

THE ACADEMIC AND RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS
AT
THE MINNESOTA STATE ACADEMY FOR THE DEAF

A STUDY CONDUCTED BY

Frank R. Zieziula, Ph.D., Gallaudet College

James L. Collins, Ph.D., The Ohio State University

Gerald Nelson, Minnesota Foundation for Better Hearing and
Speech

NOVEMBER, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS.....	3
STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM.....	6
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8
Future of the Academy	8
Atmosphere of Learning.....	8
Long Range Planning.....	9
Governance.....	10
Admission/Discharge.....	11
Annual Report.....	12
Psychological Services.....	12
Individual Educational Plan.....	14
Communication.....	15
Faculty.....	17
Residential Program/Staff.....	18
Socialization.....	19
Curriculums.....	20
Accreditation.....	21
Gifted and Slow Learners.....	22
Staff Development Plan.....	22
Assessment Center.....	23
Library and Media Holdings.....	24
Multiply Handicapped Youth.....	24

Counseling.....	25
Career Planning.....	26
Computer Technology.....	26
Alumni Relations.....	27
Demographic Data.....	27
Local School Districts.....	28
Dissemination of Report.....	29
SUMMARY.....	30
APPENDICES.....	32

APPENDICES

- A. Letter to Fred Grimm of the State Planning Office outlining plan for the Evaluation Team.
 - B. Schedule of Formal Meetings for the Evaluation Team presented by Mr. Carl Johnson.
 - C. Schedule of Individual Meetings (Interviews) requested by the Study Team.
 - D. Letter sent to Parents of MSAD students by Evaluation Team.
 - E. Listing of documents reviewed by the Evaluation Team.
 - F. Listing of individual interviews conducted at MSAD by the Evaluation Team.
-

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a study of the academic and residential programs at the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf which was conducted during the months of October and November, 1985 by a team of three individuals: Dr. James Collins, Associate Professor and Director of Clinical Training in the Department of Human Services at The Ohio State University, Mr. Gerald Nelson, Executive Director of the Minnesota Foundation for Better Hearing and Speech and me. This study was conducted at the request of the Minnesota State Legislature at the direction of Ms. Colleen Wieck, Minnesota State Planning Office.

Although the content of the report is the result of the best thinking and writing of the three member team, I take responsibility for any confusion, misunderstandings and errors in facts or demographics. Final editing was left to me and "the buck" does stop here.

On behalf of the team I would like to thank a number of individuals and groups who cooperated with our effort at learning all we could about the Academy and its programs. Mr. Carl Johnson and his administrative staff, especially Mr. Colin McAdam, were most amiable and forthright with all our requests for information and documents. Thanks to the teachers who warmly welcomed us into their classes. A special thanks to the residential staff who welcomed us with open arms. The team is most grateful to the parents and alumni who took the time out of their busy schedules to meet with us at the Academy or who took the time to write to us expressing their concerns. Lastly and most importantly, thanks to the STUDENTS. As always they are great.

The authors have attempted brevity of words. Too much has already been written. It will be up to the professionals within State and within the Academy to take our statements and recommendations and use them as the beginning of a dialogue that will lead to the best educational and residential program for hearing-impaired students in the country.

With that thought in mind, the team dedicates this report to the present and future students of the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf. Given our biases...given our intellectual limitations.....our hearts are focused on one goal...to better the lives of present and future students of the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf.

Frank R. Zieziula
Professor and Chairman
Department of Counseling
Gallaudet College
Washington, D.C.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The recommendations that will be presented in this report were obtained through analyses of materials, documents and personal interviews and observations. The evaluation team wishes to communicate to the reader of this document that, through the process of establishing recommendations, each team member accepted a number of basic assumptions that relate to the state of Minnesota and our philosophies of educating hearing-impaired youth. The evaluation team views these assumptions as positive and in the best interest of educating hearing-impaired children.

We present these assumptions so that the reader better understands the recommendations that will follow. Some assumptions are presented verbatim from government documents written for constituents in the state of Minnesota.

1. In the state of Minnesota, the purpose of public education is to help all individuals acquire knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes toward self and others that will enable them to solve problems, think creatively, continue learning, and develop maximum potential for leading productive, fulfilling lives in a complex and changing society.
2. Hearing impairment is a monumental disability that directly affects the life of a child and an adolescent who attempts to live by the customs, values and life style of the majority of normal physical functioning people. The total disruption of a smooth, acceptable COMMUNICATION SYSTEM with society caused by a severe hearing impairment cannot be fully comprehended. What this MUST IMPLY for us as educators is that although our expectations must always be high, we must work twice as hard, spend twice as much, rely on minimal guidance from few experts, constantly defend our clients and educate the public and, most importantly, learn to accept successes in smaller quantities. All this must be accomplished under the watchful eyes of parents who are frustrated, politicians who are demanding more for less, the public who seeks anonymity and most importantly, students who would just prefer being left alone to be kids.
3. Systems of educating hearing-impaired children vary with times and philosophies. This evaluation team believes that

there is no one system or method of educating hearing-impaired children that is appropriate or better for everyone. The methodology and environment for educating hearing-impaired children must truly fit the needs of the child and his/her parents.

4. Related to the above issue, the evaluation team believes that the term "mainstreaming" for hearing-impaired children has received a aura of respect, sanctity and protectiveness that is truly unwarranted. Mainstreaming is not appropriate for every hearing-impaired child. There is no research to date showing that it is the best of all approaches for hearing-impaired children. It is a popular concept but one that warrants study and examination.
 5. By the same token residential programs are not, nor should they be, the last resort for handicapped children when other educational programs have failed. Good residential programs can serve a variety of functions and need to be part of a broad range of possible educational possibilities available to parents in a state committed to excellence in educating hearing-impaired children.
 6. The evaluation team commends the legislature of the state of Minnesota for taking the definitive action of requesting a study that would lead to recommendations to improve the Academy. Very few states are taking such a direct interest, as the state of Minnesota, in improving the quality of educational services to disabled people.
 7. Likewise, the legislature of the state of Minnesota took a positive step forward in passing legislation mandating sign language usage by personnel in the Academy for the Deaf. No state that the evaluation team is aware of has taken this initiative in the form of legislation. We applaud the legislature for this effort.
 8. The state of Minnesota has always been at the forefront for the rights and services of hearing-impaired clientele. The state of Minnesota has had a positive national reputation as a leader in superb post-secondary programs for hearing-impaired people through the St. Paul Technical Vocational Institute for the Deaf as well the training and research which has been offered through the University of Minnesota and the pioneering mental health services offered through St. Paul Ramsey Hospital. There is every indication that the Academy for the Deaf can be a model environment for educational services to hearing-impaired youngsters that can
-

not only be a resource to the state, but be an exemplary program to other states.

THE LAST TWO ASSUMPTIONS WE WISH TO OFFER ARE VERY IMPORTANT.

First, we realize that our perspective is limited and vulnerable given the time and effort placed into this project. Our recommendations should be topics for discussion that should lead to adaptation only when all opinions are expressed from parents, teachers, residential staff, administrators, school board members and in some cases, students. In the end though, adaptation and implementation will be the responsibility of the Superintendent and his/her staff.

Secondly, recommendations are presented without limitations of funds, time and resources. The evaluation team realizes this is not reality. Priorities must be established. Some recommendations may be placed on the back-burner. Some recommendations may never see the light of day. Yet, we would hope that decision makers would not use monetary excuses alone to avoid consideration of and implementation of the recommendations.

STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM

The team would like to state emphatically that we believe the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf has a number of strengths of which all should be proud. The nature of a report like this focuses on areas of "weakness" and "areas of needed improvement." That will come later in the report. For now we would like to report what we believe are programs and facts that deserve commendation. It is the positive aspects of personnel and programs that will provide the energy, motivation and attitude to make the changes necessary to advance the entire program forward.

1. The qualifications of the teaching staff are excellent.
2. The enthusiasm and dedication of the Residence Hall staff should be applauded. What these professionals lack in educational credentials, they make up in concern for the children.
3. The facilities at both schools appear to be adequate to excellent. Classroom space is conducive to learning. Recreational areas are plentiful and dormitory conditions (although some do need remodeling based on age) are adequate.
4. The recreational programs and staff are superb. The programming efforts with the Fairbault community deserves special commendation.
5. The placement record (as we understand it from interviews) of graduates is excellent. It would be safe to state that 70% of the graduates of the MSAD are accepted at post-secondary institutions within and out of state. St. Paul Technical Vocational Institute (although it may seem limiting to people within state) is a superb placement. Many states would like to have the opportunity provided by St. Paul Technical Vocational Institute for their hearing-impaired children in state.
6. From all that we have ascertained a major strength of the program lies in a strong parent organization that is willing to take an active interest in their children's education. The parents we have met are concerned, bright and can be a supportive group when specific recommendations need to be implemented.
7. The structured "Journalism Course" for high school students

resulting in a project such as the student magazine the "Trojan Times" is an excellent example of creative programming that can occur and can work at an educational facility for hearing-impaired children. Creativity such as this must be rewarded in order that it and others like it flourish.

8. The legislation related to sign language usage in the Academy is a fantastic idea whose time has come in Minnesota. The team cannot emphasize enough the importance of this legislation. We applaud the administrators' and teachers' efforts in attempting to design a fair and equitable evaluation system vis-a-vis the NTID model. It will take time but the end result will be worth the effort.
9. The implementation of an experimental structured course in Sign Language that is offered to one class of elementary children is another example of a creative program whose time is finally here. A program such as this can only be implemented with a commitment on the part of the Academy through the hiring of an instructor /interpreter in Sign Language. We applaud MSAD for taking this initiative.
10. The mainstreaming initiative with the academic programs in the Fairbault public school system should be commended. This effort needs to be further shaped, refined and broadened. Yet, the initiative is excellent and deserves support in any way possible.
11. The program and system of individual speech therapy for most children deserves special praise. The number of speech therapists for the student body is excellent. From what we were able to learn the program and staff are excellent. We especially commend the effort on behalf of the speech therapy department to write meaningful and goal oriented IEPs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FUTURE OF THE ACADEMY

RECOMMENDATION: It is the strong opinion of the evaluation team that it would be in the best interest of the state of Minnesota to fund the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf now and in the future. Closing the Academy would be detrimental to the lives of hearing-impaired people in the state. Further, closing the MSAD could have a detrimental effect on hearing-impaired children nationally.

COMMENT: The Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf is a fine educational institution with a dedicated and able staff, interested parents and motivated students. Constituents of the state of Minnesota deserve a choice in the educational programs for hearing-impaired children. The Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf is a worthwhile expenditure. Keeping the Academy open is morally and programmatically the right thing to do. To do otherwise would send a negative message nationally that could jeopardize residential programs for hearing-impaired children across the nation.

ATMOSPHERE OF LEARNING

RECOMMENDATION: The Superintendent along with the State Board of Education and the Governor's Office must take immediate steps to re-channel the energies of the faculty and residential staff back to what should be their major concern: the academic and residential lives of hearing-impaired children.

COMMENT: Throughout the evaluation teams' interviews and

observations, it was obvious that the political events over the past two years have made a dramatic impact on the attitudes and behaviors of on-line personnel at the Academy. The evaluation team has never met a group of professionals who were better versed in the language of state wide school politics, chains of political command and flow charts showing lines of authorities. The last two years have extracted a toll on the lives of these professionals. Energies, which in the past were focused on improving the lives of hearing-impaired children, are now partially channeled in non-productive directions. The atmosphere within the Academy and state must change for the better. It is the responsibility of the administration of the Academy along with the State Board of Education to help the staff get back to what they have been trained to do: EDUCATE HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

RECOMMENDATION: A five year plan for the MSAD be written and implemented by the Superintendent's office and communicated to the School Board, Department of Education, Governor's Office, LEA's and parents. The plan should be evaluated, up-dated and revised on a yearly basis.

COMMENT: No state school for the deaf and blind can exist in these times without a plan for academic and residential objectives on a long term basis. At the present time, the Academy does not have such a plan. The first year of the new Superintendent's tenure provides an opportune time for discussion and establishment of clear academic and residential objectives. Administrators' responsibilities and professional evaluations should be tied to meeting stated objectives. A written five year plan of action is the clearest means of directing the Academy into the 1990's.

GOVERNANCE

RECOMMENDATION: The superintendent of the Academy along with the administrative staff should take full advantage of the state legislated Advisory Council in planning for the future of the Academy and in liaising with local school districts, the State Board of Education and the legislature of the state. The Advisory Council must be fully utilized as it was intended in the original legislation. Moreover, it should be the guiding force in assuring continuance of the program at Fairbault.

COMMENT: According to information provided to the evaluation team, the MSAD is governed administratively by the Minnesota Department of Education. Prior to the passage of PL 94-142, the Academy had been governed by the State Department of Welfare. The transition to a new relationship between the State Department of Education and the MSAD has apparently been marked by some of the expected difficulties which tend to occur anytime an event of this magnitude occurs. Additionally, the State Department of Education has undoubtedly been involved in an enormous amount of work to assure that PL 94-142 is executed in all the school districts of the state.

Deafness remains a low-incidence condition. Historically the needs of hearing-impaired children have been understood by only a handful of educators, primarily because of the very few hearing-impaired children found in any state or community. With all the commendable things which have happened for handicapped children as a result of PL 94-142, there are a few dangers which have been created by its passage. One of these dangers is that the needs of children who have a handicap which falls into the low-incidence category will be inadvertently overlooked by those educators and public officials who have responsibility for large numbers of children. Another danger is that the cost of educating children who have a low-incidence handicap, such as deafness, will not be understood by administrators and public officials who do not have a thorough grounding in the needs of these children. Yet another danger which has grown out of PL 94-142 is the hope/expectation that a majority of handicapped children can be educated in the "mainstream." This hope is admirable, especially since it might also be less expensive, but since no evidence is yet available that this hope is to be a reality for most severely

lost children, it does not seem wise for any state to behave as if it has actually occurred.

For all these reasons, it was with great foresightedness that the legislature of the state of Minnesota enacted legislation establishing an Advisory Council to the State Board of Education for the purpose of advising the Board on policies pertaining to the control, management and administration of the Academy.

In reviewing all documents pertaining to the Academy, as well as discussions with personnel on campus and group meetings with interested parties, the evaluation team did not receive a sense that the Advisory Council as established, was being fully utilized by the Academy. The composition of the Council as specified by the legislation as well as its relationship with the Board of Education creates a powerful body that can be very influential in program planning, implementation and public relations. The administration of the Academy should utilize this Council to its greatest advantage.

ADMISSION/DISCHARGE

RECOMMENDATION: The State Department of Education should assist the MSAD in the development and execution of a plan which will assure all appropriate referrals of hearing-impaired children are made to the MSAD. The Department can be especially helpful in this by using its knowledge and influence with the local school districts in the state.

"Discharge" from the MSAD of a hearing-impaired child should not be thought of in the current sense of the discharge of a mentally retarded child or an emotionally disturbed child from an institution or hospital. Due to the pervasive effects of deafness, discharge from the MSAD for most of the students there will probably best occur at the end of their educational career and not prior to that. Return to the local school district is not a realistic measure of success in most instances.

COMMENT: The evaluation team was made aware of the fact that there is some question in the state regarding the criteria for the admission of and discharge of children at the MSAD. This situation is not unique to Minnesota. The decision by parents and by public officials to agree that a child leave home and

community to receive educational services is not one to be made lightly. However, the pervasive and life-long effects of significant hearing loss are such that for many of these children such a decision remains the best one when all things are considered. Although there is no evidence available to the evaluation team that hearing-impaired children are now being systematically kept away from the MSAD to their detriment, such a circumstance is possible - especially with the national trend to educate nearly all handicapped children in the home community. Severe caution is advised. Trends are not necessarily in the best interest of all children.

ANNUAL REPORT

RECOMMENDATION: The Superintendent's Office should produce an annual report to the School Board, Department of Education, Governor's Office and parents covering all accomplishments during the past academic year, problems encountered and major objectives for the next academic year. The report can be used for informational purposes with LEA's and other interested parties.

COMMENT: Dissemination of information and communication between interested groups of people can always be improved upon in a state residential facility for hearing-impaired youngsters. The MSAD is obviously no exception and is in need of open lines of communication immediately. Additionally, the Academy has many fine accomplishments and unique programs that should receive publicity and public recognition. It is the responsibility of the Superintendent's Office to produce and disseminate this publication.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended strongly that a systematic program of psychological assessment of the MSAD

students be instituted. The lack of assessment data and the improper assessment of hearing-impaired children, is a national concern which is documented in the literature. The importance of this type of information in the appropriate planning for educational intervention, both academic and social, is also documented. It is not considered in the best interest of the children to accept test results from the local districts in a carte blanche fashion, nor is it considered to be in the best interest of the children to rely on results which are several years old since the characteristics of children change and should be monitored in a systematic manner. With 1.5 psychologists available to serve the children enrolled at the MSAD, it would seem that a systematic assessment program should be feasible while not detracting from the other important and necessary functions performed by the staff.

COMMENT: The MSAD enjoys a very favorable staffing ratio for psychological services when compared to most other educational programs for hearing-impaired children, with one person available on a full-time basis and another person on a half-time basis. Both persons seem qualified by training and/or experience to serve the target population. An interview with the two psychologists and a review of randomly selected student folders indicates that the thrust of psychological services at the MSAD is focused on the counseling, observation and consultation aspects of psychological services. These services are important and the psychologists involved and the Academy administration are to be commended for attention to these needs..

It is noted that testing does not seem to be a high priority in the psychological services which are provided. The evaluation team is bluntly saying it SHOULD BE a priority. Fifteen student folders were randomly selected for review (not just of psychological services, but for their complete content). Of these 15 folders it was noted that one student had been evaluated psychologically by the MSAD staff, one by both the local school district and a mental health program in St. Paul, four by their local school district only, four by the mental health program in St. Paul only and five students had no record of any psychological evaluation. It is also noted that some of the psychological reports bear dates of 1980, 1981 and 1982. In some instances the psychological reports from the local school districts contain comments from those district psychologists who did the testing, to the effect that communication with the child was a problem or that testing was accomplished with the assistance of another person who served as a helper to the psychologist, mainly the classroom teacher.

Some of the psychologists' duties at the MSAD are carried out in

the dormitories. One evening per week is spent in the dormitories and this is considered a strength of the psychological program. Some evaluation is also done at the request of local school districts who need specific recommendations about how to better serve a hearing-impaired child who is enrolled in the local district. Again, this is considered to be a commendable practice.

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN

RECOMMENDATION: One MSAD staff member should be given responsibility for the IEP process at the Academy, including the residence program. This person should initially obtain agreement from all state agencies which oversee or impact on the MSAD on what constitutes an excellent IEP. Then this person should oversee the IEP process for the MSAD, including training of the staff.

Further, the MSAD staff should re-evaluate the time-line for writing of IEPs. Consideration should be made for writing of the IEP during the spring semester in preparation for the following academic year.

COMMENT: The development of and execution of an IEP for each student is a central part of PL 94-142 and an important part of the educational services provided to hearing-impaired children. The development and execution of these plans has necessitated changes in the activities and the philosophy of many teachers and educational programs across the country. Interviews at the MSAD with teachers, residential staff members, administrators and parents indicate that all parties are aware of the importance of a good IEP and of the time and effort which is involved in the development, monitoring and modifications which are necessary if the IEP is to serve the purpose for which it is intended. Throughout the field of special education, the development of appropriate IEPs and the most efficient use of these instruments has created some discussion as to exactly what form the document should take and how they can best be fitted to the individual needs of the child. All this must occur without additionally burdening the valuable time of the staff.

A review of randomly selected student folders at the MSAD revealed that all folders contained an IEP. In all instances but one the IEP contained a plan for the student's academic and

dormitory experience. The dormitory portion of the plan was not present in one of the folders selected. It was observed that the MSAD does a good job of detailing on the IEP the many opportunities and experiences available to students at the Academy, including some which are usually available to a hearing-impaired student only at a residential facility. It was also observed that a number of the IEPs were not all that individualized, rather they were quite similar to those of other students. Replication of goals, objectives and procedures is to be expected to a certain degree, but in this case it seemed to be somewhat more than desirable.

It was reported during a number of the interviews with the staff that the IEP writing/monitoring process is unduly time consuming, cuts significantly into the time available for teaching and learning and has received criticism from outside sources in a conflicting manner. Specifically, it was reported to the evaluation team that an IEP which is acceptable or considered good by one external agency in the state may be criticized or judged inadequate by another external state agency. (As an aside comment, it was noted that the MSAD IEP's were superior to some old IEP's found in student folders which had been developed by local school districts).

It was observed that the residential staff at the MSAD is involved in the IEP process, which is commendable. Yet this group probably needs more assistance in developing their skill in this area. The evaluation team realizes that this training has begun but more attention will need to be given to this task.

Lastly, in terms of time-line, teachers and staff of the MSAD presently prepare the IEPs in the fall semester for the current academic year. It appears to the evaluation team that the academic semester is almost over before all IEPs are complete and discussed at staffings. Discussion should ensue about having the IEP written and signed before the end of the previous academic year (spring semester).

COMMUNICATION

RECOMMENDATION: The systematic assessment/training of all staff members in a comprehensive communication program should be executed. Future staff members should be hired only with the

understanding of the importance of good communication skills and the willingness to acquire them if they do not possess such skills at the time of hiring. Specifically, the evaluation team has reviewed the Recommendations from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Training Workshop of October 12-18, 1985 and applaud the document. The evaluation team suggests the following changes to the SCPI levels: 1. The position of COUNSELLOR be added with a minimum hire level of Intermediate and a Proficiency level of Advanced, 2. Minimum hire level of Psychologist be changed to Intermediate, 3. Proficiency levels of Houseparents, Superintendent, Audiologist, Speech Pathologist, Health Care Staff (Nurse) and Library Staff be changed to Advanced.

Further, the evaluation team strongly suggests that the Academy adopt and implement a clear COMMUNICATION PHILOSOPHY that is accepted and understood by all individuals employed in the institution.

COMMENT: It was observed and reported that the majority of staff members are able to communicate effectively with hearing-impaired students, staff, parents, and alumni. Some concern was expressed that this level of communication is not always high and is not universal among the staff, particularly among administrative staff. This should not be construed as a criticism by the evaluation team, since some of the persons in these positions were placed there with no experience in the field of education of the deaf and were placed because of expertise in other important areas.

The current and future students of the MSAD deserve a fair shake. The legislators of the state of Minnesota realized the importance of communication at the Academy and adopted the current legislation related to sign language proficiency at the Academy. The evaluation team applauds this legislation and further, applauds the efforts of the Academy to define the proficiency levels of all personnel and develop an evaluative technique that is fair and acceptable to all.

The evaluation team is suggesting specific changes to the SCPI levels that would raise the minimum hiring standards for a few personnel and change the proficiency levels for a number of personnel. The basic premise of the evaluation team is that ANY PROFESSIONAL who accepts a position (along with a very healthy salary) in which he/she may have direct contact with a hearing-impaired child should be able to use sign with sufficient grammatical accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations with that person. THERE CAN BE NO EXCEPTIONS TO THIS BEHAVIOR. THERE CAN BE ONLY EXCUSES.

Secondly, the evaluation team reviewed a copy of a COMMUNICATION PHILOSOPHY for the Academy (the Philosophy Statement was undated and therefore we assume it has not been accepted by the Administration of the Academy). Although the evaluation team has problems with certain parts of the statement as written, the need for such a statement with input from all personnel and adopted by the Administration is clear. Further, open communication between hearing individuals and hearing-impaired individuals must be at the heart of the statement.

F FACILITY

RECOMMENDATION: The Administrators must terminate contracts of incompetent personnel or develop a system whereby specific individuals are transferred to assignments that do not require daily contact with the children.

COMMENT: AS A WHOLE, THE EVALUATION TEAM OBSERVED EXTREMELY COMPETENT, DEDICATED PERSONNEL WHO PERFORMED THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES APPROPRIATELY WITHIN THE ACADEMY. Yet, as exists in any school system, there are a number of personnel who for various professional and personal reasons are not meeting the objectives for which they were originally hired. The evaluation team is not criticizing the MSAD for having individuals like this. Nor is the evaluation team implying that more than an acceptable number of individuals like that work at the MSAD. Rather, the evaluation team is criticizing the administration because specific individual's incompetence is accepted and ignored. In this day and age, some action must be taken regarding incompetent personnel. The evaluation team understands the sensitivity of this problem and assuredly, WE have no grasp of the personal lives of these people and what they have contributed to the Academy in the past. The evaluation team is concerned about the present, the current students who must socially and academically learn, and the parents who are well aware of the problems and insist upon change. The administration must find creative ways to deal with this dilemma.

RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM/STAFF

RECOMMENDATION: The residential program philosophy and policies are in place but are not being fully utilized. Efforts should be made to further capitalize on the unique opportunities offered by the residential program. There must be a way or ways to further bridge the goals, staff and programs of the academic programs with that of the residential programs. The gap between programs simply has to lessen.

COMMENT: One of the unique aspects of an Academy like the MSAD is the residential component and the opportunities which this component affords hearing-impaired students to learn: socially, academically, and communicatively. In general, the residential environment and the staff which runs the residence program were observed to be quite good. The physical facilities of the residence hall varied. The girls' dormitory is housed in a rather old building and the boys are in a much newer, more modern structure. Both facilities were judged to serve the needs of the students well. Both buildings were observed to be quite clean and, to the interested but non-engineer eye, in good repair.

Interviews with and observations of the residential staff gave the impression that they are generally intelligent, active, motivated and committed to their responsibilities. Because of the geographic location of the Academy it seems reasonable that the job as a residential worker at the MSAD is a desirable one and attracts a higher functioning applicant than might be true in other residential schools. Yet, the evaluation team was surprised that very few residential staff were pursuing advanced degrees. Some system must be developed to encourage their continuing education.

As is typically the case, the pay and benefits of the residential staff members are below that of the teaching staff. Partially as a result of this the residential staff and the residential programs appear to rank lower in the pecking order at the MSAD, a situation which is true at most residential schools. While this was mentioned as a fact of life by members of the residential staff during some of the interviews, they do not seem bitter about it. Yet, they would like to be able to participate more actively in the general school program and to see the academic

and residential processes tied more closely together. The evaluation team could not agree more.

Consideration should be given to expanding the role of the teaching staff and the academic programs into the residential environment. At a minimum this could include some classes being taught in the dormitories. Academic study areas should be available in residence with print and non-print materials and computer accessibility. A teacher-in-residence program should be developed encouraging one, two or a number of teachers to take responsibility and caring for a specific housing unit of students. Having one teacher serve as an evening tutor is just not satisfactory. Residence staff could rotate work schedules to be available to meet with teachers before the teachers leave for the day. The pairing of teacher-residence staff members to plan and execute specific educational programs or to work on specific behavioral concerns for given children might also be beneficial. IEPs for academic programs and residential living should be combined and shared between teachers and residence personnel. The evaluation team realizes this "togetherness" is the most difficult aspect of residential programming. Yet without 100% effort on both parts, residential educational programs will die a fast death.

SOCIALIZATION

RECOMMENDATION: The MSAD staff must find a way to document and disseminate information regarding the excellence of its socialization opportunities provided by the residence hall programs and accompanying educational programs.

COMMENT: During the team's visit to campus, there was a fair amount of discussion by the staff of the MSAD regarding the opportunities available to the students at the MSAD for socialization with other hearing-impaired persons and not to the students at local mainstreamed programs. Success stories were told by most professionals, along with the success stories told by all parents.

There is no doubt that this socialization opportunity is and should be one of the most valuable features of the MSAD's programs. However, professionals and politicians will not believe idiosyncratic success stories by themselves. An

administrator (responsible for residence hall programs) must work with a research oriented university to develop a systematic method for defining and measuring socialization behavior in the student population. This information should then be disseminated to educators and politicians in and out of state with the same vigor and vitality that the anecdotal life stories are communicated.

CURRICULUMS

RECOMMENDATION: It is imperative that the entire Academy staff including the administration give priority attention to revision of the elementary and secondary academic curriculums. Further, the faculty member designated to take responsibility for revision of all curriculum be given time to accomplish the task successfully. Lastly, one administrator (Assistant Superintendent) should take charge of assuring implementation of curriculum revision.

COMMENT: The heart of any educational program for special education children is the academic curriculum. As the evaluation team talked with various individuals within the Academy there was not one individual who did not see an immediate need for curriculum revision at the Academy. Academic curriculums on the elementary and secondary levels are out-of-date. The current curriculum outlines are just that, outlines providing only sparse objectives that in most cases are not measurable and, most importantly, provide very few activities or resources a new teacher could utilize to implement the objectives. Secondly, the courses themselves with very few exceptions (e.g. Career Awareness, Introduction to Computers) do not appear to be up-to-date with future life and job placement needs. Third, the evaluation team is very concerned that the courses, objectives and evaluation measures be compared with curriculum goals of hearing students in the state of Minnesota as well as nationally recognized educational programs for hearing-impaired youth. No one needs to create the wheel here; there are fine examples of current curriculums that exist within the state as well as in programs for hearing-impaired youth around the country.

The evaluation team applauds the efforts and results of the Math Curriculum Study Group that occurred in the summer of 1985. It was needed. The results were a good beginning. Yet, the evaluation

team would like to emphasize that, the results of the study group were limiting. More clear definition of resource and activities are needed in the document. No evaluation strategies were presented. Comparison of objectives with the state of Minnesota general education objectives is not really clear.

The evaluation team believes the MSAD cannot rely solely on summer workshops to complete the task at hand. Further, a language curriculum is needed NOW or the credibility of the program is in jeopardy.

Related to issues of curriculum, the evaluation team is puzzled by the Industrial Arts and Fine Arts curriculums that appear to be existent on paper but somewhat lacking in reality. If the Industrial Arts program is to survive, current curriculums must reflect job trends. Equipment must be evaluated and replaced. The evaluation team saw very little instruction of the fine arts during its visit. There appears to be no one person who other than in name, is responsible for activities in this generic area. This must be reviewed and updated.

ACCREDITATION

RECOMMENDATION: The MSAD take steps immediately to meet accreditation standards established by the Confefence of Educational Administrative Schools for the Deaf (national accrediting body for educational programs in deafness). Secondly, the MSAD should consider seeking accreditation through the North Central Association (educational accreditating body for the state of Minnesota).

COMMENT: The evaluation team's understanding is that at the present time the educational program at the MSAD is not accredited by appropriate governing organizations. Credibility throughout the state and nationally can only be achieved through accreditation. The processes are long and time consuming but worth the time and effort.

GIFTED AND SLOW LEARNERS

RECOMMENDATION: The MSAD should develop a long range plan that meets the needs of gifted as well slow learning students (we do not mean multiply-handicapped children in this section). The plan for both the gifted and slow learners should include residential components to make them comprehensive programs which would compliment the academic programs.

COMMENT: The evaluation team observed a number of gifted children (broadly defined as children who academically excel at a faster rate than normal functioning children) at the MSAD but only sporadic and reactive programs to fit their needs. This classification of children and programs to meet the needs of these children is fast becoming a priority in general education around the country. There is no reason that it should not become a priority in special education too. "Mainstreaming" of these hearing-impaired children is not and should not be the sole answer. Because of deafness, their needs are unique and should be given appropriate attention within the the MSAD environment.

Likewise, slow learning hearing-impaired children should receive programmatic attention on the main campus. Referral to the program for multiply-handicapped children on the blind campus is insufficient. A master plan needs to be designed and implemented to assure that these two ends of the spectrum are being served.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RECOMMENDATION: A comprehensive staff development plan should be established as soon as possible . This report can serve as a start. The plan should identify major objectives to be accomplished within a specific time frame along with an evaluation system to measure achievements.

COMMENT: Staff development is occurring at the MSAD but haphazardly. Monies appear to be available and time is provided by the administration for workshops, conferences and alike. Yet, staff development appears to be overly individualistic and reactive in nature. Who goes to what event appears not to be clearly explainable.

The evaluation team feels that staff development is vital to an institution such as the MSAD. Yet, specific activities must fit into a master plan for goals and objectives of the Academy. A five year plan is helpful here.

The State Board of Education as well as the Administrators at the Academy must initiate an incentive system for continuing education specifically for the Residence Staff and secondarily for graduate training of the teaching staff. Formal continuing education on the part of Residential and Academic staffs is not occurring in numbers seen at other Residential facilities for hearing-impaired youngsters. The MSAD might broaden the work with colleges and universities in the area to develop linkages that can help with this issue.

ASSESSMENT CENTER

RECOMMENDATION: An assessment center should be established at the MSAD to serve the hearing-impaired children of the state of Minnesota. This center should focus on the assessment and referral of hearing-impaired children regardless of their school placement and should evaluate and make recommendations regarding all educationally relevant characteristics of the child including, but not necessarily limited to: academic, language and communication, social/personal, and vocational needs. Ongoing consultation should be provided to local districts and other agencies in the state which serve hearing-impaired children.

COMMENT: The MSAD seems uniquely qualified in the state of Minnesota to provide assessment/consultation/referral services for hearing-impaired children from all parts of the state, regardless of where they attend school. The cadre of specialists found on this campus have expertise in audiology, psychology, counseling, diagnostic teaching, language, administration, communication and child care to name just a few examples. This expertise could be put to much needed use as a source of referral

for all hearing-impaired children in the state, not just those who attend the MSAD. These services would also be of much benefit to local school districts and the parents of hearing-impaired children in the state.

LIBRARY AND MEDIA HOLDINGS

RECOMMENDATION: The state of Minnesota must increase its budget allotment for print and non-print materials (film, soft-ware, video) at the Academy for the Deaf if it is to keep in touch with the future. More importantly, the Academy at Fairbault should be a RESOURCE CENTER for print and non-print materials on hearing impairment and special education that surpasses the holdings at local colleges and universities.

COMMENT: The evaluation team had the opportunity to not only speak with the Librarian responsible for the student and faculty print collections, but also to review the print, non-print and media holdings available at the Academy. The collection of both print and non-print materials is not adequate to be a first-rate service and training model. Specifically, the evaluation team would advocate for the MSAD to become a Resource Center in the state for teaching and research materials related to education of hearing-impaired and deaf children. The visibility of the MSAD through this vehicle will only enhance its reputation and its contacts with the community. Software availability for present computer hardware is virtually non-existent.

Continuing education possibilities for the Librarian on new trends in library service must be implemented immediately.

MULTIPLY HANDICAPPED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION: Academic and residential programs for multiply handicapped hearing-impaired children are provided and should be provided on the campus for blind students. Mainstreaming of multiply handicapped hearing-impaired children

with normal functioning hearing-impaired students must occur through academic programs and recreational programs where possible.

COMMENT: Through an on-site tour of the campus for blind students, it was evident that facilities and equipment to serve multiply handicapped students was far superior than on the main campus for hearing-impaired students. The evaluation team feels that the needs of multiply handicapped hearing-impaired children are best served on the campus for the blind than at the main campus. Having the multiply handicapped hearing-impaired youngsters separated academically and residentially can only be defended if there are clear and evident programs of substantive mainstreaming of multiply-handicapped students with the normal functioning hearing-impaired students. There must be a clear program of mainstreaming with specific objectives that is not SIMPLY TOKENISM. The multiply handicapped hearing-impaired students need a program of mainstreaming and deserve it at a residential educational facility.

COUNSELING

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended strongly that the counselor on staff be permitted to spend the majority of his time in tasks of individual and group counseling along with programs of group guidance.

COMMENT: It was obvious through observations and discussions on campus that concepts of individual and group counseling were held in high esteem by the administrative staff and teaching staff of the MSAD. A school counselor position is vital in all residential programs serving hearing-impaired children. In many cases the school counselor is the "link" between the academic staff and the residential staff.

Ironically, the MSAD has by reputation and observation one of the most clinically skilled professionals in the position of school counselor. Yet, all admit that he spends a great deal of his time scheduling children in academic classes. THE TIME WHEN SCHOOL COUNSELORS WERE PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHEDULING IS GONE. The evaluation team suggests that an administrator or administrators become responsible for this task and permit the school counselor to do his clinical work.

Further, it is suggested that curriculum outlines be developed in areas of human growth and development and socialization by the counselor with the same vigor and detail as curriculums in math, language and the arts. The school counselor should be responsible for implementing the curriculums through group guidance activities.

CAREER PLANNING

RECOMMENDATION: A formal career guidance program and curriculum should be designed and implemented to assist teachers and residence staff to provide thorough instruction related to career planning.

COMMENT: Career guidance is considered one of the most important facets of a hearing-impaired child's life. The decisions that he/she will make in a world where discrimination against hearing-impaired people is clearly evident need to be explored and evaluated from a very early age. Career courses are evident at the MSAD on the high school level. That is commendable. All educators would admit that this is only the tip of the iceberg. A well developed career education plan starting at the elementary levels must be designed and implemented immediately in order that students can be prepared for what lies ahead of them outside of the school environment.

COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION: MSAD must develop a more structured plan to weave computer technology into its current academic and residential programs immediately. Further, and more importantly, the state must find a way for the MSAD to increase the number of personal computers on campus; increase the amount and variety of software; and increase training of staff.

COMMENT: Minnesota reportedly leads the country in the

number of personal computers used in its elementary and secondary schools. This may be true everywhere but at the MSAD. Computers are visibly scarce and were not utilized as one would envision on the Fairbault campus during the evaluation teams visit. Software programs designed with hearing-impaired people in mind (language levels) exist, yet are not available on campus. Computer technology appears to be only minimally incorporated into the Industrial Arts programs. Introductory courses on Computers were being offered but the content of these courses was very, very minimal. More needs to be done in this entire area.

ALUMNI RELATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: An alumni organization be established to draw upon the dedication, commitment and experience of the MSAD graduates.

COMMENT: It was obvious to the evaluation team that a number of alumni of the MSAD feel a very strong bond to the Academy and to its students. The evaluation team feels it would be in the best interest of the Academy and its programs to harness this energy among the hearing-impaired community to meet a variety of present day needs. It appears that the implementation of this recommendation would necessitate very little effort and the gains would be enormous.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

RECOMMENDATION: It is imperative that the MSAD begin a systematic procedure for compiling data related to demography of students, test score distributions and placements of graduates. Further, the statistical information should be disseminated widely.

COMMENT: Rightfully or wrongfully we live in a society where statistics are as important to educational institutions as text books. It was obvious to the evaluation team that at the

present time, the MSAD staff have only compiled rudimentary statistics on its students, personnel and graduates. We realize attempts have been made and we also realize how time-consuming these collections of data can be. Yet, it truly is a necessary evil if one must constantly prove the importance of the institution and the success of the present students and past graduates. MSAD should be proud of its accomplishments. All the evaluation team suggests is that staff show the success through compilation of numbers. A department of research at a university should be able to assist in designing a mechanism or mechanisms to gather data appropriately.

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

RECOMMENDATION: The state of Minnesota should conduct a study focusing on educational programs for hearing-impaired children operated by local school districts.

COMMENT: Because of its size, clear identity, financial obligations and political climate, the MSAD was clearly more expedient to study compared to the rest of the programs which serve hearing-impaired children in the state. The MSAD is only a small part of a very large picture. If the state of Minnesota is serious about assuring maximum educational services to hearing-impaired children, then one must place the results of this study in the context of all educational programs in the state. Therefore, a broader study of local school programs for hearing-impaired children is being recommended.

Very little information was available to the evaluation team about the quality of educational programs for hearing-impaired children at the local school levels. The evaluation team felt that the state legislature as well as the Board of Education were working on the supposition that education at the local school level was superior. A matter of fact, a state document reviewed by the evaluation team, related to the purpose of the MSAD, states "Development of independence, learning potential and preparation for returning to his/her local educational agency are goals set for each student."

Educational opportunities, services and outcomes for hearing-impaired youngsters may be superior at the local school district compared to the residential educational facility at

Fairbault, but at the present time the evaluation team finds NO PROOF of that assumption. A study should be conducted resulting in the delineation of specific advantages and disadvantages of all educational opportunities for hearing-impaired children in the state of Minnesota. The study should be based on the assumptions that hearing-impaired children and their families are as diverse as hearing children and their families and that the best placement of a hearing-impaired child is made when a child's individual needs are matched with the strengths of the educational programs.

DISSEMINATION OF REPORT

RECOMMENDATION: The evaluation team recommends strongly that this report, IN ITS ENTIRETY, be made available to teachers, parents and hearing-impaired consumers upon request.

COMMENT: The evaluation team is well aware that some aspects of this report are controversial and may "rub people the wrong way." We will stand by our opinions and judgements. We know that misunderstandings MOST frequently occur when people have only half the facts or are provided second-hand information. With that in mind, we feel that the recommendations will be given more credence if they are reviewed in the context of the full report.

SUMMARY

A team of three professionals, Dr. James Collins of The Ohio State University, Mr. Gerald Nelson of the Minnesota Foundation for Better Hearing and Speech and Dr. Frank R. Zieziula of Gallaudet College were contracted by the Minnesota State Planning Agency as a result of legislation enacted by the State Legislature in May of 1965 to conduct a thorough programmatic evaluation of the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf. The result of the evaluation was to be a report to the State Legislature providing specific recommendations that could be implemented by the state and administration of the MSAD to make the Academy a first-rate residential educational institution.

The team conducted a thorough evaluation of the Academy's programs through review of pertinent documents, observation of programs, interviews with relevant individuals and groups and lastly a great deal of discussion among ourselves. The conclusion of all this effort is the report presented within, the heart of which are 26 specific recommendations which we offer for discussion, adoption and implementation.

First and foremost the evaluation team would like to reiterate its primary recommendation that it would be in the best interest of the state of Minnesota to fund the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf now and in the future. It is in the best interest of hearing-impaired children and parents within state and nationally that the Academy remain open.

The team found the Academy to be a solid educational institution with a dedicated staff and good educational and residential programs. The evaluation team identified a number of strengths within the Academy that deserve special recognition.

The evaluation team believes that upon these strengths can be built a first-rate educational residential program that can be a model for all states seeking to up-date their residential schools for hearing-impaired youngsters. With this premise in mind, the evaluation team has presented a number of specific recommendations which are WORKABLE and which should be given every consideration in planning for the future of the institution.

Lastly, the evaluation team wishes to commend the legislature of

the state of Minnesota for taking the bold step of initiating the study. We would like to thank the State Planning Office and all personnel at the Academy for the Deaf for their full cooperation. To the kids and their parents...the evaluation team hopes that our combined knowledge and common sense has resulted in change for the positive; positive change and creativity which have always been the cornerstone of programs and services for hearing-impaired people in the state of Minnesota.



G A L L A U D E T

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES
(202) 651-5586

KENDALL GREEN
800 FLORIDA AVENUE NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20002

October 10, 1985

Dr. Frederick Grimm
Planner
Minnesota State Planning Agency
Room 100
Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dear Fred:

This letter is in regards to the contract of services being provided to the Minnesota State Planning Agency by Dr. James Collins, Mr. Gerald Nelson and myself. As designated leader of the team which will assess the educational program for hearing-impaired youngsters at Faribault, I am using this opportunity to communicate what I believe is our objective, what will be needed by the team to accomplish our goals and lastly, what will be the end result of our work. Let me say up front that this letter represents my perceptions of the task. I have not had the opportunity to communicate at length with my colleagues.

As I understand the task, the major objective of the contract of services is for a team of experts in the field of education of deaf children (that is, Dr. Collins, Mr. Nelson and myself) to make specific programmatic recommendations to the Minnesota State Planning Agency that would assist and assure a well rounded, first-rate educational experience for hearing-impaired children (K-12) at the Minnesota School for the Deaf in Faribault, Minnesota.

As a team we will study and analyze the educational system at Faribault through previous written evaluation and more importantly, through a site visit to the Faribault school on Monday through Wednesday, October 21, 22 and 23.

It is my understanding that a written report will be presented to the Minnesota State Planning Agency (the date of which escapes me at the moment, yet it is specified in the contractual agreement). I, in my role as team leader, will be responsible for presenting the final report to your office. The nature and shape of the report is at the discretion of the team but basically it will contain two vital elements:

- A) Make a programmatic recommendation whether hearing-impaired children and parents in the state of Minnesota are best served with the continuation of a residential educational facility in Faribault, Minnesota.

Dr. Frederick Grimm
October 10, 1985
Page 2

B) Present specific programmatic recommendations to the Minnesota State Planning Agency that can be implemented and would result in a first-rate educational program at the Faribault campus.

In terms of our team's needs, I am assuming that Dr. Collins and Mr. Nelson have received:

1. The Evaluation of the Minnesota School for the Deaf and The Minnesota Braille and Sight-Saving School Report of January 4, 1984.
2. The Impact of Closure of the Minnesota School for the Deaf and Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School from the Perspectives of Students, Families, and Local Schools Report, February 8, 1985.
3. Guidelines for Evaluating Programs for Children with a Hearing Impairment prepared by Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, April 1980.
4. Component 3: Comprehensive Compliance Review of State Education Agency Operations of the U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

Our site visit is scheduled for October 21, 22 and 23. The team plans to arrive on Sunday, October 20. I would hope that the team can have a two hour working session Sunday evening (starting at approximately 8:00 p.m.) to discuss strategy for the next three days.

During the three working days of October 21, 22 and 23, I would ask that the following arrangements be made:

- A) A private room at the school be made available for the team that would permit us to discuss our responsibilities, write, conduct individual meetings and review files. The availability of coffee would be great.
- B) Student files (including grade report, IEPs, assessment batteries etc.) be made available to the team. Curriculums and written teaching objectives also should be available. Use of the files in the team's room would be helpful.
- C) The team be permitted to visit and observe classes in progress. Visitation to the residence halls including residence programs also be permitted.
- D) The Chief Executive Officer as well as other administrators of the school be available to respond to questions or requests as they occur. It would also be helpful if one person at the school was responsible for our visit and be our contact for information.
- E) The team should be able to meet individually with teachers, support staff (including psychologists, residence counselors and teacher aides) to ask questions about their roles and responsibilities.

Dr. Frederick Grimm
October 10, 1985
Page 3

In addition to the requests above, it would be very helpful to the team if the following arrangements could be made:

A) A group meeting of all teachers or in small groups (if that is easier) for a minimum of one hour with the team or a team member. The time can be arranged by school staff.

B) A group meeting of Parents (chosen at the discretion of the school). An evening meeting would be fine.

C) A group meeting of Alumni of MSD, if it could be arranged. An evening meeting would be fine.

D) If possible, a morning or afternoon visit on Tuesday or Wednesday to a few mainstreamed classes for hearing-impaired youngsters in the St. Paul area for one of our team members.

I realize we are requesting a great deal. We will be an imposition to the students, teachers and administrators. We will conduct our business courteously, flexibly and attempt to be as inconspicuous as possible. The end result will be a valuable document that will be in the best interest of the children and staff.

I have not been in contact with the Chief Executive Officer of the Minnesota School for the Deaf. The team looks forward to meeting with him. I would ask that you share a copy of this letter with him and he in turn share a copy of this letter with his staff. All should be informed of our responsibilities and our intent during the site visit.

Please feel free to contact me by phone if you require clarification of the contents of this letter. If not, I look forward to meeting you in the near future.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Zieziula, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairman

xc: Dr. James Collins ✓
Mr. Gerald Nelson

Office Memorandum

DATE : October 18, 1985

DEPARTMENT Residential Academies

TO : Dr. Frank Zieziula
Professor and Chairman

FROM : Carl T. Johnson
Residential Academies Administrator

SUBJECT : Legislative Study requests in your letter of October 19, 1985
to Dr. Frederick Grimm

As per page 2:

- Item A: Room #23, Smith Hall is reserved for your use
Coffee will be provided
- Item B: Students' files will be available
Curriculum will be available
- Item C: Observation of classes is permitted.
Visitation to residence halls permitted
- Item D: Administrators will be available
Mr. McAdam will be contact person
- Item E: Staff will be available for interviews upon request

As per page 3:

- Item A: A meeting of all teachers has been scheduled for Monday,
October 21, 1985, at 3:30 p.m. in Quinn Hall Auditorium
- Item B: A parents' meeting has been scheduled for 7:30 p.m. on
Tuesday, October 22, 1985, in Quinn Hall Auditorium
- Item C: An Alumni meeting has been scheduled for 7:30 p.m. on
Monday, October 21, 1985, in Quinn Hall Auditorium

Interpreters will be provided for Mr. Nelson as needed and also for the
scheduled meetings above.

A policy manual will be available for your use.

mv

SCHEDULE FOR STAFF INTERVIEWS BY THE TEAM AT

MINNESOTA STATE ACADEMY FOR THE DEAF
(If you have any questions, call Colin)

DR. JAMES COLLINS:

Tuesday, 9:00 a.m.	Ed Nagy, Secondary Principal, meet in Ed's office - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 10:00 a.m.	Jim Potter, Counselor, meet in Jim's office - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 11:00 a.m.	Max Carter, Dean of Students, meet in Max's office - Tate Hall
Tuesday, 1:30 p.m.	Al Hoekstra, Psychologist, meet in Al's office - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 2:30 p.m.	Reg Kennedy, Secretary to Audiologist, meet in Hearing Clinic - Noyes Hall

DR. FRANK ZIEZUILA:

Tuesday, 9:00 a.m.	Dave Rohm, Curriculum, meet in Room 11 - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 10:20 a.m.	Dr. Waddick, Assistant Supt./Academic Program, meet in Room 23 - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 1:30 p.m.	Ed Nagy, Secondary Principal, meet in Ed's office - Smith Hall
Wednesday, 9:00 a.m.	Sally Kramer, Librarian, meet in the Library - Smith Hall
Wednesday, 10:30 a.m.	Carol Dierksen, Elementary Principal, meet in Carol's office - Quinn Hall
Wednesday, 1:30 p.m.	Mary Ann Thompson, Girls' Residence Hall Director, TATE HALL
Wednesday, 2:30 p.m.	Adrian Hagen, Boys' Residence Hall Director, FREDERETTE HALL

MR. GERALD NELSON:

Tuesday, 9:30 a.m.	Dr. Waddick, Assistant Supt./Academic Program, meet in Room 23 - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 10:30 a.m.	Ed Nagy, Secondary Principal, meet in Ed's office - Smith Hall
Tuesday, 1:30 a.m.	Cathy Phillops, Media Specialist, meet in IMC - Noyes Hall
Wednesday, 9:00 a.m.	Carol Dierksen, Elementary Principal, meet in Carol's office - Quinn Hall
Wednesday, 9:45 a.m.	Kitri Larson, Mainstreaming Coordinator, meet in Room 23, Smith Hall
Wednesday, 11:00 a.m.	Pat Maday, Outreach Coordinator, meet in Room 23, Smith Hall

cc: Dr. James Collins
Dr. Frank Ziezuila
Mr. Gerald Nelson
Mr. Carl Johnson

State of Minnesota

Department of Education



Minnesota School for the Deaf

P.O. Box 308

Faribault, Minnesota 55021

Phone 507-332-3363

Page 37

October 21, 1985

Dear Parent:

This letter is an invitation for you to provide input to an Evaluation Team that has been hired by the Minnesota State Planning Office to evaluate the academic and residential programs at the Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf. The end result of our efforts will be a written report to the State Planning Office detailing the strengths of the academic and residential programs as well as areas of needed attention. Specific recommendations for the future will be provided.

A team of three professionals are at the Academy for the Deaf during October 21, 22 and 23. On October 22 we have scheduled an evening meeting for parents. Because some of you may not have been contacted about the meeting (our request for a meeting arrived late) we are providing you an opportunity to express your concerns in writing. If you would like, please forward your comments to:

Dr. Frank R. Zieziula
Professor & Chairman
Department of Counseling
Gallaudet College
Kendall Green
Washington, DC 20002

We would ask that we receive your comments by November 1. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Frank R. Zieziula in cursive.

Frank R. Zieziula, Ph.D.
Professor & Chairman
Department of Counseling
Gallaudet College

Handwritten signature of Gerald A. Nelson in cursive.

Gerald A. Nelson
Executive Director
Minnesota Foundation for
Better Hearing and Speech

Handwritten signature of James L. Collins in cursive.

James L. Collins, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Clinical Training
Department of Human Services
Ohio State University

Appendix E

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Minnesota Department of Education Annual Work Plan for July, 1985 to June, 1986
2. Residence Hall Semi-Independent Level Assessment Schedule
3. General Administration Regulations: Residential Academies Philosophy
4. Residential Schools Organizational Chart
5. Residential Academies Functional Chart
6. Student Activities of Daily Living Rating Form
7. Semi-Independent Living Program Description
8. Minnesota State Academy for the Deaf Weekly Calendars
9. State of Minnesota Levels of Service to Handicapped Children Paper
10. Report on The Implications of Closing Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School and Minnesota School for the Deaf (Residential Schools) by Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Education
11. Charts on Post-Secondary and Employment Placements of DVR Deaf Clients from 1976-1982
12. Minnesota Academy for the Deaf Brochure
13. Personnel Policy: Comprehensive Development System 84-85
14. Conference Committee Report on H.F. No. 282: A bill for an act relating to education; declaring the mission of public elementary and secondary education in Minnesota; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 120.
15. Volume 1, Nos. 1-6 of The Trojan Times
16. Graduate Questionnaire Result from Classes 1965 thru 1984
17. Minnesota Academy Communication Philosophy

18. Individual Educational Plan
19. Teacher Performance Appraisal Form
20. Minnesota School for the Deaf Student Evaluation Form
21. Fairbault Residential Schools Financial and Compliance Audit Report on the Year ended June 30, 1984
22. Evaluation of the Minnesota School for the Deaf and The Minnesota Braille and Sight - Saving School Report of January 4, 1984
23. "Here's What's Happening" Newsletters
24. Random Sampling of Student Files
25. Random Sampling of Teacher Personnel Files
26. General Administration Handbook of Policies and Procedures
27. Recommendations from Sign Communication Proficiency Interview Training Workshop: MSAD, October, 1985
28. Result of Math Curriculum Workshop, August, 1985
29. MSAD High School Curriculum and Course Outline
30. MSAD Elementary Curriculum and Course Outline
31. MSAD Registration Course Guide, May 1, 1985

Appendix F

INTERVIEWS WITH PERSONNEL

1. Sally Kramer, Librarian (Zieziula)
2. Carol Dierksen, Elementary Principal (Zieziula, Nelson)
3. Mary Ann Thompson, Residence Director of Girls' Dorm (Zieziula)
4. Adrian Hagen, Residence Hall Director, Boys' Dorm (Zieziula)
5. Carl Johnson, Superintendent (Zieziula, Collins, Nelson)
6. Dave Rohm, Coordinator of Curriculum Review (Zieziula, Nelson)
7. Erv Schultz, Substitute Teacher (Nelson, Zieziula)
8. Greg Waddick, Assistant Superintendent (Zieziula, Nelson)
9. Linda Gallea, Interpreter/Instructor (Zieziula, Nelson)
10. Mike Lockner, Recreational Program Assistant (Zieziula)
11. Ed Nagy, Secondary School Principal (Nelson, Collins, Zieziula)
12. Eunice Jacobs, Teacher (Zieziula)
13. Coleen Wieck, Director State Planning Agency (Nelson, Collins, Zieziula)
14. Kathy Wente, Residence Hall Leader (Collins, Zieziula)
15. Paula Matthews, Teacher (Nelson)
16. Ernest DeLuca, Teacher (Nelson)
17. Colin McAdam, Assistant Superintendent (Nelson, Collins, Zieziula)
18. Cathy Phillops, Media Specialist (Nelson)
19. Kitri Larson, Mainstreaming Coordinator (Nelson)

20. Kathy Sandberg, Teacher (Nelson)
 21. Pat Maday, Outreach Coordinator (Nelson)
 22. Corrine Peterson, Teacher (Nelson)
 23. Jim Potter, Counselor (Collins)
 24. Al Hoekstra, Psychologist (Collins)
 25. Howard Walker, Psychologist (Collins)
 26. Reg Kennedy, Secretary to Audiologist (Collins)
 27. Max Carter, Dean Of Students (Collins)
 28. Josephine Matthies, Residence Staff (Collins)
 29. Cathy Chambers, Residence Hall Staff (Collins)
 30. Audrey Sand, Residence Hall Staff (Collins)
-