY RETARDED

At the elementary level, the program for the mentally retarded was about evenly divided between county classes and district classes. In 1955-1956, county classes totaled 47 and district classes 61, and they increased to 54 and 71 during the school year 1956-1957. Probably the trend will be for counties to turn the classes over to districts just as rapidly as they can assume the responsibility for them.

There were no secondary classes operated by county offices, but there was a marked increase in the number of classes operated by secondary districts for the Point 1 program. In 1955, these classes in the high schools of the state with over 900 A.D.A. became mandatory. Studies have been undertaken to determine needs and develop curricula for these boys and girls.

The severely retarded program was confined to the elementary level exclusively and not one class was found at either the county secondary, district secondary, or unified level. This situation was due to several very important factors; (1) the program is permissive rather

than mandatory, (2) the strong pressure for classes comes from the parent groups that are organized for children of elementary school age, and (3) the cities of Fresno and Bakersfield both have private organizations that maintain schools for the severely retarded. In Fresno, the Fresno County Foundation for the Severely Mentally Retarded operated a school which cared for thirty children, and the Nursery School in Bakersfield had an enrollment of fourteen severely retarded children from the Bakersfield City Schools. The program will probably never expand until the classes are made mandatory and authorities in the field feel that this development is not very likely in the foreseeable future.

III. GIFTED

Pilot studies for the gifted were being conducted in Fresno County and Monterey County. Districts with programs included the Bakersfield City School District, Merced City School District, Fresno City Unified District, Tulare City School District, Kern County Union High School District, Wasco High School, Porterville Union High School, China Lake Elementary School District, Santa Cruz City Schools, San Benito High School, Monterey Public Schools, Arroyo Grande Union High School, and

Shandon Elementary School District. Several of these were written up in more detail in Chapter III, pages 52-55.

Quite likely there were other programs that districts had that were called special classes for the gifted, or the above average, or the especially capable learner. There is such a wide variety in the interpretation of test scores and I.Q.'s that it is almost impossible to discover all the special classes in an area as large as this study encompassed. Until the program comes under the jurisdiction and support of the State Department of Education in the same manner as other types of special education, there will not be any standardization in the screening, testing, and development of these special classes for the gifted child.

The number of children on waiting lists for special education varies from county to county in proportion to the thoroughness of the screening program and referral system in use in each county. Some county special education directors can tell exactly how many children are waiting for admission to each type of special education class, and others must estimate because they do not have a complete county screening program and depend entirely on the referrals from the individual school districts. Some school districts are reluctant to refer a child

because he would have to attend a school in another district or under the county superintendent, and they would lose the A.D.A., or might even have to pay some excess costs beyond the state allowance.

Table XXIV is rather incomplete for these reasons, but it does show the number of children who are tested and ready to enter a class whenever it is available.

In asking directors of special education to estimate the number of children in their counties who had not been found, it was difficult to get much response. However, they all agree that there are many children who must need special education that they do not know about. With 1 per cent of the total elementary school enrollment in special classes at the end of the 1956-1957 school year,¹ which is one-half of the children who should be in special classes for the mentally retarded, the Point 1 program comes closer to being a complete program than the other special education classes.

¹Statistic from Dr. Ernest Willenberg, Acting Chief, Bureau of Special Education, California State Department of Education, June, 1957.

TABLE XXIV

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ON WAITING LISTS FOR ALL TYPES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION IN THE ELEVEN COUNTIES STUDIED, JUNE, 1957

County	S.&L.R.	I.I.	C.P.	D.	B.	M.R.	S.M.R.	Total
Fresno	29		22	5	14	55		125
Kern						190	29	219
Kings					8			8
Madera				2				2
Mariposa								
Merced								
Monterey								
San Benito						48		48
San Luis Obispo			5	2		12	3	22
Santa Cruz								
Tulare			6				6	12
Totals	29		33	9	22	305	38	436

CHAPTER V

REVIEW OF THE 1957 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

During the regular session of the 1957 California State Legislature, there were more than 900 bills introduced that would have affected the public schools. It was an economy minded session and most of the bills that required additional financing did not pass unless they were accompanied by revenue bills that raised the additional moneys needed to support them.

The 1955 and the 1957 Reports of the Senate Interim Committee on the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults had shown conclusively that more financial support was needed for special education. Chairman, Senator James J. McBride; Vice-Chairman, Senator Stephen P. Teale; Vice-Chairman, Senator James E. Cunningham; and Senator Louis O. Sutton had worked diligently to solve some of the problems which were brought to light by the two studies. In 1955, about one-third of the handicapped children in California were receiving special education. Since then the regular program of education has increased more rapidly than the special classes. Witnesses before the Interim Committee testified that special education was in direct competition

with regular education, and that with increasing costs and crowding of the schools there might be an actual decline in the special education program unless remedial steps were taken.

The support for special education was part of the \$180 per unit of A.D.A. and amounted to \$3.70 per unit. School administrators, teachers, parents' groups, and professional associations all recommended that the money for special education be budgeted outside of the \$180 per unit of A.D.A. It was recommended that the formula for financing special education by the payment of excess costs be reviewed and be brought more in line with the actual costs. It was recommended that the 75 per cent formula for classes established under Section 9801.1 be removed and that the district be reimbursed for its full excess costs. It was recommended that some provisions should be made for housing these classes. County superintendents are required to educate mentally retarded minors residing in school districts with less than 900 A.D.A. County boards of supervisors have raised taxes for current expenses, but they are reluctant to raise money to build classrooms for these special classes. This has created a real housing problem for the county superintendents.

The Senate Committee stated that the development of classes for cerebral palsied children could be traced to the passage of legislation authorizing the construction of classrooms on a matching basis between state and district. It recommended that a special appropriation be made to pay half the cost of construction for classrooms for handicapped children in school districts that do not qualify for school building aid funds.

The Committee agreed that there was sufficient evidence of a need for a study of the problems of children who have severe emotional disturbances and that the state also has a responsibility in the development of appropriate curricula for the gifted child.

I. SENATE BILLS

In the final analysis, the special education program was carried through the legislature in twelve bills; six in the Assembly, and six in the Senate. One of these became a special education bill at the end of the session during a free conference committee hearing on AB 3045. The provisions for the support of all the special education bills were included in this major apportionment bill and increased the amount for special education by \$3,800,000. This changed the formula from \$3.77 per unit

to \$5.15 per unit and still kept it within the basic apportionment which was raised from \$180 to \$193.37 per unit of A.D.A. The major Senate bills that this additional money will support are SB 61, 62, 65, and 66, which were known as the McBride Bills and were direct results of the Interim Studies. Three of these were passed and signed, and the fourth received a pocket veto.

Senate Bill 61 amends Section 7103.1 of the Education Code and provides that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall allow to each school district an amount equal to the excess current expense of education to the district, excluding transportation, of educating mentally retarded who come within the provisions of Section 9801.2 during the preceding fiscal year but not in excess of \$450 per unit of average daily attendance of such minors. The same allowance is made for a county school service fund operating a class under the provisions of Section 9801.2. This is an increase of \$50 per unit, as the previous excess cost was \$400 per unit. The bill was signed by the governor on July 4, 1957, and is Chapter 1511.

Senate Bill 62 in its original form was a pilot study for gifted children with an appropriation of \$137,532. After many hours of hearings in the Education Committees

of both the Senate and the Assembly the bill was re-written to include a \$68,000 appropriation for the 1957-1958 Fiscal Year for a study of problems relating to emotionally disturbed children in the public schools of the state. There was, also, a \$40,000 appropriation for the 1957-1958 Fiscal Year for a study of special educational programs designed to meet the needs of gifted pupils in the public schools of the state. Preliminary reports for both studies must be provided the Legislature by January 1, 1960, and the final report by January 1, 1961. This is Chapter 2385 and was signed by the governor on July 15, 1957.

Senate Bill 65 was the housing bill for special education and received a pocket veto from the governor. It would have provided \$500,000 on a matching basis for housing and equipment for the education of physically handicapped minors as that term is defined in Section 9601 of the Education Code and mentally retarded minors who come within the provisions of Section 9801.1 or Section 9801.2 of the Education Code.

Senate Bill 66 amends Section 7101.1 of the Education Code and provides that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall allow to each school district an amount equal to the excess current expense of educating

physically handicapped minor pupils but not in excess of \$600 for each unit of A.D.A. An additional amount not in excess of \$600, or the cost to the district, whichever is the lesser, is provided for each unit of A.D.A. for blind pupils. Additional funds are furnished when a reader has actually been employed to assist these pupils with their studies, or for the purchase of Braille books, or the transcribing into Braille, or the purchase and making of sound recordings, or the buying of special supplies and equipment for blind pupils. It amended Section 7101.2 to provide the same excess costs to the county school service for classes operated by the county superintendent of schools. This is Chapter 2060 and was signed by the governor on July 8, 1957.

Senate Bill 1240 amended Section 7102.1 of the Education Code so that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall allow to each school district an amount equal to the excess current expenses of education, including transportation, for the educating of mentally retarded minors who come within the provisions of Section 9801.1 during the preceding fiscal year in special schools or classes but not in excess of \$200 per unit of A.D.A. Section 7102.2 provides the same allowance to the county school service fund for classes operated by the county

superintendent of schools. The 75 per cent formula was eliminated from both 7102.1 and 7102.2 and districts and counties will now receive the full excess cost up to \$200 per unit. This will be an increase of \$50 per unit. This bill was signed by the governor on July 6, 1957, and is Chapter 1913.

Senate Bill 1250 added Section 9613.5 to the Education Code which allows the Department of Education to appoint counselors to assist blind students attending public schools in the state to solve problems in connection with their school program. It appropriates the money to defray the costs of the program. The bill, which is Chapter 2287, was signed by the governor July 10, 1957.

II. ASSEMBLY BILLS

On the Assembly side, AB 831 was signed into law by the governor on May 30, 1957, and amended Sections 7101.1 and 7101.2 of the Education Code which pertains to the education of blind students. It allotted \$400 per unit for the same excess costs that SB 66 covered later with \$600 per unit. Therefore, this bill has been superseded by the Senate Bill which was signed on July 8, 1957, because the Senate Bill gives a more generous allowance for the excess cost of certain physically handicapped

minor pupils.

Assembly Bill 959 was the original bill for the pilot study for the gifted child for \$137,532, and it was passed by the Assembly on May 31, 1957, and passed by the Senate on June 11, 1957. However, when Governor Knight signed SB 62 which had a smaller allowance for the study of the gifted program, he pocket vetoed this bill.

Assembly Bill 1083 amends Section 6813 of the Education Code to read that the minimum school day for pupils of kindergartens and for mentally retarded minors in special training schools or classes prescribed in Section 9801.2, is 180 minutes inclusive of recesses. There is an exception to this rule, in that if a school district maintains two such classes on the same day which are taught by the same teacher, the minimum school day for each of such classes shall be 130 minutes inclusive of recesses. It was signed by the governor on July 8, 1957, and is Chapter 2128.

Assembly Bill 3045 is the major education bill of the legislative session and apportions approximately \$37,000,000 of additional state aid to school districts. Included in this bill is the increase in support for special education from \$3.77 per unit of A.D.A. to \$5.15 per unit, which is approximately \$3,800,000. This is

almost a 40 per cent increase in the support of the program and should give tremendous impetus to the further development of additional classes for exceptional children. This is Chapter 1013 and was signed by the governor on June 20, 1957.

Assembly Bill 3352 was identical to Senate Bill 61 and did not pass as the other bill was approved and signed into law.

Assembly Bill 3353 is an act to amend Section 9801.2 of the Education Code relating to the education of mentally retarded pupils who do not come within the provisions of Section 9801.1. These are individuals who are at least five and not more than eighteen years of age, and who may be expected to benefit from special educational facilities designed to educate and train them to further their individual acceptance, social adjustment, and economic usefulness in their homes and within a sheltered environment. Districts may limit the number of minors to be admitted to such classes. A minor becoming eighteen years of age during the school year may continue for the remainder of the school year. From now until the 1961-1962 school year this section shall pertain to mentally retarded minors who are at least five years of age and less than twenty-one years of age and who meet the requirements of this section.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the financial aspects of the special education program for exceptional children in the central and central coast sections of the State of California. There were 275,160 children in average daily attendance in the total educational program for the school year 1955-1956 in the 454 school districts in this area. Districts and counties applying for reimbursement for the excess costs of special education classes included 2,998 units of A.D.A., which was 1.09 per cent of the total educational program.

Three major classifications of special education were included in the data gathered; physically handicapped, mentally retarded, and gifted.

The objectives of the study were to find out (1) whether the special education program was larger or smaller in 1956-1957 than it was in 1955-1956, (2) whether the losses and loss ratios of other school districts were as large as the Fresno City Unified School District, (3) if there was any relationship between the amount of money lost in the present classes and the development of

new ones, and (4) whether one type of organizational level of instruction was able to offer special education more economically or more efficiently than another level of instruction?

Five levels of organization of the instructional program were considered: (1) elementary classes operated by county superintendents, (2) secondary classes operated by county superintendents, (3) elementary classes operated by school districts, (4) secondary classes operated by school districts, and (5) classes operated by unified school districts.

The total expenditures for classes one through seven of the budget for the 275,160 units of A.D.A. was \$88,363,290, of which \$1,973,503 was used to support special education. Of the total expenditure, 2.23 per cent was used to educate 1.09 per cent of the children. Districts and counties reported losses of \$510,360, which was 26 per cent of the total current expense of \$1,973,503.

The average loss per unit of A.D.A. for the 2,998 units of special education was \$170. The ratio of the cost between the support of special education and regular education was 2.04 to 1.00.

The largest group of special classes was operated by elementary districts with an A.D.A. of 1,533 and expenses of \$941,645, for an average cost of \$614. Their losses were \$326,266 for an average of \$213 per unit.

County superintendents operated classes for elementary districts with a total of 815 A.D.A. Their expenses were \$570,181 and averaged \$700 per unit. They lost \$77,566 which amounted to an average of \$95 per unit.

Unified districts had an A.D.A. of 351 and expenses of \$289,437. Their average cost was \$824. Their losses were \$83,928, which averaged \$239 per unit.

Secondary districts with 290 A.D.A., and expenses of \$165,007 had an average cost of \$568. They lost \$26,623 which averaged \$99 per unit.

Special classes for secondary students operated by county superintendents had an A.D.A. of 9. The expenses were \$7,233 for an average of \$831. Their losses were \$2,399 or \$276 per unit.

Corrective speech accounted for 410 A.D.A. of the total special education program. Individual instruction was 9 per cent of the total, or 283 A.D.A. Cerebral palsied children had an A.D.A. of 190 in various classes in the eleven counties. Deaf children accounted for 114 units of A.D.A. The blind program had only 9 A.D.A. with

one class in the Fresno City Unified School District. The mentally retarded classes operated under Education Code Section 9801.1 accounted for 1,829 units, or 61 per cent of the total program, and the severely retarded classes totaled 163 A.D.A. This was a grand total of 2,998 A.D.A. for the school year 1955-1956 for the seven types of special education. The data for gifted children was not gathered on an A.D.A. basis because most situations are pilot studies and are supported entirely by district or county funds. No excess allowances are provided by the state, and the Education Code does not provide for classes for gifted children in all school districts.

The special education program in each of the eleven counties either remained the same or increased in size during the school year 1956-1957. The total increase was from 316 classes or teachers to 363 classes or teachers, which was a growth of 15 per cent.

The 1957 Legislature passed legislation to increase the support for special education by \$3,800,000. This was part of the major apportionment bill, Assembly Bill 3045, and raised from \$3.77 to \$5.15 per unit the amount of money to be expended for the education of exceptional children. It raised the support for physically handicapped children from \$400 per unit to \$600 per unit of A.D.A., with \$600

additional per unit for certain purposes in the blind program. It raised the support for mentally retarded Point 1 children from \$150 per unit to \$200 per unit of A.D.A., and removed the 75 per cent formula. It raised the support for the severely mentally retarded Point 2 child from \$400 to \$450. It provided funds for a study of the problems of the education of emotionally disturbed children and of gifted children. It passed other laws pertaining to the age of admission and to the length of the school day for mentally retarded children.

In other words, this Legislature did almost everything that the Senate Interim Committee Reports of 1955 and 1957 had recommended. It could be called an outstanding Legislature as far as special education was concerned.

II. CONCLUSIONS

It appears that, in spite of the problems inherent in educating exceptional children and equally, in spite of the financial losses sustained by districts and counties in furnishing such educational facilities, the Californian voter and his representatives are aware of the needs and rights of these children. It is to be expected that, with time, such facilities will show a marked increase.

In this study, and according to the data gathered, the following points seemed significant:

1. Special education classes were educating 1.09 per cent of the total A.D.A. in the eleven counties studied. Compared with the national rate of incidence of 8.62¹ per hundred only 13 per cent of the potential exceptional children were in special classes.

2. On an average, it cost twice as much to support a unit of special education as it did a unit of regular education in 1955-1956.

3. The loss ratio of 1955-1956 was not a factor in the support of the classes for the school year 1956-1957. Every county either added classes or kept the same classes it had in 1955-1956; the total increase being 15 per cent. Fresno City Unified School District, which had one of the largest losses in 1955-1956, increased from thirty-two classes and teachers to thirty-nine classes and teachers.

4. The elementary classes operated by districts and by counties had an A.D.A. of 2,348. Figuring 8.62 per cent of the total A.D.A. for elementary of 169,542 would give 14,615 potential special education units. The actual figure of 2,348 is only 16 per cent or one-sixth of those who should be in special classes.

¹Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report. On the Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults (Sacramento: Senate, California State Legislature), p. 105.

5. Unified districts had 351 A.D.A. in special education compared with their potential of 3,881. This is only 9 per cent and far under the one-third or 33 1/3 per cent state average in 1955.

6. Secondary districts had 299 A.D.A. in special education compared with their potential of 5,223. This is only 6 per cent of their potential and shows the weakness of the special education program in the secondary schools.

7. The speech program is a district responsibility. The best solution to the problem of rural areas is the "cooperative personnel" used in Kern County, where one speech therapist is shared by a half-dozen school districts and the program is organized by the county and paid for by the various districts.

8. The programs for the cerebral palsied and the deaf are limited by transportation problems and housing problems.

9. The program for the blind is more of an institutional than a public school responsibility.

10. The mentally retarded Point 1 program is very strong and is higher than the 1 per cent state average at the end of the 1956-1957 school year, with 1,829 children in classes in the elementary schools out of a total of 169,542.

11. The severely mentally retarded Point 2 program is limited since it is not a mandatory program and it is operated by private organizations in Fresno and Bakersfield.

12. The interest in classes for the gifted is tremendously high with activity in two counties and thirteen different school districts.

13. With the new formulas for the support of the special education program, losses will be cut drastically and new classes will be organized at an increased rate. This investigator believes that classes and teachers for special education will increase 30 or 40 per cent in 1957-1958 compared with the 15 per cent increase this year.

14. The new formulas would reduce the 1955-1956 losses of \$510,360 or \$170 per unit to \$249,186, or \$83 per unit. This new financial support will make it possible for any skillfully planned and carefully managed special education class to be maintained without financial loss to the school district.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is strongly recommended that the establishment of every type of special education class in the public schools be made mandatory responsibilities of the duly

constituted educational authorities. From the data gathered for this study it would appear that the lay public is willing to support the costs of such services. Therefore, these special classes should become an intelligently structured and generally accepted part of public education in this state.

It also appears that in order to bring this about:

1. There should be legislation to provide for a mandatory periodic screening of all children in the public schools, under the supervision of the county superintendent of schools, to find all the exceptional children who need special education.

2. Senate Bill 65 should be re-introduced at the next regular session of the Legislature to provide more adequate housing for special education classes.

3. There should be a special audit of the reports of school districts for excess costs in 1957-1958 for the classes operated under Section 9801.1 to be sure that districts are not taking advantage of the removal of the provision which formerly limited their reimbursement to 75 per cent of their excess costs.

4. There should be a grant by the state of an amount equal to the estimated excess costs for the first year of operation, paid during the first year of operation,

for any special training class, as an incentive to districts and counties to organize the new classes that they need at the present time.

5. There should be some method devised to enforce the 1955 legislation which made mandatory upon high school districts of over 900 A.D.A., the responsibility of providing special educational opportunities for mentally retarded pupils under the Point 1 program.

6. There should be more information available to districts by the offices of the county superintendents on the procedures for filing the J-22 Report of Expenses for Special Training Schools and Classes of the California State Department of Education for the reimbursement of the excess costs of special education.

7. There should be a mandatory program at the elementary level for severely mentally retarded children who can benefit from a public school experience rather than from institutional training.

8. There should be mandatory provisions for the establishment of a curriculum for the especially capable learner or the gifted child in all school districts as soon as the pilot study provided for in Senate Bill 62 shows a need for the program. It should not be held over until the final report to the Legislature on January 1, 1961.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Publications of the Government, Learned Societies, and Other Organizations

California Schools, Vol. XXVIII. Ivan R. Waterman, Chief, Bureau of Textbooks and Publications. Sacramento: State Department of Education, March, 1957.

Education Code, 1955. Sacramento: Documents Section, Printing Division.

Education of the Aurally Handicapped, Vol. XXII. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, January, 1953.

Gifted Child Education in California, 1955. California State Advisory Council on Educational Research. Annotated Bibliography. California Teachers' Association, Research Resume No. 1.

Gifted Child Education in California, 1955. California State Advisory Council on Educational Research. Survey. California Teachers' Association, Research Resume No. 2.

The Gifted Child in the Elementary School. Twenty-sixth Yearbook. Sacramento: California Elementary School Administrators Association, 1954.

Guide to the Education of the Deaf in the Public Schools of California, Vol. XXIV. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, August, 1955.

Handbook of Information for the Hard of Hearing. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1947.

Information Regarding the Education of Mentally Retarded Minors in California, Vol. XXIV. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, August, 1955.

"Kern County Finance and Personnel Statistics, 1956-1957." Kern County Office of the County Superintendent of Schools, Division of Fiscal and Administrative Services, September, 1956. (Mimeographed.)

Laws and Regulations Relating to Educational and Health Services for Exceptional Children in California.
Sacramento: California State Department of Education,
July, 1956.

Mentally Retarded Students in California Secondary Schools.
Vol. XXII. Bulletin of the California State Department
of Education, Sacramento, October, 1953.

Newsletter. California State Federation, International
Council for Exceptional Children, Department of the
National Education Association, Vol. 6, March, 1957.

Objectives of Education for Gifted Children in California
Elementary Schools. State Advisory Council on Educa-
tional Research, California Teachers' Association,
Research Resume No. 4, December, 1954.

Principal Apportionment, Part I. Apportionment of the
State School Fund. For the Fiscal Year ending June 30,
1957. Sacramento: State Department of Education,
December, 1956.

Senate Interim Committee, 1955 Report. On the Education
and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and
Adults. Sacramento: Senate, California State Legis-
lature.

_____ 1957 Report. On the Education and Rehabilitation
of Handicapped Children and Adults. Sacramento:
Senate, California State Legislature.

Special Purpose Apportionment, Part II. Apportionment of
the State School Fund. For the Fiscal Year ending
June 30, 1956. Sacramento: State Department of Educa-
tion, April, 1956.

Speech Correction in the Elementary Schools. Vol. XVII.
Bulletin of the California State Department of
Education, Sacramento, March, 1948.

"Statistical Information Monterey County, 1956-1957."
Office of the Monterey County Superintendent of Schools,
1957. (Mimeographed.)

"Statistical Report Merced County Schools, 1955-1956-1957."
Office of the Merced County Superintendent of Schools,
1957. (Mimeographed.)

"Statistical Report Santa Cruz County Schools, 1955-1956."
Office of the Santa Cruz County Superintendent of
Schools, 1956. (Mimeographed.)

Suggested Activities for Mentally Retarded, Vol. XXI.
Bulletin of the California State Department of Educa-
tion, Sacramento, January, 1952.

Teaching of the Cerebral Palsied Child, Vol. XXIII.
Bulletin of the California State Department of
Education, Sacramento, November, 1954.

2. Unpublished Materials

Gowan, J. C., and Mary Seagoe Gowan. "An Annotated
Bibliography of Writings on the Education of the Gifted
Child," 1955. (Mimeographed.)

Tillitt, Sylvia P. "Gifted Children in the China Lake
Elementary School District." (Mimeographed.)

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books

Abbott, Marguerite. Basic Organization and Management of
Cerebral Palsy Facilities. New York: Coordinating
Council for Cerebral Palsy, Inc., 1953.

Baker, Harry Jay. Introduction to Exceptional Children.
New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Bowman, Paul H., et al. Mobilizing Community Resources for
Youth. Robert J. Havighurst (ed.), The Youth Develop-
ment Series. Chicago: The University of Chicago
Press, 1956.

Capa, Cornell, and Maya Pines. Retarded Children Can Be
Helped. New York: Channel Press, 1957.

Cruickshank, William M., and George Raus, (eds.).
Cerebral Palsy, Its Individual and Community Problems.
Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1955.

Cutsforth, Thomas Darl. The Blind in School and Society.
New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1951.

- Doll, Edgar A. The Measurement of Social Competence. Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, 1953.
- Fiedler, Miriam Forster. Deaf Children in a Hearing World. New York: The Ronald Press, 1952.
- Frampton, Merle E., and Elena D. Gall, (eds.). Special Education for the Exceptional. 3 Vols. Boston: Porter Sargent Publisher, 1955.
- Garrison, Karl Claudius. The Psychology of Exceptional Children. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1950.
- Hall, Theodore. Gifted Children, The Cleveland Story. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1956.
- Havighurst, Robert J. Developmental Tasks and Education. New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1950.
- _____, et al. A Community Youth Development Program. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- _____, and Eugene Stevers. A Survey of the Education of Gifted Children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- _____, Lloyd W. Warner, and M. B. Loeb. Who Shall Be Educated? New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- Heck, Arch O. The Education of Exceptional Children. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.
- Hildreth, G. H., Florence N. Brumbaugh, and Frank T. Wilson. Educating Gifted Children at Hunter College Elementary School. New York: Harpers, 1952.
- Hodgson, Kenneth W. The Deaf and Their Problems, A Study in Special Education. London: Watts and Company, 1953.
- Ingram, Christine Porter. Education of the Slow Learning Child. New York: The Ronald Press, 1953.
- Levinson, Abraham. The Mentally Retarded Child, A Guide for Parents. New York: J. Day Company, 1952.
- Lightfoot, Georgia Frances. Personality Characteristics of Bright and Dull Children. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1951.

Ogilvie, Mardel. Speech in the Elementary School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954.

Pollock, Morris F., and Miriam Pollock. New Hope for the Retarded. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1953.

Sarason, Seymour B. Psychological Problems in Mental Deficiency. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Witty, Paul. The Gifted Child, American Association for Gifted Children. Boston: Heath, 1955.

Worcester, D. A. The Education of Children of Above Average Mentality. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956.

2. Periodicals

Cruickshank, William M., and Jane E. Dolphin. "The Emotional Needs of Crippled and Non-Crippled Children," Journal of Exceptional Children, 16:33-41, November, 1949.

Font, Marion M. "Parental Reactions to Psychologic Measurement," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 56:48-51, July, 1951.

Grebler, Anne Marie. "Parental Attitudes Toward Mentally Retarded Children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 56:479-83, January, 1952.

Greenberg, Harold A. "Problems of Parents of Handicapped Children," Journal of Exceptional Children, 17:1-7, October, 1950.

Javier, Carmelte. "Social Implication in the Selection of the Child for the Special Class," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 56:441-44, October, 1951.

Kenner, Leo. "Parents' Feelings About Retarded Children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 57:375-83, January, 1953.

Lieberman, Daniel. "The Education of the Severely Retarded Child," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 58:397-402, January, 1954.

Mullen, Frances A., and Mary M. Nee. "Distribution of Mental Retardation in an Urban School Population,"

American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 56:777-90,
April, 1956.

Popp, Cleo E., Vivian Ingram, and Paul H. Jordan. "Help
for Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," American
Journal of Mental Deficiency, 58:530-34, April, 1954.

Report of Education Committee of the National Association
for Severely Retarded Children, "Day Classes for
Severely Retarded Children," American Journal of Mental
Deficiency, 58:357-70, January, 1954.

Stevenson, George S. "A Community Program for the
Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental
Deficiency, 56:719-26, April, 1952.

Strauss, Alfred A. "The Education of the Brain Injured
Child," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 56:712-
18, April, 1952.

Weingold, Joseph T. "Parents Groups and the Problem of
Mental Retardation," American Journal of Mental
Deficiency, 56:484-92, January, 1952.