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DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to Martha Anne Houg, who, in her belief that the project's goals and the work of its participants could be enhanced if those involved knew each other on an informal basis, dedicated herself to participating, planning, organizing, and hosting informal social activities associated with the project. In her own special way, she became a cherished and indispensable part of the team.
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The author makes no claim to have included everything and everyone. However, the responsibility for any flagrant omissions or unintended inaccuracies is, of course, the author's. The vagaries of selective documentation and occasional hazy recall are difficult to avoid. Those who helped in unnoticed and unseen ways are not unthanked. The "deaf" will always know that many fine people--including both hearing and deaf individuals--worked hard to turn their lives toward a future of equal opportunity with the hearing world.

There evolved a moment that was right for this idea to surface. It was at the Riverside meeting of the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf in April 1964. And the right people were there to recognize its significance. (Winalski) Forsythe was there at the beginning, started this important project on its way, and kept it moving. She was responsible for getting people on Capitol Hill interested, and convincing them that a National Technical Institute for the Deaf program was needed. Rep. Hugh Carey, Rep. John Fogarty, and Sen. Lister Hill introduced the legislation and helped get it passed. Forsythe, in a magnificent and bold effort, took the lead in investigating the need for the project. He convinced members of Congress that a true need existed and that the program should be supported and overseen by the government. Silverman contributed more than anyone to shaping the blueprint for the NTID.

The NAB was a team of exceptionally fine citizens with enormous intellectual capacity for analysis and evaluation. They brought education, experience, wisdom, and determination to their task of selecting a home for the NTID. They were in the forefront of the effort. They completed their task on schedule and with distinction.

In the more than 20 years since its establishment, NTID's achievements have amply demonstrated that the noble intent and the work that brought it to reality constituted an investment whose dividends shall enrich the lives of deaf people everywhere. It is a powerful statement to the world, including, most importantly, deaf persons themselves, that, given the opportunity, deaf people can achieve and accomplish.

From the author's perspective, and with great hindsight, a sense exists that we knew we had a good idea, and we thought it would work if we put it in the right place with the right people. We did and it did. I'm grateful and a little proud.

Ralph L. Hoag
1989
PREFACE

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) is one of nine colleges of Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) in Rochester, New York. NTID is designed to offer deaf students education in the setting of a larger postsecondary institution for hearing students. The programs at NTID prepare deaf students for employment in business, education, government, and industry.

NTID utilizes all the resources of its parent institution, thus allowing deaf students, with assistance where needed, to study or learn in any of RIT's multifaceted array of technological programs. All RIT degree programs, from associate through bachelor's and master's degree levels, are open to qualified deaf students.

On June 8, 1965, with these remarks, President Lyndon Baines Johnson established NTID under Public Law 89-36:

_This institution will help to meet the needs of hundreds of deaf young people, both students and adults, who want to be and can be trained for various technical occupations and placed in very useful careers. Deafness is not and need not be regarded as the handicap that men thought it was in the past. Given the opportunity to learn and to prepare themselves, the deaf can fill a wide array of useful and important positions in industry and professions throughout our society._
FOREWORD

by
Dr. William R. Castle
Director
National Technical Institute for the Deaf

Although, in terms of serving young deaf people, NTID is only 21 years old, the incredible story of this Institute began decades earlier, when the idea was first proposed in the 1930s. It wasn't until the early 1960s that the idea truly went from dream to reality.

The dedication and vision of a select group of individuals concerned with the future of education for deaf people in our country, combined with the enthusiasm and perseverance of a National Advisory Board formed by the government and supported by a small staff, made the dream come true. Dr. Ralph Hoag was part of that dream.

From his very personal roots as the child of deaf parents, through his educational journeys that led him to Gallaudet College, the Rome School for the Deaf, the Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind, and then on to his position as head of the federal government's NTID Special Staff Office, Dr. Hoag has devoted his entire professional career to promoting educational opportunities for deaf persons. After his tenure on the NTID Project, he became superintendent of the Rochester School for the Deaf and later of the Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind.

When he first approached me about documenting the history of the establishment of NTID, I applauded his initiative and encouraged his methods. After months of information-gathering from living National Advisory Board members and others whose lives were touched by the "NTID Project," Dr. Hoag has compiled a masterful account of those incredible years.

This report represents the first part of a more complete history of NTID that I hope will be written someday. We at NTID are grateful to Dr. Hoag for preparing this publication in concert with NTID's 20th anniversary year, and we are pleased that it can now be shared, particularly with those persons who played the roles described herein.
NTID

Because it heard the silence of the heart
Its destiny was daring from the start
Beginning with a searching eye whose gleam
Envisioned new worlds for his kind,
It gathered to a great crusading cause
Whose faithful followers held high the torch
For *faït lux* and all the world to see.

NTID! Its time and tide had come
To integrate the hearing and the deaf
In kindred studies on a common campus,
Each learning from the other an awareness
Of human needs, of unfulfilled desires,
Of breaching the diverse wall of silence
And bridging the communication gap.

And theirs became the challenge and the charge
To mingle with the mainstream and to master
Their little fears and hang-ups and prejudices—
Not to belittle but be big of heart.
And from the experience in their vestibule
Where stand the many ports of destiny,
Embark upon their chosen odyssey.

Meaning so many things to these our people,
Today we pledge to dedicate anew
The dreamers and the dream they kept alive,
The spirit and the spur of "New Frontiers,"
The promise of the "Great Society"—
Our *open sesame* at R.I.T.!

Robert F. Panara *

* Reprinted with permission.
AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

This story began for me at birth. My parents were deaf and I was not. I grew up in that special universe of deaf people and, as it turns out, served most of my professional lifetime educating deaf people. I know well their ordeal in coping with family, environment, community, and society. I identify with their continual struggle for a rightful share of the opportunities that exist in our society through education and career development. The establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) was a significant turning point in efforts “to free and be freed from the shackles of ignorance and prejudice.” I am privileged to have lived within the problem, to have seen the trends and changes occur, and to have played a part in the solution. It is from this perspective that I tell the NTID story.

In many ways, what happened in my family relates directly to the theme of this report. My mother, Glenn Flora Axtell, was deafened at 18 months, the aftermath of cholera; my father, Mahlon Everett Hoag, was deaf from age 2, a result of scarlet fever. During my childhood, our home was mostly silent. Mother and Father chose not to use their voices during my early years, thus preventing me from imitating what they believed to be their incorrect and improper speech sounds. In this way, they hoped to avert difficulties for me in developing my own verbal skills. I heard my first verbal sounds from my grandmother during her occasional visits. My parents held to the same principles of maintaining verbal silence throughout my sister’s early years. From the beginning, they used sign language and fingerspelling to communicate with us. They enjoyed recalling their school experiences, sharing with my sister and me their most intimate feelings about those times. We learned what educating deaf people was like in the years around the turn of the century.

Both my mother and father attended the Minnesota State School for the Deaf, which served children who were deaf or who had serious hearing impairments. My parents attended as residents. The school year was long and trips home were infrequent. When they went home, they had difficulty communicating with their hearing parents, brothers, and sisters, who lacked the knowledge to communicate.
effectively with them. Only their friends in school really understood them, and consequently, most of their closest school friends were veritable family.

Mother's education was less unpleasant than Father's. She graduated from the Minnesota State School for the Deaf. Although her speech skills were poor, she was a good student in most academic subjects.

Father was bright, mischievous, enterprising, and defensive. Although he lost most of his hearing at the age of 2, he may have retained some small amount that helped him during his early years at school. At the time, electronic amplification, or hearing aids for use in schools, did not exist. By the time he was 7 or 8 years old, he was placed in an orphanage among people who knew nothing about deafness. He came from a broken family that was too poverty stricken to care much about the whereabouts, safety, or life of this small deaf child. Often he longed for school to start so that he could be back with friends who understood.

Since my father was small for his age, he learned early from the orphanage environment how to survive under extraordinary circumstances. Because conditions necessitated that he provide for his own financial independence, he conducted many enterprises and activities to satisfy this need. A survivor and hustler from the start, he shined shoes on the streets whenever he could and maintained a concession in his locker at school for selling candies and snacks. He developed, and held into later life, an unwavering resolve to seek justice for himself and for his closest friends.

My father's early years in school were pleasurable and exciting. Later, however, he became bored with his teachers' preoccupation with training in speech and lipreading, which he felt was overemphasized at the expense of a more informative curriculum. Working repeatedly with elementary mathematics, reading, and writing appeared to be the whole curriculum. My father believed that the school did not offer subjects with more substance and interest because such courses were difficult to teach to deaf students. Without sign language and fingerspelling.

Because few teachers could communicate well in sign language and all instruction was oral, my father had difficulty learning. The philosophy of his school, and of most schools during the 1890s, was that subject matter should be taught through speech and lipreading. The use of signs and fingerspelling was tolerated only in some shop classes, in sports, in the residence halls, and outside of school activities.

During that period, many schools used the oral approach exclusively throughout the student environment. Some schools did this well because the teachers had the ability to develop in their students an appreciation of the value of good speech skills for participation in community and social activities. My father's school experiences were negative—he disliked what his teachers and school offered the older students.

For the older boys in my father's school, their shop work was the most interesting part of the curriculum. It seemed to promise a way toward securing employment. My father recalled little career counseling, and job placement was unheard of. Although parents frequently undertook the counseling role, they were ill equipped to do it. Usually parents, like others, underestimated the capabilities of deaf people and, characteristically, deaf people were underemployed with respect to their true potential. The poor and those without parents had to fend for themselves and find employment on their own. For my father, going to college was unheard of and financially out of the question even if it was possible. He decided to drop out of school and look for work.
A few years after leaving school, he and Mother were married. He was a mill hand to start, a printer later, and then a candy store entrepreneur. With two children during the Depression, my parents struggled. The family moved to New York when a chance for a job opened. He became an assembly line machine operator, a printer, and later a machinist. His mechanical abilities were recognized by his employer, International Business Machines Corporation (IBM). He retired from IBM in 1955.

As a leader in community organizations for deaf people, my father helped establish a social center on a shoestring budget. He did much of the painting and construction work himself. Our home always seemed to be open to all deaf people and friends needing help.

My parents achieved much and helped many. Their story suggests a central theme of the NTID story: talented deaf people are as potentially productive as their hearing counterparts, but without benefit of comparable educational opportunities, they must struggle to approach their potential.

I was privileged to have been a part of this family and to know of my parents' hopes, desires, disappointments, and successes firsthand. I was never far from a great many other deaf persons with unfulfilled talents. I had observed, lived with, and experienced through associations with the byproducts of schools, that there existed major problems in our nation's educational system for deaf people. I was to remember how different it could have been if even a little organized counseling and quality school assistance had been available. Eventually, this perception led me to a career in the field of education and, later, to the teaching profession for deaf students.

After receiving an undergraduate degree in 1947 from Hartwick College in Oneonta, I taught at the Central New York School for the Deaf in Rome, New York. I later enrolled at Gallaudet College to pursue a master of science degree in teaching. I returned to the Rome School for the Deaf, where I remained for three years. In 1951, I accepted an administrative position at the Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind in Tucson. I later served as principal of two departments at that school. Having earned my doctorate in education while at Arizona, my next venture was a position in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, where I served as a specialist in programs for deaf persons. Eventually, our group became the Division for Handicapped Children.

Finally, in 1965, I became staff director of the special staff appointed to administer Public Law 89-36, providing for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. And this is where the story begins.
ENDNOTES

1. The term "deaf" as used in this report includes individuals who are deaf or seriously hearing impaired and who, in communicating with others, depend primarily on visual cues for comprehension.

2. The term "Turning Point" (in singular form) in this context, was first used by the prominently known historian of the education of the deaf, Edward Scouten, who gave the title "Turning Points" to his 1983 publication on the history of the education of the deaf. In the preface of his book, he stated:

   Education of the deaf through the ages has been marked by a great number of significant turning points. Each of these has proven to be a testimony to the determination of the human spirit in its effort to free and be freed from the shackles of ignorance and prejudice. These 'turning points' and their lines of influence are the concern of this presentation.

   The NTID story was cited by Scouten as one of these significant turning points and is used here to characterize what took place during the 1960s.

3. The National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) in Rochester, New York, is a college of Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). The Institute was designed to serve deaf students by providing technical education for them in the setting of a larger institution with hearing students. The programs within NTID/RIT prepare students for employment in business, education, government, and industry.
This report traces the formation of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) from the time that the need for federal assistance to deaf and hearing-impaired people was perceived to the formation of NTID in 1966.

Presented is evidence verifying a mandate from deaf and hearing-impaired people, and from the people who worked with them, to pursue the task of informing and urging the Congress to assume responsibility for providing assistance.

Examined at length is the conviction held by professional educators that a model alternative higher educational program was needed in the technical fields. Those educators believed that the program should be equipped and staffed to educate deaf and hearing-impaired people and to help them find employment in the technical fields. This report examines alternative views and provides a detailed review of the needs discussed and of the options for satisfying them.

This report also provides a historical record of how the idea of establishing a national program came to fruition. Included are discussions of the events leading to the legislation, funding, and appointments of staff members and people to serve on the National Advisory Board (NAB)—a responsibility of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The detailed activities of the NAB provide a historical reference and highlight the effectiveness of the staff members in completing their task. Included are discussions of hearings, meetings, and deliberations involved in developing guidelines, reviewing applications, visiting contesting sites, and selecting the preferred site.

The report includes a summary of the legislative history of the project and complete references to information available in the Archives and Special Collections Room of Rochester Institute of Technology's Wallace Memorial Library.
PRINCIPAL INDIVIDUALS

*Dorothy Appel
Office of the General Counsel for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW). Appel was appointed by the DHEW to provide legal assistance to the National Advisory Board (NAB) on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID).

Robert Baird
Department Head, Electronics Department, Oregon Technical Institute, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Baird was a member of the NAB.

Martin Burke
Vice President for Industrial Relations, United Aircraft Corporation, East Hartford, Connecticut. Burke was a member of the NAB.

Rep. Hugh Carey
Chairman of the House Ad Hoc Committee for the Handicapped. Carey was the author of the House NTID Bill and director of legislative activities concerning the Bill in the House of Representatives.

*Dr. Wilbur Cohen
Under Secretary of the Department of Health Education and Welfare. Cohen was responsible for activities of the offices of the deputy assistant secretary for Legislation and the NTID project.

*Philip Des Marais
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health Education and Welfare. Des Marais was initially responsible for the operation of the NTID project office.

Dr. Mark Ellingson
President of Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). Ellingson was responsible for responding to local appeal for RIT to bid for sponsorship of the NTID project, and then directed the RIT application effort to win institutional sponsorship of the project.

Rep. John E. Fogarty
Chairman of the House Education and Labor Appropriations Committee. Fogarty was co-author of the House NTID Bill.

John Forsythe
General Counsel for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Forsythe was responsible for all legislative activity concerning the NTID Bill in the Senate.
Sen. Lister Hill
Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hill was author of the NTID Bill in the Senate.

Dr. Ralph Hoag
Staff Director, Special Staff for the Establishment of the NTID.

President Lyndon B. Johnson
President of the United States. Johnson was personally interested in the project since its origin in government and was a frequent and important participant who followed its progress from beginning to end through the Congress, the department, the National Advisory Board, and finally to his desk, where he signed the bill into law.

*D'Alan Huff
Superintendent of Hamilton Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio. Huff was a member of the Special Staff for the NTID project.

Dr. Edward Keller
Vice President for Public Affairs, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania. Keller was a member of the NAB.

Dr. Samuel Kirk
Director of the Institute for Research on Exceptional Children at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Kirk was Chairman and a member of the NAB.

Dr. Edgar Lowell
Director of the John Tracy Clinic for the Deaf in Los Angeles, California. Lowell was a special consultant to the NAB.

*Dr. Paul Miller
Assistant Secretary for Education of Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Miller was given responsibility for the NTID project and Special Staff activities by DHEW Secretary John Gardener in July 1966. He later became president of RIT.

John O'Marra
Assistant Administrative Officer, Manufacturing Division, Western Electric Co., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. O'Marra was a member of the NAB.

James Orman
Principal of the Vocational Department of the Illinois School for the Deaf, Jacksonville, Illinois. Orman, who was deaf, served as special consultant to the NAB.

Robert Panara
Faculty member at Gallaudet College and member of the first NAB. Panara later became the first deaf professor at RIT, host institution of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Gustave Rathe, Jr.
Director of Education, International Business Machines Corp., Armonk, New York. Rathe was a member of the NAB, and became chairman in July 1966 when Dr. Kirk resigned.

Dr. Hugo Schunhoff
Superintendent of the California School for the Deaf in Berkeley, California. Schunhoff was a member of the NAB.
Hettie Shumway
Member of the Boards of Trustees of RIT and the Rochester School for the Deaf. Shumway, after hearing about the NTID legislation, urged the president of RIT to apply and later rallied support of the RIT Board for the project.

Dr. Richard Silverman
President, Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, Missouri. Silverman was a member of the NAB.

*Hon. Mary Switzer
Commissioner of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (VRA) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Switzer was an ex-officio member of the NAB.

Eloise Thornberry
Wife of Hon. Homer Thornberry, federal judge and former congressman from Texas. Thornberry was a member of the NAB.

Mrs. Spencer Tracy
President, John Tracy Clinic, Los Angeles, California. Tracy was a member of the NAB.

Sister Agnes Vincent, Ph.D.
Principal, St. Francis de Sales School for the Deaf, Brooklyn, New York. Sr. Vincent was a member of the NAB.

Dr. Boyce Williams
Specialist on deafness in the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Williams, who was deaf, served as a consultant to the NAB and, in DHEW, assisted in the development of a number of aspects of the project.

*Dr. Morvin Wirtz
Director of the Division for Handicapped Children, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Wirtz was appointed ex-officio member of the NAB by the Commissioner of Education.
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Assistant Congressional Liaison Officer for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Winalski, who later married John Forsythe, served as a legislative staff member of the Senate Subcommittee for the Handicapped of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

*Denotes persons whose supportive efforts assisted those involved with the NTID project on a more direct level.
KEY DATES

April 1, 1965
Three identical bills TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF (NTID) are introduced on the floors of both houses of the United States Congress.

May 17, 1965
The NTID Bill is brought up on the floor of the House of Representatives by Rep. Carey for final vote. The Bill is passed unanimously.

May 26, 1965
Sen. Lister Hill does the same in the Senate; the Bill passes unanimously.

June 8, 1965
President Lyndon Johnson conducts a White House signing ceremony in the Rose Garden for the new legislation on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

December 30, 1965
The Department of Health, Education and Welfare invites colleges and universities nationwide to submit letters of application for sponsorship of the NTID project.

July 19-21, 1966
A site visit to Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) is conducted by the National Advisory Board (NAB).

September 30, 1966
A final meeting of the NAB involving the selection of a sponsoring institution for the NTID takes place.

November 14, 1966
The official announcement of the selection of RIT as the sponsoring institution is made by Rep. Carey.

December 20, 1966
A contract signed by Secretary John Gardener awards RIT the right of sponsorship of the NTID project.

February 1, 1967
Dr. Robert Frisina, the first director of NTID, begins his new job.

September 1968
The first class of deaf students arrives at NTID.

June 4, 1971
A groundbreaking and dedication ceremony of the first building for the new NTID takes place in Rochester, New York.
CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

In the early 1960s, deaf children lacked the right kind of education for useful positions in business, industry, education, or government. This unfortunate situation existed not only in the United States, but throughout the world as well.

Up to and during the early 1960s, most programs to educate deaf children—including deaf young adults—were located in public and private residential schools. In 1960, 70 or more schools served about 60 percent of all deaf students. The other 40 percent were in special programs and classes associated with or located in public schools for hearing students.¹

In 1965, the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DOE) reported 37,000 deaf or severely hearing-impaired school-aged children, about 30,000 of whom were registered in known educational programs for deaf children. Of that 30,000, 59 percent were enrolled in public or private residential programs, and 41 percent in special classes or day school programs for deaf students in regular public schools throughout the country. Approximately 7,000 were integrated or involved in regular classes in schools for hearing students that lacked supportive services.²

Educators and government agencies were making efforts to improve the programs while schools were struggling to find ways to better satisfy the needs of deaf students. The Arizona State School for the Deaf and the Blind, where Hoag served as principal, did a good job in the early academic years teaching subject matter, developing speech skills, teaching lipreading, providing athletic activities, and developing social skills. Many schools had come a long way toward becoming more interesting, enjoyable, and productive.

Even with this good foundation, students were ill-equipped after high school to face the rapidly increasing complexity of the 20th century. Realizing this, the Arizona school, as well as others, revised its curriculum to meet the challenge. Practical job hunting, job holding, and work experience programs; sex and family development studies; first aid training; driver education; independent living programs; supervised part-time employment, and occupational sampling experiences were added. Education at the so-called high school level, however, continued to be mostly elementary and junior high school-level work, and vocational offerings led the majority of graduates
toward entry-level manual employment. Bright and academically talented students had few options for continuing their education into postsecondary programs.

College-bound students were schooled for enrollment into Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C.—the only institution of higher education, at that time, that offered specially designed programs for deaf students. For the most part, Gallaudet, which then enrolled 450 students, offered a liberal arts program and was limited in its offerings in other areas. An additional small number of students were enrolled in conventional colleges and universities, though secondary schools for deaf students generally were not preparing students for postsecondary education. This combined enrollment was far less than would have been possible, had a more purposeful high school preparation had been provided.

The postsecondary options for deaf students were not increasing as they were for hearing students. Of the many community and junior colleges starting all over the country, only one offered special programs and services to encourage deaf student enrollment. Furthermore, sending deaf students to these schools was not considered feasible by many schools. The one move into this community environment for postsecondary education was made in California by Riverside City College in cooperation with the California School for the Deaf in Riverside. Dr. Richard Brill, superintendent of the California school, was primarily responsible for this truly pioneering effort.

Educators and administrators of programs for deaf students throughout the country were dissatisfied with the lack of advanced vocational and technical education available to graduates of their schools. These concerns were deliberated regularly at meetings and conventions. In 1960, the Council on Education of the Deaf was established through the leadership of three organizations: the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf (A.G. Bell); the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf (CAID); and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (CEASD). The latter was later renamed the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf. The Council was established to coordinate issues of common concern and agreement in order to promote public understanding, to sponsor and promote international professional meetings, and to work together on federal legislation.

Individuals within the CEASD at large and within its committee structure began to formalize their concerns about the education and training of young deaf adults. The consensus was that these young adults were inadequately prepared to compete for satisfactory employment. For the most part, opportunities to train in the professions and in advanced technical programs were almost completely out of the question.

In the early 1960s, CEASD began to advocate the establishment of "regional centers" to provide advanced vocational or technical education and training to deaf residents of several contiguous states. They approached Congress through contacts with legislators in their respective states. Although Rep. Wilbur Mills of Arkansas emerged as a possible CEASD supporter in Congress, efforts were disappointing.

In 1964, the federal government undertook a study to determine the status of education of deaf persons in the United States. DHEW Secretary Anthony Celebrezze, in response to a Congressional Act, appointed a special Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf, with Dr. Homer Babbidge as chairman, to conduct an in-depth study of the field. The Babbidge report was completed in March 1965.
At the time, the Babbidge committee study was viewed as somewhat annoying to professionals and educators in the field. Congress' call for this study was partly a reaction to the confusion created by individual organizations in the field approaching Congress separately for support of favorite projects. Within the field, communication and coordination among concerned organizations serving the deaf were lacking. The early effort by the CEASI to get Congressional support for the formation of "regional vocational schools" was delayed, pending the Babbidge Committee findings. But early feedback from the committee did help with the NTID project.

The Babbidge report made it clear to Congress and the public that:

The American people have no reason to be satisfied with their limited success in educating deaf children and preparing them for full participation in our society.... The average graduate of a public residential school for the deaf...has an eighth grade education. Seniors at Gallaudet College...rank close to the bottom in performance on Graduate Records Examinations. Five-sixths of our deaf adults work in manual jobs, as contrasted to only one-half of our hearing population.

An important element regarding this problem was the number of deaf students who, in the early 1960s, were thought to be integrated or enrolled in regular schools without support services provided by special schools for deaf students. The Office of Education, DOE, speculated that about 7,000 students were so engaged. Unknown was the number who were successful or who might have been with special help.

One resource to estimate the number of deaf individuals enrolled in institutions of higher education was the 1955 Bigman study, which reported 65 deaf individuals in attendance. Some successful deaf people were probably not available to be surveyed; there may have been more.

The Volta Review, a major publication of A.G. Bell, reported annually during the 1950s and 1960s the number of deaf people in institutions of higher education. In 1966, the Association reported 30 students attending colleges for hearing people.

Within this category, there abound examples of what some determined and exceptional deaf people had done. The National Association of the Deaf, in its publication, The Deaf American, cites many examples of exceptional deaf people who have succeeded in a variety of professions. Over the years, Volta Review has reported the successes of deaf adults in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and the arts.

Dr. Richard Silverman, director of the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, Missouri, describes the problem:

A young child who has a severe hearing loss, acquired at birth or before the normal age for learning language, has a serious educational disability. Every attempt has been made by educators of the deaf to accelerate the acquisition of reading, language, and communication skills by deaf children. For the most part, the objective has been to teach the basic language and communication skills well enough at the elementary level so that these children can continue their academic education or pursue vocational training in our colleges, universities, and vocational training facilities for hearing students.
Philosophically, this goal appears reasonable. Many educators have believed that this kind of preparation is the best way for deaf children to become full participants socially and economically in a hearing world. Numerous individual success stories can be and have been produced to support this theory. Nonetheless, the facts reveal that for the general deaf population this has not been achieved.

Most residential schools for the deaf offer programs that provide the equivalent of an eighth grade education. Few specialized day school programs go beyond this level. Students desiring more are expected to enroll in hearing high schools and vocational schools for hearing students. This is a commendable objective, and its practice should be encouraged whenever and wherever possible. However, because of the serious communication problem involved, a relatively small percentage of these children can communicate well enough to do this.12

The Babbidge report indicated that, collectively, existing programs were ineffective in educating deaf children and preparing them to participate in society. Many of us had spent most of our lives trying to achieve exactly what the study indicated was a failure. We did the best we could with this fragmented educational structure and limited resources. We were not operating with the organizational advantage of a national educational system. But we worked hard on our objective— that our students would find work, succeed in the working world, and find rewarding places in society.

Until the 1960s, school vocational programs mostly focused on the development of basic manipulative skills in auto mechanics, baking, cabinet making, kitchen work, laundry work, photography, printing, sewing, shoe repair, and woodworking. Most of the training was "hands on." Students who had advanced reading skills or who showed special interest in advanced work were given principles and theory. At this time, vocational training consisted of exposing students to the basic functions in a job-related area; showing them how to operate basic machinery in the area; and continuing this long enough to provide the fundamentals necessary for entry level employment in that area.

Some high schools offered basic introductory work that might be considered technical. Such work required academic or text information about the subject before entering into the "production" or "hands on" aspects of the activity. Examples of this were typing, accounting, operation of business machines, drafting and engineering drawing, the use of equipment to produce and reproduce drawings used in a variety of industrial activities, and computer science.

Training in many other technical areas was not generally available to deaf students, although it was available to the general public in public and private schools, junior colleges, and technical schools across the country. Such programs included accounting, dental science in prosthetics, engineering drawing, optics, and advanced photography. Efforts to include deaf people in these programs, except in a few isolated cases, were nonexistent. Understandably, special schools for deaf students could not afford to duplicate, for their comparatively small enrollments, the technical equipment and staff provided in schools for hearing children.
The fundamental challenge of the early 1960s was to give deaf students both the resources and the help they needed to do the required work. To further complicate the problem, many educators doubted that deaf students could succeed in areas of study where the new technologies challenged even the comprehension of hearing students. Some felt that the number of able deaf students likely to qualify was so small that a major effort on their behalf might not be justified. On the other hand, others were certain that large numbers of young deaf people could and would succeed in these advanced and more demanding programs, if given the opportunity.

Deaf people's abilities, like those of their hearing peers, relate to intelligence, determination, and resourcefulness. In the 1950s and 1960s, however, an intolerable difference existed in their opportunity to be educated - given the technical (mechanical) barriers of deafness. A need existed to design programs for talented deaf students to bridge this barrier. At that time, only a few exceptional students successfully broke from the mold. With adequate help in educational preparation, special programming, and supportive assistance, many more students might have found the way.
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CHAPTER II

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

In the early 1960s, educators, government agencies, and interested individuals sought ways to correct the disparity between postsecondary education for deaf students and the opportunities available to their hearing peers.

These efforts aimed to find ways to meet the educational needs of the nation's deaf young people and adults who had the desire and ability for technical, vocational training that could lead to placement in useful careers. These efforts were based on the belief that, given the opportunity to learn, deaf people could fill an array of useful, important positions in the workforce and society.

Among other things, deaf students needed help in two related, sometimes overlapping, categories of educational opportunity.

First, a significant increase in postsecondary vocational training was needed for deaf students with the desire and ability for the kind of trade-related schooling that was available to hearing students in community and junior colleges. The focus of this category would be to develop basic manipulative skills within a broad assortment of useful occupations, including baking, building, carpentry, food service, heavy equipment operation, maintenance, mechanics, photography, plumbing, printing, shoe repair, sewing, and woodworking. Significantly, expanding the vocational training was feasible without major adjustments to ongoing educational techniques. The solution centered on financing and on devising ways to bring student and facility together.

Second, a universal technical educational opportunity for deaf students had to be created, organized, funded, and provided. The focus of this second category would be to equip deaf students with technical knowledge and specific skills and attitudes pertinent to the professions. They would enjoy the same learning that hearing students receive in institutions of higher education.

Hearing students had access to many educational opportunities leading to useful, important careers, but by the eighth grade, education for deaf students followed a different course. The system was designed to produce students who, by this point, could communicate well enough to join their hearing peers in school as equals. The system worked for some, but most could not communicate well enough to do this.
Consequently, most deaf people had little or no opportunity for the kinds of education open to hearing students.

The rationale for this approach was that deaf students could overcome their communication "burden" if a universal conduit of educational opportunity anchored in the secondary program and reaching the university system existed. Primarily, it would equip deaf students with the technical knowledge and skills needed to join their hearing counterparts in studying for positions in the professions, business, industry, education, or government. Along the way, special help would be needed for those who wanted or needed to pursue other choices.

In the early 1960s, educators of deaf persons understood that their students needed new educational opportunities in all areas and at all levels. They realized that one specific program could not do it all, and that they would have to make difficult decisions about where to start. Therein were legitimate differences of viewpoint and approach.

The most notable methods discussed by educators were embodied in these possible solutions:

- Establish a series of regionally located schools designed to provide both vocational and technical programs.
- Add enough staff members and resources to the vocational and technical programs already available to the general public so that deaf students could be included.
- Establish one model program affiliated with a university or technical institute that would prepare students for entry into the technical programs offered at the parent institution.
- If successful, duplicate the model elsewhere.
- Do all of the above.

One of the ideas urged by CEASD proposed the establishment of regional centers to provide advanced vocational training or technical education specifically for deaf people in a region of contiguous states. A formal resolution on this subject was presented to congressional contacts by CEASD members. In 1963, since Congress had not responded to these efforts, CEASD sought the help of DHEW. At that time, Patria Winalski, assistant congressional liaison officer for DHEW, agreed to find out what the Department could do for the group and what chances their proposal would have in Congress.

Winalski’s subsequent report implied that Congress, having had difficulties with other regional projects, would not consider the CEASD proposal. Winalski then recommended the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (OVR), DHEW, with its programs of financial support for research and demonstration projects, as the best source of assistance.1

In early 1964, at a meeting of several educators, a discussion ensued about vocational and technical education for deaf students. Those present included Francis Corrigan of the Office of Education, DHEW; Dr. Edgar Lowell of the John Tracy Clinic in California; Dr. George Pratt, president of the Clarke School for the Deaf in Massachusetts; Dr. Hugo Schunhoff of the California School for the Deaf in Berkeley; Winalski; and Hoag. A possible solution emerged—the idea of a single national facility to serve as a model for higher technical education. If successful, the existing vocational and technical schools for hearing students, and junior colleges as well,
might develop smaller but similar support programs to include deaf students. Although the idea was broad and general, it was a start.²

In April 1964, Winalski and Hoag explored this idea with participants at the CEASD conference at Riverside School, and by the end of the conference, a resolution was passed to endorse the national concept.

The idea received further support when Hoag presented it in October 1964 to the National Workshop on Improved Opportunities in Knoxville.

In addition, Winalski used her contacts on Capitol Hill to investigate possibilities of getting congressional support for such a project. She succeeded in interesting Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama and eventually interested staff members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (SCLW).

Forsythe, general counsel to the Committee, agreed to pursue legislative feasibility of such a project and asked Charles Lee, staff director of the Subcommittee on Education of the SCLW, to conduct a separate, independent study of the idea.³

To collect information on this proposal, Forsythe in September 1964 organized a Conference on Technical and Vocational Education for the Deaf, to which he invited concerned members of the CEASD and members of other organizations serving deaf people.

In attendance at the meeting, which was held in Washington D.C., were the following:⁴

- Kathleen Arneson, special assistant, Office of the Commissioner, OVR, DHEW
- Dr. Edmund Boatner, superintendent, American School for the Deaf, West Hartford, Connecticut
- Charlotte Coffield, interpreter/administrator, Programs for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, OVR, DHEW
- Francis Corrigan, research assistant, Programs for the Deaf, Office of Education, DHEW
- Dr. George Detmold, dean of Gallaudet College
- John Forsythe, general counsel, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
- Dr. William Geer, executive director, Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Washington, D.C.
- John Gonzales, specialist in the office of the Coordinator of Programs for the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing, OVR, DHEW
- Dr. Marshall Hester, superintendent, New Mexico School for the Deaf
- Dr. Harriet Kopp, director, Detroit Day School for the Deaf
- Peter Muirhead, Office of Higher Education, Office of Education, DHEW
- Roy Parks, superintendent, Arkansas School for the Deaf
- Dr. George Pratt, president, Clarke School for the Deaf, conference chairman
- Chester F. Relyea, Office of Education, DHEW
- Dr. Boyce Williams, coordinator of Programs for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, OVR, DHEW
- Patria Winalski, assistant Congressional liaison officer, DHEW.

Many of the participants had attended the Riverside and Knoxville meetings and represented a variety of special interests in the field. They included executors and administrators of educational programs, representatives of the federal government, and representatives of national organizations working with people with disabilities.
The meeting's purpose was to arm Forsythe with information to present in his quest for congressional support for the program. He was convinced of the need and determined to find the solution.

The first item on the agenda was a CRASD resolution that had been framed at the April 1964 meeting in Riverside, California, and had been presented to members of Congress earlier in the year. The resolution:

...urgently requested the Congress of the United States to make provisions for the establishment of technical and vocational facilities for the deaf to prepare deaf youth to utilize fully their abilities and skills in the increasingly complex world to make their rightful contribution to the Nation.6

During the early part of the conference, much of the discussion focused on the status of the education of deaf children in the United States. Additionally, the conferees speculated on how well deaf students would perform in advanced technical programs or higher education in general. Eventually, they agreed on a plan to establish a technical education facility for deaf students on a par with the current liberal arts program at Gallaudet College.

The conference then narrowed its discussion to the development of more specific recommendations:

_It was the consensus of the conferees that an attempt should be made to conduct a study initiated by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare through Congress authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to appoint a representative committee to make a study and submit recommendations to Congress concerning the establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf._6

On October 14, 1964, Forsythe convened a small group to discuss the recommendations from the September 21 meeting. Attending were Corrigan, Silverman, Winalski, and Hoag.

Silverman was asked for his reactions to the results of that meeting. An administrator, educator, lecturer, researcher, and scholar, Silverman was held in high regard by his colleagues, government officials, and medical, scientific, and educational researchers. For these reasons, Forsythe asked him to become involved.

Silverman stated that a technical education facility for deaf students was needed, but that further documentation of the need would be a key factor in the success of any such project that might be proposed.

When participants at the meeting discussed aspects to consider in planning such an institution, Silverman suggested several points:7

- The need to do a better job of documenting the need. Such considerations as "assessment of the prospective clientele's educational achievement level, language ability, reading and communication skills, and intelligence levels would be important in determining the character of the institute as well as the potential number of candidates," according to Silverman.
The need to explore the possibility of a relationship with a higher educational institution. He felt that management of a program in this kind of setting would be important to the success of such an institute. He believed that current trends and statistics made a strong case for locating the institute in an urban setting. Criteria for selection of the location were outlined as follows:

- The trend is for people to make their living in urban areas.
- The many diverse occupational categories in urban areas offer potential training and apprenticeships as well as eventual job opportunities.
- The community chosen should be one that would be receptive to this type of program. Representative community leaders serving on a board or advisory panel could be invaluable to the institute.
- An accessible, central location should be sought.
- A university and its numerous ancillary services must be available to support various aspects of the program, its planning, and the educational placement of students.

Silverman believed that the institute's size also would be an important factor. Such things as teacher/student ratio, and, the availability of ancillary personnel in the university and community should be important considerations.

Although Silverman obviously favored university affiliation, he cautioned those concerned to meet and resolve the issue. The proposed institute would undoubtedly be a residential facility, thus he suggested consideration be given to socialization, living arrangements, and security.

Because the previous conference had considered vocational and technical programs, Silverman explained his views of the differences between the two. Technical education required a higher level of abstract thinking and judgment than vocational education, he said, and therefore would require more time to acquire. A technical person also would have to spend more time on formal learning. Silverman also believed that the limitations of deafness should be considered when developing programs for the schooling of technical personnel. This would include curriculum planning and development, communication techniques, and support services.

Suggestions were made regarding the proper constitution of a committee to assess the need for a national technical institute for the deaf and to develop its operational blueprint. Individuals sought for the committee were described as follows:

- a person of high caliber who might be described as a "friend of the deaf population"
- two occupationally successful deaf people: one from a residential school background, the other from a mainstreamed educational setting
- a specialist in vocational education of deaf persons
- an expert in technical education who was familiar with trends and projections
- a representative from higher education, possibly the president of a college specializing in community service
- a union official
- a person familiar with the field of compensation law, or a director of personnel or training
- a representative of one of the colleges of applied arts.
The group agreed that a Congressional study committee would be the key to establishing guidelines for a national technical institute for the deaf. Such a committee, it felt, should be initiated during the next session of Congress. 11

At a major national conference on vocational and technical education of deaf people that was sponsored by OVR, DHEW, in Knoxville, Tennessee, the following October, OVR sought input on the proposed national technical institute for the deaf.

Funds were already available as a part of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1963 to meet some of the needs expressed by people in the field. But it was hoped that the conference would answer some of the who, what, where, when, and how questions. This input could help give direction to the OVR people responsible for grants and program support for vocational training and other kinds of rehabilitation services.

Although Forsythe did not attend that conference, he later met with Hester, a recognized educator in this field, and editor of the conference, to discuss what took place and other related issues.

Their meeting in Washington, D.C., in October 1964 also was attended by Winalski, Corrigan, and Haug—the same group that attended Forsythe's earlier meeting. At the Knoxville meeting, there had been general agreement that both vocational and technical education facilities and programs for deaf students were needed and that affiliation of these programs with higher education would be advantageous. A central location and urban setting seemed desirable. Conference in Knoxville proposed the utilization of vocational and technical programs already available with adaptations added for deaf individuals. 12

Communication was cited as perhaps the most difficult problem to be dealt with when using existing institutions for hearing students, along with admission policies and prerequisite requirements. The highly verbal and language-oriented entrance examinations used by such institutions were thought to be disadvantageous to deaf students. In addition, there was the strong possibility that many deaf students might not have taken the prerequisite coursework required by many of these institutions. Consequently, it was seen that, in order to accommodate all the deaf applicants, a double standard for entrance would have to be used.

A major conclusion reached at Knoxville was that, for the most part, schools for deaf students as they were then organized and financed could not adequately prepare students for most of the currently existing vocational opportunities, and the situation was expected to worsen.

Hester felt that a free-standing technical institution would require a study commission to develop an effective program for it. A program affiliated with a university, however, might begin sooner, on a small scale, and possibly without a major oversight or guiding committee. Other ideas to achieve the same goals included expanding the role of Gallaudet College, and contracting with a university with which an institute for deaf students could affiliate. Hester pointed out the necessity for guidance and counseling to a greater extent than was then provided in schools for deaf students. This would be needed, he said, to prepare students for the kinds of careers that this technical education could open up to them. 13

At the end of this meeting, Forsythe agreed to review all the information provided—especially on the subject of technical education for deaf students—in order to determine legislative possibilities. Among other inputs were reports from the September and October meetings and the Knoxville conference.
Meanwhile, another government committee also was studying the topic of educating deaf students. Early in 1964, the secretary of DIHEW had his own investigative committee—the Babbidge Committee—working on the situation. This committee had finished most of its work by October 1964, at about the same time as the previously mentioned work was underway concerning the establishment of a technical institute for the deaf.

The content of the Babbidge report would not be officially available for review until March 1965. When released, the Babbidge Committee's recommendations on postsecondary education for deaf students were somewhat in conflict with what was developed by Forsythe. Forsythe believed that his conferences and the Knoxville conference, held subsequent to the work of the Babbidge Committee—but before the release of its report—were current and provided pertinent information in support of the institute concept.14

Consequently, Forsythe took the lead in preparing legislation. He believed that the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare should support the proposal to establish a technical institute for the deaf. Toward this end, several working conferences were held in November and December 1964, with individuals from DIHEW working on the proposed legislation's wording.

The best solution was being created.
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CHAPTER III

THE CONGRESS LISTENS

Exactly 101 years earlier, during the Lincoln administration, Congress had chartered Gallaudet College, then the only institution in the world providing higher education for deaf students. In the new bill to create a national technical institute for the deaf, Congress once again was sponsoring and overseeing an educational institution for deaf students.

Normally, agencies of the executive branch oversee and administer educational programs. In this case, however, DHEW, the agency by which such programs would logically have been handled, apparently made no effort to assume the role. The successful, long-standing precedent of Gallaudet College reporting directly to Congress may have been the key to Congress accepting direct responsibility in this new legislation.

On April 1, 1965, three identical bills were introduced into the Senate and the House. In the Senate, bill S. 1650, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF, was introduced by Sen. Hill, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In the House, Rep. Hugh Carey of New York, chairman of the House Ad Hoc Committee for the Handicapped, introduced bill H.R. 7031, with the same title. To reinforce the importance of these bills, Rep. John Fogarty of Rhode Island, chairman of the House Education and Labor Appropriations Committee, introduced H.R. 7100, identical to the Carey bill.

Typical of what was said on the floor of both houses in support of each bill was this statement by Rep. Carey:

On April 8, 1864, Abraham Lincoln signed the charter for Gallaudet College here in the Nation’s Capital. This was the first and still is the only institution providing postsecondary education for deaf young adults. Today, 101 years later, I bring to this 89th Congress a piece of legislation for further assistance to the young deaf adults of our country. This bill would establish a national technical institution for the deaf, the second postsecondary educational institution in our great country.
Following is a summary of the three bills:

The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare would be authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf. A 12-member National Advisory Board on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would be appointed by the Secretary to review proposals from institutions of higher education which desire such an institute and to make recommendations to the Secretary on entering into a contract for the establishment and operation of such an institute. The Commissioners of Education and of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex-officio members of the Board.3

Included were the following provisions for the technical institute:

- The legislation would be titled THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT.
- The legislation would authorize the appropriation of necessary funds required for the establishment, operation, and construction of the institute as a residential facility for the postsecondary technical training and education of persons who are deaf.
- The legislation would provide that any institution of higher education could submit a proposal for an agreement to establish and operate the institute according to procedures prescribed by the Secretary.
- The legislation would require the appointment of a National Advisory Board, consisting of 12 persons selected by the Secretary from leaders of the field of education of deaf persons, related fields of technical and vocational education, and members of the public familiar with the need for the services that would be provided by the institute.
- The legislation would authorize the Secretary, after consulting with the appointed National Advisory Board, to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment and operation of such an institute.
- The legislation would require the appointment of an Advisory Board by the sponsoring institution for the purpose of advising the institute's director on basic policies for its establishment and operation.
- The legislation would require that an annual report containing certain required information be submitted to the Secretary.
- The legislation would require that the commissioners of the agencies of Education and Vocational Rehabilitation serve as ex officio members of the Secretary's National Advisory Board.
- The legislation would provide that, after a review of proposals from interested institutions of higher education, the Board would recommend to the Secretary the selection of the institution best suited to operate the program. At this time, the board also would make such other recommendations concerning the establishment and operation of the Institute as might be considered appropriate.4
At this point, supporters rallied to prepare testimony in support of the bill. Experts who had helped up to this point were again brought into the project to help document its need. The bills (S. 1650; H.R. 7100; and H.R. 7031) were referred to respective committees of the Senate and House for review, study, and exposure to the general public through public congressional hearings.

Winalski, a major force in organizing the support effort in preparation for Congressional hearings, worked with the Congressional Committee staff responsible for the hearing format and agenda. Throughout the process, she worked closely with these people to help bring to bear on the hearings the best minds from the field of education of deaf persons; as well as from among professionals in related fields. Individual sponsors, supporters, and opponents alike were notified and given an opportunity to come forth and be heard. A number of individuals did so on their own initiative, making their expertise, views, and wishes available to the committee staff for inclusion in the process.

Winalski did much of the work involved in contacting, alerting, organizing, and helping the supporters and sponsors of the bill, thus assuring that the most promising testimony and documentation was available to the Senate and House conferees. Supporters within and outside the government did much of the work in the face of short deadlines and within impromptu and quickly formed groups. Key people were provided the particulars of the legislation being proposed. They, in turn, assessed their respective constituencies to test the extent of support available and brought the results in the form of testimony to the hearings. Major organizations were contacted and asked to provide position papers or letters in support of the bill. Concerned individuals were invited to attend, and many did so at their own personal expense. This preparation for the hearings was an immense task. Much of the credit for its unqualified success rests with Winalski's organizational leadership and personal tenacity—not only during the preparation phase but throughout the process until the bill became law.

The first hearing on the NTID establishment bill (H.R. 7031) was conducted by the House Committee on Education and Labor, on April 27, 1965, with Rep. Carey presiding. Other representatives present were: Frank Thompson Jr., New Jersey; James O'Hara, Michigan; Carlton Sickles, Maryland; James Schueier, New York; Robert Griffin, Michigan; Glenn Andrews, Alabama; and Ogden Reid, New York. Five major presenters or witnesses with prepared testimony were scheduled. These stimulated much discussion on the issues and proposals presented. Twenty letters and position papers were reviewed and included in the record.5

Rep. Carey opened the hearing:

By reason of my authorship on this Bill, I wish to announce that the hearing will be conducted with absolute impartiality. I think that we can all be impartial about this particular group of the handicapped.

We have an illustrious panel of witnesses this morning and in advance of the testimony of the first witness, may I say that in connection with my activities on the Board of Gallaudet College and the longstanding interest in the plight and situation of deaf persons, it would seem
completely timely now that we move, in this age of technology and
automation, to the consideration of such measures as are needed for the
education and development of the useful skills of deaf persons. 6

The first witness heard was Philip Des Marais, deputy assistant secretary for
Legislation, DIHEW. With him were Dr. Morvin Wirtz and Hoag. The paper that Des
Marais presented had been developed by staff members with input from both the Office
of Education and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. For additional support, he
referred to the recently released Babbidge Report of the Secretary's Committee on the
Education of the Deaf, DIHEW (Appendix G). Des Marais described the target
population, its size and nature, and its needs. Further, he presented a model
curriculum thought to be best suited to fill the existing gaps in the education of deaf
youth. 7 Because it provided a foundation for the discussion and questioning that
followed, it was a good starting point for the hearing. Among other things, this paper
provided the documentation information needed by Congressional staffers to develop
the final report and a committee position on the bill.

An excerpt from Des Marais' testimony follows:

This report emphasizes the inadequacies and gaps in the whole range of
education services for the deaf and recommends a broad scale program
of improving educational opportunities for the deaf on all levels-
 elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and collegiate.

A young child who has a substantial or total hearing loss, acquired at
birth or before the normal age for learning language through hearing,
has a serious educational handicap. Our schools and special classes for
deaf children have done an unquestionably outstanding job over the
past 150 years in providing these children with basic elementary school
education. These schools have been performing their task under
extremely difficult conditions which include: lack of funds, weak or
token public support, poor facilities, and a lack of adequately trained
professional personnel. 8

Des Marais then reviewed the status of educational programs described in the
Babbidge Report:

The Report, THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF, indicates many
weaknesses across the Nation in educational programs for these
children. They include the absence of adequate services in many parts
of the country for evaluation, diagnosis, and training of children at
preschool levels; the complete absence of a real secondary school
program, inadequate vocational training opportunities; and virtually
no opportunity for technical or advanced training in skilled or
semiprofessional occupations. 9

He followed with an elaboration of the conditions cited in the Babbidge Report
and with some of its recommendations of needs. He explained how the NTID bill would
meet some of these needs:
As we understand the bill we are considering today, it would permit programs along the following lines:

It would provide a flexible program on a postsecondary level.
A first year course in mathematics, language, and science would be available for those who need it.
It would provide a comprehensive curriculum of technical training geared to up-to-date occupational needs and opportunities. (See suggested curriculum included on pages 10 and 11 in Appendix B.)
Some courses of college-degree level that could be accredited and qualified for a bachelor's degree would be offered, and this could be transferrable to Gallaudet or other institutions of higher education.
Provisions would be made for a full range of medical, audiological, psychological, social service, and other diagnostic and special counseling services.
It would be located in a university complex, and operated by a university located in a metropolitan center to provide on-the-job training and employment opportunities; and designed to put the deaf student in a dynamic, non-insulated campus community setting. 10

De Marais' testimony discussed the need in terms of the numbers that could be served and the new opportunities that such a program would provide. He cited benefits that could follow as a result of modeling and replicating programs to serve greater numbers of deaf individuals. He cited that the current lack of training of deaf persons had been responsible for and continued to contribute to the underemployment of deaf people prevalent at that time. He closed his testimony with the following statement:

Surveys and conferences of experts who have studied the problem for years confirm the need for a program of technical education for the deaf. As the Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf has indicated, such support can be most effective if it permits diversified programs at a number of cooperating institutions. We believe that action should be taken to follow up on this recommendation. The welfare of these citizens and the nation compels it. 11

The presentation stimulated a series of questions from committee members and responses from members of the audience. It appeared to be a learning situation for Congressional Committee members who had little previous contact with deafness. Discussions ensued on the nature of deafness and its impact on learning, communication, and education. This was followed by a presentation by Dr. Leonard Elstad, president of Gallaudet College.

Elstad expressed concern about the educational level of students graduating from school and the level of education in most schools for deaf students. He described Gallaudet's recent experience reviewing the entrance examination results of 600 applicants, of which only 275 were academically qualified. The others, although interested in some form of continuing education as well, would not be served. He then focused his attention on what he felt was a need for more regular academic high school programs to prepare students for their education. Detmold then demonstrated the
lack of proper academic preparation among the Gallaudet population, stating that 85 percent of those admitted required preparatory academic work before entering college programs.12

Next followed a lively discussion regarding the academic high school concept, since college academicians generally require academic achievement test scores in order to consider a student's eligibility for college enrollment. Questions were raised about the status of schools for deaf students throughout the country. It was cited that most schools offered the equivalent of ninth or tenth grade level academic education in terms of reading, language, math, social studies, and science. Few high schools for deaf students existed that were adequately equipped to prepare students for college.13

Elstad and Detmold suggested that the Committee consider the establishment of regional high schools for deaf students to provide better academic preparation for college, which they considered the greater need for deaf students at the time. The data they presented were based only on academic achievement levels of applicants from all schools for the deaf. The important issue not considered was the learning potential of average to properly inspired or motivated bright deaf students. The other witnesses ready to present testimony understood this but could not speak out to clarify the situation for Congressional Committee members.

The proposal before the Committee seemed to be disregarded by the Gallaudet witnesses in favor of an entirely different plan. The proposal for a "technical institute" as interpreted by the supporters of the legislation apparently was not what it seemed to be to the two representatives from Gallaudet. A dialogue ensued between the Committee and these two witnesses. Others did not get an opportunity to join the discussion until their turn came to testify. Most who came to testify believed the proposed plan for a technical program, as in the bill, to be viable. The discussion between the Gallaudet witnesses and the Committee members continued with more questions about the status and academic needs of graduates from existing schools.

After a few minutes, Rep. Thompson asked:

*In addition to your suggestion, I gather that it would be valuable to have regional equivalents of high schools in the Northeast and Southwest; yet in addition to this, you do support the principles and objectives of this legislation?*14

After Elstad responded affirmatively, Rep. Thompson continued:

*Might it be valuable to proceed with this [single model facility], look at it in 5 years as the legislations suggests, then, on the basis of the experience, reconsider, or consider establishing three more such institutions?*15

Elstad's response:

*That's right. Your point this first year is an important thing, because even if they didn't go on to the second or third year, think of what they got that one year.*16
Detmold then spoke:

I don't think any of our remarks should be interpreted as critical. We have long advocated such an institute, which at least would double the number of deaf students in college and open to them new fields of education that we can't supply.

We still think the critical problem is the high school education that is impeding students' progress through the school systems [the transition from high school to college]. Until this problem is solved, we won't have deaf students going to college in the same proportions as hearing students.\(^17\)

Rep. Sickles added:

I don't think you should worry about being critical, this Committee can recognize criticism, and it helps to get the bill in final form.\(^18\)

Rep. Sickles then sought an answer to an earlier, related question--should a technical training institute, if established, be part of a larger university complex lacking experience with deafness, or should it have a separate facility located at Gallaudet? He felt that the group had reached a point where this institute was sufficiently different from Gallaudet to be one that should be managed elsewhere.\(^19\)

Detmold reinforced the notion that the proposed institute be located in a multipurpose institution in a metropolitan area. He discounted the value of an affiliation with Gallaudet, based on the differences in philosophy of the two programs, Gallaudet having a liberal arts orientation as opposed to programs of general technical education.\(^20\)

Discussion continued on issues including student applications, Gallaudet's inability to accept more students due to space limitations, the possibility of a second preparatory year at Gallaudet increasing enrollment opportunities, consideration of a second liberal arts program for deaf students, the numbers of students enrolled in colleges for hearing students, and speculation on the success of these students in programs for hearing students.

Detmold closed with the opinion that until the educational level and numbers of students warranted it, Gallaudet should not expand into new or different areas of study, but should reserve its resources to do a good job at what it was doing. He felt that if a national technical institute for the deaf were established, it would take the pressure off Gallaudet to do such things, which he felt they should not be doing.\(^21\)

Rep. Carey then closed the discussion:

In my view, to have a liberal arts program available for the deaf but not to have training in engineering, sciences and technical disciplines, would be akin to a 20th century nation without a national science program.\(^22\)

Apparently, the Gallaudet witnesses had not understood that the proposed institute would be designed for students who might need remedial academic help. Other witnesses, yet to be heard from, believed that enough students were available who were capable of learning in a technical program setting. As long as the students
were judged capable of learning and doing the required work, they should be given the
opportunity to do so, now.

Initially, the program was to be designed to serve technical areas of
employment in support of medicine, law, engineering, business, manufacturing,
building, and the service professions. Most in attendance understood and supported
this concept, believing there would be enough students to more than fill such a
program. As the hearings progressed, this point of view was made.

Rep Fogarty spoke next. Although not a member of this subcommittee, he
offered to be a witness, stating that he was behind the movement 100 percent. After
expanding on the need for this legislation, he closed with the following statement:

Federal legislation has provided much in recent years to assure the
proper upgrading of educational opportunities for all of our citizens.
The deaf who have the talent and the potential, however, are left out of
this picture. The establishment of a National Technical Institute for
this group would give them the opportunities we have so generously
provided for others.23

Other witnesses expanded descriptions of the target population, the needs of
this group, and what could be accomplished by supporting this legislation.
Contributions were made by Msgr. John Hourihan, director of the Mount Carmel
Guild for Speech and Hearing in Newark, New Jersey; Rev. Thomas F. Cribbin from
the International Catholic Institute for the Deaf in Brooklyn, New York; and
Silverman.

A question was posed earlier in the hearing by Schueter, who asked for a good
representative definition of deafness. Silverman responded with what might be called
a clinical definition, and then gave another view of deafness:

What really is deafness? Is it a number on a decibel scale that describes
the severity of hearing impairment? Is it a disease like the mumps or
measles or meningitis? Is it a piece of tissue in the auditory system that
would be judged to be abnormal if viewed under a microscope? Is it an
affliction to be conquered by ingenious scientists? Is it the burden of
a child whose parent hopes persistently and fervently that the scientists
will succeed and soon? Is it a special mode of communication? Is it
something that is encountered occasionally in the man or woman whose
fingers fly and whose utterances are arrhythmic and strident? Is it a
cause to which diligent, skillful, and patient teachers have committed
themselves for generations? Is it the agony of isolation from a piece of
the real world? Is it the joy of accomplishment that mocks the
handicapped? Is it the bright mind and the potentially capable hands
for which the economy has no use because they are uncultivated? Is it a
crystallization of attitudes of a distinctive group whose deafness, modes
of communication, and other associated attributes such as previous
education, and [what] they have in common, cause them to band
together to achieve social and economic self-realization? Of course, it is
all of these and more, depending on who asks the question and why.24
Silverman made several other observations that later became important to the project planners. Referring to "criteria for this institute," he said:

First, note the word TECHNICAL... Such an institute has quite a range to encompass, and the fine distinction between vocational and technical training is one with which we need not concern ourselves here. I believe the right training will make available to deaf people opportunities beyond the sheer vocational.

Technical training consists of knowing not only how to fix something, but also knowing how it works—and it is here that many of our deaf people fall down.

A second criterion for this institute would be to take account of the increasing urbanization of our population. This means that the institute must not only be exposed and be in an environment of diverse economic opportunities, but its students must have experiences in learning how to use a city. Many deaf children are educated in relatively sheltered environments, frequently removed from urban centers, and don't know how to make their way, so the urban setting is important for reasons other than the availability of diverse industry and economic opportunities.

A third feature already mentioned is the relation to a university. What form it will take, I don't think is clear at the moment. One would have to find a university that is interested and meets some of the criteria in the proposed legislation.

However, two outcomes of this affiliation would be: First, research. You have posed a number of interesting questions to which we do not have answers. Second, the preparation of professional people for the institute... We must get people who not only are skilled in the area in which they will operate, but they must also understand deafness.

The fourth feature would be the continuing emphasis on communication. However much we may think we can get by without deaf people penetrating the hearing world, we have to concentrate on reducing that barrier. The opportunities for economic achievement depend on communicating, so this institution will stress language, reading, and expression of all sorts...

Still another feature emphasized before is flexibility, a virtue that everyone seems to support, but I think that here we will have to use all of the imagination at our command. Upon completing their studies at the institute, some young people will find work in industry, some will go to other institutions, and some, perhaps, will enter a work study program. We will not be bound, we should not be bound, by the conventions of academic administration and organization.

Last I'd like to emphasize [what had been talked about before]... that it [the institute] should become a symbol of attainment for a class of the population, in this case a subculture, that brings it to national attention... That is, its alumni should speak of it with pride, as we speak of the service academies and other national institutions. And this subtle, symbolic value can do something, I believe, that a more direct effort might not accomplish for this class of people. 25
The hearing ended on a note of confidence that the legislation would receive the support of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The Committee's report, published and released May 6, 1965, was favorable (Appendix C) and its positive legislative intent was clearly stated. Much of the substance provided to the Committee during the hearing was incorporated into the report. The report covered: the need, population, and enrollment of the proposed institute; special problems in the education of deaf students; the proposed institute itself; and its size, program objectives, location, curriculum, administration, standards for admission, research, and physical facilities.26

On May 17, 1965, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held its hearing on the bill (S. 1650) to establish a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. Conducted by the Subcommittee on Health and chaired by Sen. Hill, the hearing was attended by many of the same people who appeared at the House Committee hearing. Wilbur Cohen, undersecretary of HHW, made a presentation that provided the department's strong support for establishment of the institute. Cohen was followed by Commissioner Mary Switzer of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (HHW), who also presented a strong case for passage of the bill. A portion of her statement follows:

_I am delighted this morning to add my enthusiastic endorsement to S. 1650, because it is very much a part of our whole vocational rehabilitation push to broaden opportunities for everybody who is handicapped. In fact, next to our own bill, this is my favorite bill before the Congress; really in a way it is part of our package._27

Other major witnesses who made presentations in support of passage included Msgr. Joseph Doeling, Archdiocesan director of the Mount Carmel Guild; Elstad; Dr. Samuel Kirk, Institute for Research at the University of Illinois at Urbana; Msgr. Hourihan; and Silverman. Thirteen statements were published in the report and more than 45 communications were acknowledged and filed in the record.

The report on this hearing was published and released May 25, 1965, by the Senate Committee. The content, similar to the report issued from the House, again contained an endorsement from the Senate Committee to pass the bill.28

It appeared that all the barriers to achieving an endorsement for passage of the bill were cleared and all that was needed was to send it to the Senate and House for final review, debate, and vote. Here again, Winalska played a key role in keeping it moving and getting it scheduled. Rep. Carey and Sen. Hill introduced the bill for votes May 17, 1965, in the House and May 26 in the Senate, respectively. It passed both bodies unanimously.29

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act then moved to the White House for signature by President Lyndon Johnson. Because of his personal interest in this legislation, Johnson held the signing ceremony in the Rose Garden. Attending the ceremony June 8, 1965, were sponsoring and supporting congressmen, government officials, and other guests invited by the President and White House staff.
Johnson was familiar with deafness through association with his lifelong friend and former congressional colleague, Rep. Homer Thornberry, who was the son of deaf parents. Growing up in Texas with the Thornberrys as friends and neighbors, the President knew the parents well. Referring to Homer’s mother, he said:

More than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln signed the charter of Gallaudet College here in Washington. From that time until this, Gallaudet stands as the only institution of higher learning in the world for those that are afflicted by deafness. This institution [NTID] will help to meet the needs of hundreds of deaf young people, both students and adults, who want to be and can be trained for various technical occupations and placed in very useful careers. Deafness is not and need not be regarded as the handicap that men thought it was in the past. Given the opportunity to learn and to prepare themselves, the deaf can fill a wide array of useful and important positions in industry and professions throughout our society.31

Upon completing his remarks, he signed the Act into law: Public Law 89-36, providing for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
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CHAPTER IV

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD IS SELECTED

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) Act, Public Law 89-36, assigned responsibility for its implementation to the secretary of DHEW. Winalski, as DHEW's legislative liaison, and a key figure in the effort to develop the NTID concept and gain passage of the Act, was asked to assume this responsibility. Three immediate actions were required to get started:

1. acquire funding
2. staff the National Advisory Board (NAB)
3. organize the NAB and oversee the mission to completion.

Documentation to justify the supplemental budget request was developed. It included, among other things, the initial program schedule and objectives plan, and the staff and NAB requirements statement. A supplemental budget request for $420,000 was presented to the Executive Budget Office and then to both houses of Congress through the Appropriations Committees of each house. The funds were appropriated as requested. In September 1965, a plan was approved to create a temporary office for the NTID project. Responsibility for managing the project was assigned to Des Marais' office. The plan called for a staff of two professionals, a secretary, and a clerk typist. The professional positions initially were defined as one specialist each in higher education facilities and rehabilitation. Since Hoag's office had been involved in the project as much as any in the government at that point, Winalski, with Hoag's concurrence, added his name to the list of those being considered to fill the professional positions. After due process of the personnel procedure, Hoag was appointed to the new position of staff director of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf/Special Staff (NTID/SS) effective October 1, 1965.

Along with the appointment came a tentative schedule of events and planning objectives. The NTID/SS and the Board, yet to be appointed, faced what appeared to be an impossible schedule:
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Tentative schedule for the development of a contract for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf

October 1, 1965

Letters of invitation to serve on the National Advisory Board (NAB).

October 4, 1965

Complete negotiations for the appointment of personnel to the NTID Special Staff group: Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (VRA) specialist, professional higher education facilities specialist, professional stenographer, and clerical.

Week of November 5, 1965

First meeting of the NAB
Indoctrination and orientation.

Week of December 6, 1965

Second meeting of the NAB
Development of application procedures for institutions wishing to sponsor and administer the NTID.

Week of February 7, 1966

Third meeting of the NAB
Consider preliminary recommendations and guidelines for operation and management of the NTID.

March 1, 1966

Letters of announcement to colleges and universities with invitations to apply for sponsorship of the NTID.

March 1, 1966

Distribution of application procedures and policies information.

May 1, 1966

Deadline date for receipt of proposals from applying institutions.

May 15, 1966

Final meeting of NAB
Review proposals and recommend selection of the sponsoring institution.

May 30, 1966

Secretary initiates negotiations on contract with institution of higher education.

June 30, 1966

Completion of contract with institution of higher education for the sponsorship and management of the NTID.
This impossible schedule was prepared hurriedly before staff members arrived to start work. Nonetheless, the first several objectives were begun, and the October 1 objective of making NAB appointments was achieved by November 2. The first two items of the second objective were achieved by October 1—Hoag was appointed staff director and Flora Gamble Sacle was appointed secretary. NAB meetings were postponed approximately five weeks each, but a date to accomplish the final objective remained June 30.

After getting office space and moving in, Hoag and Sacle worked as quickly as possible toward the established objectives. They were involved with a number of actions of immediate concern:

- drafting invitations to persons selected to serve on the NAB
- drafting schedule updates and other papers and documents
- preparing for the NAB orientation meeting scheduled for December 6, although at this time the members had not been officially appointed
- developing drafts of the institution application procedures being proposed for NAB consideration at the second meeting scheduled for January 1966
- drafting institution application guidelines recommended for NAB consideration and approval—tentatively for use in January and February
- drafting an announcement letter to inform colleges and universities about the NTID project
- developing plans for distributing the applications in March
- developing tentative plans for handling the proposals from universities, scheduled to be received in May.

The NTID/SS used this ambitious schedule as a starting point and tried to achieve its planning objectives. By the second week in October, the staff already was receiving requests for information about the project, as well as invitations to provide speakers for a number of conferences and national meetings. The public wanted to hear about the project and also wanted an opportunity to provide input. Although some speaking invitations were accepted, they were necessarily tentative at the time. By mid-November, a more realistic schedule was implemented, extending the plan from June 30 to August 31, 1966.5

Since early summer, government officials had been considering appointments to the NAB. DHIEW conducted a search for top level candidates, and the mail on this increased. A number of people sent nominations, and some nominated themselves or asked to be considered. Congressional members moved by their constituents made inquiries about institutional application procedures. Staff members in the Office of Education, DHIEW, and other government agencies were asked to provide input on nominations. The Office of Education, Special Office for the Deaf, helped manage some of the routine inquiries about the NTID project until the NTID Special Staff was established. Lists were screened and individuals were contacted regarding acceptances. In compliance with administration policy, all nominations had to be cleared and approved by the White House before appointments were final.6

The keystone to the process was to get the NAB appointed and working. Advisory boards that serve in government, especially high level boards serving cabinet offices, usually consist of people who are in great demand. Consequently, as a condition of nomination, potential NAB members were asked to commit themselves to serve for the year, to attend at least six meetings, and to participate on as many site
visits to as many prospective institutions as possible. When clearances on the recommended list came from the White House, letters of notification of appointment were signed by Cohen. These were mailed on November 2, 1965, and appointment acceptances followed shortly thereafter. Dr. Kirk accepted the office of chairman of the NAB. Kirk recently had served in DHEW as director of the new Division for Handicapped Children—a six-month appointment to help organize the division. Well-known in the field of special education, Kirk had written texts used to prepare teachers of exceptional children, and was the recipient of the first Kennedy Award for service to the field of the education of mentally retarded children. His presence on the NAB filled one of the positions for representatives of higher education, research, and administrative organization. In addition to his general knowledge of special education, he also had specialized experience with and knowledge of deafness and the education of deaf children.

Other individuals appointed to the NAB were:

Robert Baird, department head, Electronics Department, Oregon Technical Institute, Klamath Falls, Oregon

Martin Burke, vice president for Industrial Relations, United Aircraft Corporation, East Hartford, Connecticut

Edward Keller, vice president for Public Affairs, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

John O’Marra, assistant administrative officer, Manufacturing Division, Western Electric Company, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Robert Panara, associate professor of English, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.


Dr. Hugo Schunhoff, superintendent, California School for the Deaf, Berkeley, California

Dr. Richard Silverman, director, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Missouri

Mrs. Homer Thornberry, Austin, Texas

Mrs. Spencer Tracy, president, John Tracy Clinic, Los Angeles, California

Sister Agnes Vincent, Ph.D., principal, St. Francis de Sales School for the Deaf, Brooklyn, New York

The commissioners of Education and of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, DHEW, were designated in the Law as ex officio members of the NAB.
The Honorable Harold Howe II, commissioner of Education, delegated his presence at meetings to Dr. Morvin Wirtz, director of the Division for Handicapped Children, Office of Education, DHEW.

The Honorable Mary Switzer, commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, DHEW, attended almost all meetings.9

All NAB members were well-known, highly respected individuals and distinguished in the industrial or educational communities that they represented. Each agreed to serve for the purpose of selecting a site for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Panara had been a teacher of deaf students and at the time served on the Gallaudet College faculty. Deafened at the age of 10 from spinal meningitis, he had continued his education in New York City's public schools, went on to graduate from Gallaudet College, and then earned a master's degree in English from New York University. Subsequently, he taught at the New York School for the Deaf in White Plains, New York, before accepting a position at Gallaudet College. Panara brought to the NAB personal knowledge of the deaf community and the problems faced by deaf people in the world of employment.10

Three members of the NAB were prominent, well-known educators of deaf students. Schunhoff had taught deaf students earlier in his career at both the Minnesota and Illinois Schools for the Deaf. He later served as principal of the Texas and Missouri Schools for the Deaf, and of the Kendall School for the Deaf on Gallaudet's campus. He became superintendent of the West Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind in Romney, West Virginia, and then moved to California to head the school at Berkeley. By 1965, he had served with distinction for more than 32 years since graduating from Gallaudet as a teacher of deaf students.

Because of his unique lifetime experience as an educator of deaf students, Schunhoff was a key member of the NAB. His constituency, shared with Silverman and Vincent, represented the entire field of the education of deaf students. He represented and brought with him the concerns and expectations of students in residential schools for deaf students throughout the country.11

Vincent was administrator and founder of the St. Francis de Sales School for the Deaf, one of seven state-supported private schools in New York. She had gotten her undergraduate degree from St. John's University in New York, her master's in education of the deaf from the University of Buffalo, and her Ed.D. from Columbia University in administration and supervision of special education. She received an award from the Brooklyn Diocese for her role in founding St. Francis de Sales and an award from Jewish and Christian Leaders in Brooklyn for her non-discrimination practices in her work with handicapped children.12

Silverman, the third educator of deaf students on the NAB, had, by this time, served the field for 30 years. He was president of three of the major national organizations concerned with the education of deaf students: the American Speech and Hearing Association (now the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association); the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; and the Council on Education of the Deaf. At the time, he was professor of audiology at Washington University in St. Louis, in addition to serving as director of the Central Institute for the Deaf. His
experience as an advisor and consultant to government had been extensive: he consulted on problems of deafness to the Secretary of War, 1944-48; served as a consultant on audiology to the U.S. Air Force, 1951-1953; and was a member of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation, 1962-1966.

Because of his previous efforts in behalf of the project, Silverman was a fortuitous choice to serve on the NAB. His testimony at all the hearings projected extraordinary insight and persuasiveness, and his assistance to the bill's framers helped convert doubters into supporters. He was certain such an enterprise could succeed and accomplish more for deaf students than almost anything done in the past.13

One NAB member whose name is perhaps the best known nationally is Mrs. Spencer Tracy. She and her husband, actor Spencer Tracy, had a deaf son, through whose parenting Tracy learned a great deal about educating deaf children. In 1942, through her own determination and her husband's financial support, she established the John Tracy Clinic for the Deaf.

The clinic worked with parents to facilitate their deaf children's job of learning language and speech. Although located in Los Angeles to serve parents of deaf children in that area, the clinic's reputation spread until parents and children from around the country and the world flocked to its doors to attend summer programs and seminars. One reason for the clinic's international prominence was the correspondence course set up for parents of deaf children who could not attend. At the time of this writing, the clinic had grown to serve more than 80,000 families in more than 140 countries.

Even before Tracy served on the NAB, she had considerable experience as a consultant to government agencies. She was a member of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation and of the Neurological and Sensory Disease Service Advisory Committee, DHEW. She served on a number of other government appointments, receiving many honors and awards from national organizations interested in the clinic and in the work she had done. In addition, she received seven honorary doctorates from prestigious colleges and universities.14

Another person on the NAB who was familiar with deafness was Mrs. Homer Thornberry, whose appointment was a personal one made by President Johnson. Through association with her husband's parents, she became knowledgeable about deaf people and their problems. This later led to an appointment to Gallaudet's board of trustees and to consulting work for other state and federal agencies. Thornberry was personally acquainted with President and Mrs. Johnson, often staying at the White House when visiting Washington. Along with several other members, she continued to serve on the NAB (later renamed the National Advisory Group) after NTID was established and operational.15

Dr. Edward Keller brought to the NAB his expertise in higher education and in the governance of college and university programs. He became an integral part of the NAB, helping other members with difficult decisions.16

Robert Baird brought to the NAB his expertise in curriculum, program structure, and administration of programs in a technical institute. The only NAB member with firsthand knowledge of technical education and programs in technical schools, his influence in the NAB's final decision of selecting the sponsoring institution was important to the project's success.
Baird earned his undergraduate and professional engineering education in electrical engineering at Washington State University, where he also received his master's degree in education. He taught at Boise Technical Institute, Portland, Oregon; in the engineering program at Washington State University; and at Boise Junior College, in Boise, Idaho, where he also served as department head. After more than 12 years as chief engineer of radio station KWSC in Pullman, Washington, he was appointed to his position at Oregon Institute of Technology. He was a registered professional engineer and a member of the National Society of Professional Engineers.17

Gustave Rathe brought to the NAB his extensive experience in management, education, and training in an industrial setting, having grown professionally throughout the ranks of International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) to the position of Director of Education for the entire corporation. Later he became one of IBM's Vice Presidents. He also served on numerous national level government councils and committees. He served the NAB as one of its important members and became its Chairman in mid-stream after Dr. Kirk chose to resign the position. He was a significant stabilizing influence to the NAB during intense debate and in times of difficulty.18

Martin Burke contributed to the project his expertise in corporate management and personnel relations. He advised the NAB on the positive and negative personnel relationships that could develop within the staff of the sponsoring institute between current staff members and those who would come on board with the NTID project. He also was sensitive to the impact of a new, federally funded project, which in some ways could threaten ongoing programs and individual interests. He advised the NAB on how to handle potential personnel and management problems certain to be found between existing staff and new project personnel.19

John O'Marra, at the time of his service on the NAB, was assistant administrative officer of the manufacturing division of Western Electric Company in Oklahoma City. His career with Western Electric was interrupted by a term of service as an artillery officer in the U.S. Army during World War II. A graduate of Fordham University, O'Marra earned his bachelor of science in education before receiving a master's degree in business administration from New York University. When he resumed his career with Western Electric after the war, he became personnel studies assistant, section chief in Industrial Relations, department chief in Corporate Personnel, assistant manager in the Supplies Service Organization, and manager of Personnel Administration. In 1962, O'Marra's service with Western Electric was again interrupted for the better part of a year by an appointment as director of Public Affairs and Employee Information in the Personnel and Public Relations Division of DHEW. Upon returning to Western Electric, he became director of Merchandise and Service for the Manufacturing Division and soon afterward was transferred to the firm's Oklahoma City office, where he served as director of Engineering and Manufacturing. After serving on the NAB, he received another government appointment from the President, this time as assistant postmaster general of the United States. Before retiring, he became vice president and general manager of the Little Rock, Arkansas, operation of the Teletype Corporation.20

The secretary of the DHEW expected NAB members to do a number of specific things. The law was explicit as to what Congress intended (Appendix A). The Congressional Committee reports further amplified the concept (Appendices C and D). The secretary outlined to the NAB what must be done to implement Public Law 89-36
and establish the national technical institute for the deaf. Stated in broad terms, he expected the NAB, with the help of staff members, to:

- develop a set of guidelines for the operation of the national technical institute for the deaf
- recommend procedures to the secretary for selecting an appropriate site for the institute—to include application procedures, proposal review, and site visits
- develop a policies and procedures document to be used by colleges and universities wishing to apply for sponsorship of the institute through the submission of proposals process
- after the receipt of applications and proposals from colleges and universities, review them and recommend those that qualify for site visits and further review
- conduct site visits to selected institutions that qualify for sponsorship of the institute
- recommend to the secretary the identity of the most qualified college or university to sponsor the institute, with the rationale to support the selection
- recommend to the secretary some of the specifics of governance of such an institute, including curriculum and program content, enrollment procedures, and management of student affairs.

The NAB members were exceptionally well qualified for their mission. Their individual qualifications were unequalled in their respective fields, and they collectively brought a wide array of knowledge, experience, and expertise to the challenge. Above all, they were determined to provide this educational opportunity, the national technical institute for the deaf, to the deaf youth of the country.
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CHAPTER V

THE BOARD MEETS

Once the NAB was appointed, the foremost task facing the NTID/SS was to prepare for the NAB's first meeting, scheduled for December 6-7, 1965, in Washington, D.C.

Much work was already in progress to ensure that the NAB had a clear path to its goals. Along with preparing for the meeting, the Staff members became involved in a rapidly growing dialogue with the public. They responded to numerous inquiries about the project from individuals, members of Congress, and state officials. Educational institutions sought information about the implications of the law concerning "a search for a sponsoring institution." The Staff members understood their interest but were surprised it surfaced so early in the process, even before the NAB had convened for the first time.1

In order to help the NAB start its process, staff members assembled a tentative framework of understanding about the project and a preliminary schedule of events for attaining the goals directed by the law. They proposed that the goals of the first meeting should include:

- getting acquainted
- gaining a common core of understanding of deafness, and understanding the educational problems that brought about legislation to establish a national technical institute for the deaf
- gaining an understanding of the contents of the legislation that brought the members together
- understanding the outcomes expected from the meetings, now tentatively planned by the secretary, DHEW
- establishing procedures for the NAB to officially announce the project and invite institutions of higher education to apply for sponsorship
- establishing policies and procedural guidelines for the universities to use in preparing their applications and proposals to sponsor the institute.

The Secretary expected the orientation of the members to the problem and defining the mission to be accomplished in the first day's session, so that the second day could be devoted to work on application procedures.
Chairman Kirk assembled a tentative agenda to address these goals. Staff identified background information to help members with the orientation process. Kirk agreed that Silverman would be an excellent keynoter to set a professional tone and provide the necessary information about deafness and the challenges facing the NAB. Silverman agreed to present his definition of deafness--as he had done in the Congressional hearings--and to help develop in the members an appreciation of the task facing them.2

Lowell was invited to provide the NAB with a summary of the Babbidge Committee report, released in February 1965. Lowell, a member of the committee and a supporter of the NTID concept, served as a special consultant on matters relating to the work of the Babbidge Committee and on related aspects of the current status of the education of deaf children. Earlier, this report had provided Congress a basis from which to judge the need for the NTID legislation.3

The Staff had considerable background information that could be used by members to prepare for the first meeting, including press releases; Public Law 89-36, the NTID Act (Appendix A); report of Hearing on H.R. 7031, which includes, among other things, the Des Marais presentation to the House (Appendix B); House Hearing Report No. 307 (Appendix C); Senate Report No. 245 (Appendix D); and summary of the Babbidge Report (Appendix G).

However, to avoid overwhelming the members before the first meeting, only selected items were provided ahead of time. Des Marais provided an introductory summary paper--also presented at the first NAB meeting (Appendix F). This paper included a history of the NTID legislation, a statement of the intent of the Congress, a declaration of the need describing the population to be served as a portion of the demographics of the general population of deaf children and adults; and information about what had gone before and the goals to be achieved as directed by the legislation. Members also received the NTID Act, a press release, and the Senate and House hearing reports.4

The meeting agenda was designed to provide special assistance to members inexperienced with deafness and education of deaf people. Of the 12 members, only five were knowledgeable on the subject. Kirk, though not an educator of deaf persons, was experienced in the field of special education and had considerable experience with deaf children. About half of the other members--representing higher education, technical education, and industry--had no previous knowledge in this field.5 The Silverman orientation talk, followed by questions and answers, was scheduled with this in mind.

Robert Panara, who is deaf, needed a skilled sign language interpreter in order to effectively participate in the meeting. Two Gallaudet staff members, Louis Fant and Beverly Bocaner, interpreted for the occasion.

So that the NAB members could meet with some of the Congressional participants and staff members, as well as DHEW staff members, Winalski arranged a reception for the evening of December 6. Among the non-NAB members present were: DHEW staff members and spouses; Rep. Carey; Rep. Fogarty; Sen. Hill; Foraythe; Charles Lee, staff director of the Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor; and other involved staff members from Capitol Hill. This event contributed a great deal to the understanding and appreciation of the NTID legislation by both the Congressional sponsors and members of the NAB appointed to implement it.6

39
All members were present at the first NAB meeting except Burke, who had had a last-minute family emergency. After a get-acquainted coffee hour, the meeting was called to order by Des Marais. After general introductions were completed, he introduced Cohen, who gave the opening remarks. Cohen was completely knowledgeable about the project and gave members a sense of the importance of their roles in this venture.7

Des Marais summarized his paper (Appendix F), which had been mailed to members earlier, on the law's history and intent. This provided a foundation for what was to follow. Then the meeting was turned over to Kirk, who presided for the rest of the meeting.

Silverman gave his orientation presentation on "The Meaning of Deafness." Excerpts are included here to show how intensely Silverman felt about the need for this program. In each instance, and in every hearing on the subject of the legislation, it was obvious that he saw, felt, and somehow knew how important this effort could be. Certainly many others felt as strongly as he. But he was probably the most able to describe the situation for the group.8

He defined deafness, both clinically and practically, in five dimensions.

- The otological dimension, which concerns diseased tissue and its site in the auditory system. He said the problems here were not germane to the task of the NAB.
- The audiological dimension, which relates to the severity of deafness in relation to decibels and the variety and types of hearing losses. He also talked about the effects of the time of the onset of deafness, linking this with the ability to make predictions from this information about a person's communication abilities.
- The effects of deafness on the educational dimension to be "the heart of our concern."
- The psychological dimension, which he considered as critical as the educational one.
- The medical/legal dimension, which affects requirements for employment that may exclude deaf people. Then he touched on the legal status of deaf people in regard to employment generally.

Silverman then discussed the magnitude of the problem for the NTID project, explaining that the institute would have to concern itself with all deaf people: those in school; those desiring to do extension work; and those already in the field who needed to upgrade their skills.

He discussed the history of education of deaf persons, covering 18th and 19th century French and German influences. The French and German systems, with their emphasis on sign language and oral methods, respectively, greatly influenced the education of deaf children in this country. Both systems were in use, in addition to other forms that combine both philosophies.

He described the process that hearing persons use in the acquisition and use of language in communication. He explained how language is processed through vision and hearing, stored in the nervous system, retrieved, and verbally expressed. Expression takes several forms. The auditory form may be in verbal speech with spoken language. The non-verbal forms encompass written language and music. Visual expression and communication are usually associated with printed matter and books, and lipreading of speech and interpreting language symbols by watching lip
motions and facial muscles during speech. The manual alphabet, often called fingerspelling, and the language of signs, or sign language, are also means of visual communication.

He explained that beyond their loss of hearing, the problem normally encountered by deaf people—as a byproduct of this loss—is the block in the auditory system that, in turn, impedes or blocks the means for learning language. Hearing loss blocks or makes less efficient the feedback system so that deaf people cannot effectively monitor their own speech. Some deaf people have difficulty with the ambiguity of words that look but do not sound alike, and, most difficult, words or sounds that are not visible when spoken.

When deaf people speak, many do so with difficulty and often are not clearly understood. In effect, a deaf speaker may impose "discrimination deafness" (comprehension problem) on the listener. When asked to repeat, the listener is asking for clarity, not louder speech.

Silverman closed his remarks with a description of the extremes in attitudes that affect or influence the education of deaf students.

The extremes in attitudes that have significantly influenced the education of deaf persons are manifest: on the one hand by educators who are satisfied with "producing contented members of a subculture" where deafness is the strong commonality; and on the other extreme by educators who place the complete assimilation of deaf people into society as the ultimate goal and the earmark of success. He felt it would be entirely possible for a national technical institute for the deaf to recognize the commonality of deafness and use it to motivate those who desired further occupational, economic, and social advancement—as well as to cultivate their talents.

Such an institute, if properly designed and organized, could help to meet the true occupational and technical training needs of children in schools. Further, it could be a special service for those desiring to do extension work as young adults and for upgrading others already working in the field.

Silverman clarified for the NAIB who and what were involved in the education of deaf students, and why the correct education was so important.9

Mrs. Switzer discussed the importance of OVR's role in the development of a technical institute. She noted that many students who will attend the institute probably will do so under the sponsorship of state vocational rehabilitation agencies, with much of the expense being paid through state agency programs. Because of this, both federal and state VR agencies should have the opportunity to work closely with the program and to provide appropriate input in the institute's development. She further stressed that, because of the emotional difficulties involved, mental health rehabilitation and orientation were important for deaf people. She indicated that efforts to raise the level of deaf young people to a point where they can compete equally with their hearing peers cannot be accomplished by education alone. Such efforts would need to be combined with the support, understanding, and integration of community services.

Dr. Lowell then summarized the Babbidge Committee report. In 1964, the Committee did a comprehensive study of the quality and scope of elementary and secondary education for deaf students. Congress asked for recommendations to improve these programs if needed; determinations of who could best be served by specialized instructional programs at all levels; and determinations of who could
profit from instruction in regular schools and classes at various stages of their education.  

The study included a review of existing special programs at the postsecondary level. It rendered judgments on the types of courses and studies that should be offered at the post-high school level to ensure that deaf students would have the maximum possible opportunities to exploit their intellectual and other skills. The Babbidge Committee was directed to study the need for and feasibility of establishing junior colleges, technical institutes, and other programs to provide a full range of courses of study.  

Dr. Lowell summarized the conclusions of the Babbidge Committee:

The American people have no reason to be satisfied with their limited success in educating deaf children and preparing them for full participation in our society. Less than half the children needing specialized preschool instruction are receiving it. The average graduate of a public residential school for deaf students has an eighth grade education. College seniors perform near the bottom in graduate records examinations. Five-sixths of deaf adults work in manual jobs as contrasted to only one-half of the hearing population.

The Babbidge report recommended that the Office of Education, DHHEW, inaugurate five to 10 demonstration programs at cooperating colleges and universities with special facilitative services designed to enhance the likelihood of academic success; that similar programs be established in junior colleges and at "area vocational educational schools"; and in light of the evaluation of programs that are established, consider "whether or not a need exists for the establishment of federally supported regional vocational education schools and a national technical institute exclusively for the deaf."  

None of these recommendations had been implemented. Yet the NAB was charged by Congress to move ahead of the Babbidge schedule and prepare for the establishment of a national technical institute for the deaf.

Dr. Lowell's report on the limited success thus far achieved in educating deaf people created doubt in the minds of some members as to the NTID project's probability of success. Discussion following this presentation ranged from considering a recommendation that Congress terminate the NAB, expand the Babbidge study, or continue with the NTID project.

Members who were familiar with deafness had confidence that the NTID approach was not only feasible and justified, but imperative to the goal of improving deaf students' opportunities. For the benefit of those less well informed, the knowledgeable members cited case stories of deaf adults who, despite the lack of support services at colleges and other educational programs for hearing students, managed to succeed through their own determination and the help of friends. The previous adverse statistics did not take into account the many students who had removed themselves from the programs for the deaf and succeeded in the mainstreamed educational system. This evidence suggested that, with the right kind of support services and special help, more students could succeed in technical programs. This discussion followed Dr. Lowell's presentation.
With these assurances, the NAB moved to the remainder of the agenda, presented by NTID/SS, and discussed the following topics:

- contents of announcements and notifications to institutions of higher education applying for sponsorship of the NTID
- calendar of events, to include scheduling time for site visits to qualified institutions to determine their eligibility
- possible conflict of interest when NAB members are associated with applying institutions; rules concerning this situation, including nonvoting and nonparticipation in discussion of one's own program
- voting rights of ex officio members
- notification procedures for colleges and universities, and procedural guidelines for the NAB in the review of proposals
- kinds of information that institutions should be required to include in their proposals [One member said that the most revealing piece of information on an application would be "the degree of specificity which we require the university to state 'the extent to which they plan to integrate students into the mainstream of higher education.' This would be indicative of their feelings on the matter."]
- financial assistance, proposing that every student who qualified for admission should be allowed to do so without expense. The question of how states and other government agencies could or should participate was deferred to the agenda of a future meeting.15

The following decisions—in the form of motions—were made before the close of the December 7 meeting.

- A motion directing the NTID/SS to inform all institutions, judged to be qualified, according to section 3B of the law about the legislation, to invite them to apply for sponsorship of the NTID, and to ascertain their intentions accordingly.
- A motion directing the NTID/SS to select from all the eligible institutions those located in metropolitan or urban areas, and to invite their interest and call for letters of intent.
- A resolution that read: "When an institution, with which a board member is affiliated, is being voted on, that Board member shall have no vote. Secondly, when that institution is being discussed, the Board member shall engage in no activity that shall prejudice the Board in one direction or another that is inconsistent with the affording of equal opportunity to any other institution applying."16
- A motion was made to make two-thirds of the members of the Board a quorum.
- A motion was made that seven members of the Board comprise a majority.
- A motion was made that a member must be present in order to vote. No proxy votes allowed.
- An advisory motion was made that all meeting discussions be kept confidential and that all inquiries about the NTID project be directed to the office of the NTID/SS Director.
- A motion of agreement was made that letters of announcement contain a summary of the law and the legislative intent, and to make the law and the House and Senate report available to institutions on request.17
As a result of what was discussed, other important information was recorded by the NTID/SS. Among other things, this information represented consensus on discussion topics, the most important of which were:18

- Location of the NTID should be within the complex of the university.
- A request that NAB members be sent the list of those universities participating in the four regional education laboratories being financed by the Office of Education, DHEW. The possibility of inviting those schools to apply for the NTID was favorably considered.
- The NTID Special Staff Director's most difficult task would be to get the right level of specificity into proposals without restraining free expression. It was suggested that the use of "for instances" throughout the application format might help.
- Guidelines should make it clear to applying institutions to show the flow and interrelationship of activities between the NTID and the university.
- Members agreed that the NTID should serve deaf adults in some capacity. Specifics concerning how and to what extent were not discussed.
- It was agreed that the chief executives (or their duly authorized representatives) of the colleges and universities should be asked to sign letters of intent.
- Both oral and manual methods of communication should be used at the Institute.
- No clear cut distinction between "vocational" and "technical" education was made at the meeting. The terms were discussed without formal definition, and no one seemed to have any difficulty with them. The one reference to them implied that "technical education" emphasized the theoretical and academic aspects, whereas "vocational education" is concerned with the application of knowledge—the "how to" rather than the "why." The NTID, therefore, should not, at least at the onset, be forced to plan on the basis of a well-defined differentiation between the two.19

It was decided to hold the second meeting of the NAB January 13-14, 1966, in Los Angeles. Mrs. Tracy extended the invitation on behalf of the Board of Directors of the John Tracy Clinic, which would host the meeting.

The first meeting of the NAB adjourned at 4:00 p.m. on December 7, 1965.

In short, staff reactions and general impressions of this first meeting were:

- Members were definitely alert to the probable conflict in Congressional intent in regard to the Babbidge report asking for more study and the NTID law instructing them to go ahead. Although this was discussed, it was not a major difficulty. Both events (Babbidge and NTID) were within the DHEW and the semblance of conflict appeared to resolve into one of timing and administration.
- The major impact of the Lowell presentation was to alert the members to the possibility that an NTID may not be viable, or even workable, in the eyes of many in our country. Those members mentioned earlier as being outside the field of education of the deaf, had good reason to doubt; the experts had none. The essence of the discussion was that an enormous weight of evidence existed showing the success that deaf persons had achieved in spite of the lack of help or assistance. Much credit for the persuasion rests with those who were educators and with Dr. Silverman's presentation.
A significant decision had been made, perhaps unintentionally. It appeared
to be clear from the instructions given the NTID/SS (on the issue of
relationships between the NTID and a sponsoring institution) that the idea of
building a "free-standing institution" or separate institution was no longer
under consideration.

The first meeting of the NAB was productive beyond earlier expectations.
The NTID/SS had specific and abundant marching orders to move ahead with
the details of launching the project and preparing for the Los Angeles
meeting scheduled for January.
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CHAPTER VI

THE BOARD SETS THE STAGE

Following the December meeting, in order to review and analyze the NAB actions, Des Marais chaired a staff meeting, which was attended by Patria Winalski, Judith Fein (NTID/SS), and Ralph Haag. All believed that the first NAB meeting had been extremely successful. Inasmuch as members demonstrated an understanding of the reading material sent to them before the meeting, Staff members were confident they were able to move into the project with a minimum of additional time scheduled for general project orientation. Although questions of fundamental significance to the project had surfaced in their meeting, they were answered from within the membership. This had strengthened the NTID commitment of the group, and had reinforced the wisdom of selecting members with a wide spectrum of knowledge and experience.

Both the new secretary of DHEW, John Gardner, and the under secretary, Cohen, expected reports of the meeting from Des Marais as soon as possible. Staff members were pleased to report that all had gone well to this point, that the NAB was functioning favorably, and that everyone seemed to share enthusiasm for the success for the project.

The goals of the upcoming NAB meeting were to develop policies, procedures, and guidelines for use by institutions applying for sponsorship of the NTID; and to develop procedures for the NAB to review and evaluate proposals submitted to them by qualified institutions.

The Special Staff group, in preparation for the January meeting, was asked to:

- Prepare a report on the colleges' and universities' interest, following the distribution of notices to be sent out in December.
- Develop a draft of preliminary considerations, as discussed at the December meeting, as the first step toward the development of definitive guidelines for use by applying institutions.
- Prepare a report of staff activities that took place between the two meetings.
- Arrange for speakers to bring related information to the Los Angeles meeting.
Energetic attention to the project was manifest not only within the Staff itself, but also within the parent and allied organizations in DHHS. Consequently, the Staff could devote its energy full time to the project, without distraction by other assignments. Target dates suggested by the NAB were steadfastly pursued.2

The time between the December and January meetings was particularly busy. Educators and administrators in leadership positions in state and national organizations concerned with deafness were intensely interested in the Staff's activities, which generated considerable correspondence. Although announcements and public releases were distributed, these did not always seem timely in the face of the many, and sometimes impatient, inquiries.

Some people in the field, because of special offices or positions held, believed they should have been involved in a more direct way. Some critics thought the NAB had too many people serving who were not directly associated with the profession. People were beginning to realize the importance of this project and that it would soon become a reality. They believed the project had the potential of eventually affecting what was not being done in the schools and programs in which they were involved. Several individuals wrote letters of concern to members of Congress and to the secretary of the DHHS.

The Staff continued to receive correspondence from individuals and agencies nationwide. Some members of Congress wrote in support of interested institutions in their home states. Leaders of institutions wrote on behalf of their establishments. Most correspondence requested information. Some contained recommendations of persons to serve on the NAB—long after appointments were made and special consultants selected. Everything received was reviewed and considered by the NTID/SS, the NAB, and the DHHS. All correspondence was treated with care, understanding, and a true appreciation of the concerns of the individuals.3 In spite of this huge task—quantity, complexity, and pace—few dissidents or objectors surfaced. The Staff also received many letters of support and genuine interest as a result of these efforts and the announcements and public statements from the DHHS.4

Staff workloads increased, and the need for an additional professional for the NTID/SS was evident. Criteria for the position developed by the NAB included experience in school administration, budgeting and contracting, program/curriculum development, and school and building construction. A search was conducted for individuals available to serve six months to one year. All applications were reviewed and considered.

The most qualified among those available for a short-term appointment was D'Alan Huff, superintendent of Hamilton Public Schools in Columbus, Ohio. Huff was then on leave of absence from the Hamilton School District to work on a special project in Washington, D.C. He was interviewed by a number of DHHS people: Dr. Wirtz, Winalsiki, and Dr. Williams. Huff was eminently qualified for the position, and eventually received the appointment. He was not free to serve, however, until the latter part of January.5

On December 31, 1965, well in advance of the publication of application procedures, preliminary considerations were sent to more than 250 colleges and universities. For interested institutions, a formal letter of "intent to apply" was requested. This sequence was intended to generate early interest in the project and to
inform the NAB of the extent of this interest throughout the nation. The idea to
invite representatives from colleges and universities to a general meeting to discuss
the project surfaced at the Los Angeles meeting of the NAB. In January, more than
50 institutions responded and 22 expressed their intent to apply. 6

The NAB believed it should provide guidelines in a companion document to
whatever application information was to be sent. Accordingly, the NTID/SS, with
assistance from professionals within DHEW, prepared a draft of guidelines that
DHEW could recommend for consideration, titled: "Proposed Policies, Guidelines, and
Application Procedures." Much of the necessary information already was available in
the Public Law, Legislative Hearing Reports, presentations made to the Congress or
the NAB—particularly those by Cohen and Des Murais—and input from the NAB's
first meeting. A major contributor was Dr. Williams, who was responsible for
rehabilitation policies dealing with deafness. Switzer also provided comment and
input. The widespread attention given to the guidelines provided tacit DHEW
recognition of this as a staff paper appropriate for presentation to the NAB. 7 The
draft contained:

• project purpose and objectives
• definition of terms
• eligibility of applicants
• review procedures
• DHEW "boilerplate language," concerning, among other things, contracting
  procedures, construction and labor standards, equal employment
  opportunity, copyright, and patent rights
• proposal procedures
• suggested outline for proposal writing.

The NAB requested special speakers for the January 13 meeting in Los
Angeles to help members continue their orientation on vocational/technical
education. Mrs. Tracy and Dr. Lowell recommended Dr. Parker Wilbur, president of
the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College; and Dr. Richard Nelson, assistant chief of
the Division of Industrial Education in the State Department of Education in
California. 8

All 12 members were present at the meeting, along with Lowell serving as a
special consultant; Dr. Wirtz, representing the Commissioner of Education, DHEW;
Thomas Skelley, representing the Commissioner of VRA, DHEW; and Boyce
Williams, specialist on Deafness and the Hearing Impaired in the VRA. 9

Samuel Kirk called the meeting to order.

Wilbur spoke first on "The Role of Technical Education and Training Programs
in Our Modern Society." He described in considerable detail the organization,
mission, and function of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. He outlined the
curriculum—which he emphasized as "occupationally centered"—and discussed the
faculty, students, and facilities. He proposed this as a model for the institute. 10

Dr. Richard Nelson spoke on "Special Problems to be Considered in the
Establishment of a Technical Education Facility for the Deaf as Seen by a State
Department of Education Official." Primarily, he focused on:

• the need to establish goals and what some of these might be
• the curriculum areas, including health occupations, business occupations,
  commercial art and technical illustration, electricity and electronics,
  engineering technology, mechanical and metal fields, and service fields
• the special qualifications of instructors.
Much information reinforced what members had learned earlier and increased their confidence in the correctness of the decisions they were making on the project.\textsuperscript{11}

The chairman invited discussion on the NTID/SS proposal concerning the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document. However, before the document was discussed, the NAB decided that a preamble was needed, which would be their own philosophical statement on the establishment of an NTID. After much discussion, Silverman and Schunhoff were asked to draft and present such a statement for consideration. It was adopted and then incorporated into the document as a supplement to the more specific instructions. The preamble, a significant portion of the information provided to institutions, presented a clear statement of the NAB's understanding of the project:

\begin{quote}
It is emphasized that the intent of this legislation is to take into careful consideration the distinctive characteristics of the students to be served. Among the compelling characteristics are obviously their modes of communication and their educational attainments. It is likely that the academic attainments of this population will range from those who are at the eighth grade or beyond to those who are unqualified candidates for admission to institutions of higher education.

It also should be recognized that with appropriate fundamental, preparatory, and corollary instruction to be offered by the NTID, many of the individuals in the lower range of this distribution are capable of profiting from continued education of a technical sort. The wide spectrum that characterizes the proposed student population requires an attitude of innovation and originality that should not be constrained by academic precedent or existing models. It is recognized that there is not convincing agreement on the distinctions between what has been conventionally called technical and vocational education. The NTID should not, at least at the outset, be forced to plan on the basis of any clear-cut distinction between the two.

The intent of Congress in requiring that the NTID be sponsored by an institution of higher learning was to take advantage when feasible of the offerings of the institution to hearing persons and to raise the level of aspirations of deaf students. Many deaf persons have demonstrated that they are capable of high levels of accomplishment and it is planned that this institute will create the opportunity for more deaf persons to engage in satisfying callings that are consistent with the student's aspirations and ability and the requirements of society.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

This effort occupied most of the first day.

On the second day, Kirk called for a review of the "Proposed Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document. Members did a line-by-line review of the proposal and recommended revisions. Final approval was held in abeyance, pending the outcome of a conference with institutional representatives concerning, in part, the matters included herein, as recommended in paragraph 4, Motions and Recommendation, following.
Other important topics were discussed. This period of deliberation produced a series of statements for use in the guidelines document, as follows:

The Preparation of Students. This resulted in a statement that students at the NTID should be "overprepared". The NAB believed that superior preparation would be necessary for students to compete successfully in the job market. The NAB emphasized that the institute was not to be thought of as a "deaf trade school."

The Level of Training. Recognizing that the problem of specifying the level of academic skills—which may range somewhere between high school and college—is difficult, NAB members believed that the institute must consider the quality of the different levels of training and that each student should be guided and helped to achieve goals within that student's level of capability.

The Inventiveness of Institutions. The NAB believed that the application form for applying institutions must be flexible enough to enable the colleges to indicate what they plan to do.

Negotiation of Committee and Staff. The possibility of the Board and/or Staff members negotiating with particular institutions was discussed. Noting that some universities might react favorably to encouragement, the Board needed to be prepared to actively negotiate.

Other motions and resolutions proposed and adopted at the meeting included:

- the deadline for proposal submissions be moved to July 1, 1966
- the institute's full operating expenses be borne by the federal government, without cost for tuition, room, and board for all qualifying students
- after receiving applications from interested institutions, a preliminary NAB meeting be held to review with the intent of selecting the top five or six institutions and then making site visits to these places.
- a meeting be held for college and university representatives interested in sponsoring the institute to review and discuss the philosophy, preliminary guidelines, and application procedures. This would be scheduled in late February or early March. The NAB would hold its next meeting immediately following that conference.

This second meeting established a number of significant guidelines for the project. Although the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document was held in abeyance until a meeting with the institutional representatives, the line-by-line review was exceptionally thorough and fruitful.

The preamble, containing the NAB philosophy, was a major contribution to the process of stating and describing the essence of the project. This interpretation of congressional intent was both bold and decisive and was needed to move ahead.

Another interesting milestone concerned the letter of announcement sent by the NTID/SS in December to 250 colleges and universities. Aside from the content, the criteria used to select the target institutions established guidelines for the next round of selection. To have received the initial information, the school had to be coeducational; have a school population of 1,000 or more; be located in or near a metropolitan area; and have at least one graduate school.

The far-reaching importance of the decision that the operating cost of the Institute be borne by the government needed no amplification or explanation to the deaf population.
Although the NAB continued to resist defining technical education as in National Technical Institute for the Deaf—it did state a "bottom line" for what it was not: It was not to be thought of as a deaf trade school. The NAB recognized in its preamble that some categories of students would be "capable of profiting from continued education of a technical sort." No definition for "technical sort" was forthcoming. Nevertheless, the NAB announced, in the preamble—supposedly for those at the institutional level who would have to deal with the decision of what to teach—that "an attitude of innovation and originality [was required] that should not be constrained by academic precedent or existing models." Hoag had earlier suggested that deaf students needed to have "available a universal conduit of educational opportunity anchored in the secondary program and reaching the university system." It was the existence of the "conduit" that gave importance to the project at this point, not necessarily the texture.
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CHAPTER VII

THE BOARD LISTENS

The Los Angeles meeting was as reassuring as the one in Washington. What was immediately ahead was within reasonable reach. The "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document was not to be published immediately, because the NAB first wanted input from interested colleges and universities. However, the draft document was sufficiently informative for limited distribution to early inquirers.

The date for the third NAB meeting depended upon a number of factors. Primarily, the NAB wanted to meet first with representatives from all interested institutions to discuss the prospect of a national technical institute for the deaf and the process for selecting a sponsoring institution. In this way, the NAB intended to gain an appreciation of an institution's enthusiasm for the project and of their commitment to carry out the intent of the NTID legislation; and to tell them what had been proposed, thus far, as procedure for deciding which institutions would be selected. The NAB sought the representatives' opinions regarding the reasonableness of its demands for information.

Since a month seemed time enough for institutional representatives to plan to attend the conference and prepare an announcement letter and mailing list, by January 24, all institutions that had requested information were sent the announcement. The conference was scheduled for February 24 in Chicago.

The third NAB meeting then was scheduled for February 25 and 26. Its major objectives were:

* to complete the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document
* to determine, as a result of input from the institutional conference, a reasonable deadline for receiving institutional proposals
* to establish NAB procedures for reviewing those proposals.

There was much to do in readiness for the institutional conference and the NAB meeting. Conference announcements generated considerable communication traffic, with letters, phone calls, and office visits flooding in from all sorts of people representing all kinds of programs. Again, special interest groups wanted to attend to listen and possibly provide input. This was tactfully discouraged, but since these
were open meetings, the Board could not control such special interest representation. 1

Immediately after the January meeting, the original schedule of activities for
the NTII/SS was updated as follows:
Revised schedule for the development of a contract for the national technical institute
for the deaf
Updated January 14, 1966, as recommended by the secretary's Advisory Board.
(Completed)

- **October, 1965** Letters of invitation to serve on the National Advisory Board.  
  (Mailed Nov. 2, 1965.)
- **November 30, 1965** Appointments to NTII/SS. (Completed)
  - Staff Director, Ralph Hoag, appointed 10/1/65.
  - Secretary, Flora Seale, appointed 10/1/65.
  - Research Assistant, Judith Fein, appointed 12/5/65.
  - Clerk-Typist, Barbara Delahunty, appointed 1/3/66.
- **December 6-7, 1965** First meeting of the Advisory Board. (Indoctrination,  
  orientation, and recommendation of application procedures.) (Completed)
- **December 30, 1965** Announcements to 250 colleges and universities,  
  inviting letters of intent to apply, and enclosing preliminary information.  
  (Completed)
- **January 13-14, 1966** Second meeting of the Advisory Board. (Adoption of  
  recommendations for application procedures and preparation of guidelines.)  
  (Completed)
- **January 24, 1966** Appointment of additional specialist to the NTII Special  
  Staff. (Completed)
- **February 24, 1966** Conference of representatives from institutions  
  intending to apply for the NTII project, Chicago, Illinois.
- **February 25-26, 1966** Third meeting of the Advisory Board. Plan  
  procedures for review of proposals and approve final draft of guidelines.
- **March 1, 1966** Completion of final clearances for distribution of application  
  guides and procedures.
- **July 1, 1966** Tentative deadline for receipt of application proposals from  
  colleges and universities. (Committee wishes to make decision regarding  
  this date at the February meeting.)
- **July 15, 1966** Tentative date for board review of proposals. (Site visits to be  
  conducted during period July 15 - August 15.)
- **August 15, 1966** Final meeting of the Advisory Board. (Preparation of final  
  recommendations to secretary.)
- **August 30, 1966** Negotiation of contract for NTID Project. 2

On January 24, Huff joined the NTID/SS as the second professional staff
person. He was to deal with upcoming institutional contract activities and planning
for facilities construction on the campus of the sponsoring institution. He was
involved in project orientation, familiarization with NTID/SS and NAB activities,
learning about deafness and the education of deaf children, and visiting facilities for
the education of deaf children in all kinds of settings, including day schools,
residential schools, and public school classes.

Appropriation activities for the project were planned in January. The Staff had
to project beyond the current activities and predict the amount of money needed to
implement the project after the site was selected. Wherever it might be, there would have to be "up front" funds available to develop and determine, among other things, architectural drawings, surveys, and space needs.

An appropriations request for $491,000 was submitted in January; $47,000 of that was to finance the NAB meetings and provide two additional temporary staff persons needed to complete the project.

DHEW NTID/SS requested $444,000, which was necessary for the grantee to initiate architectural and engineering studies, a need justified with a detailed description of planned disbursement. Eventually, after meetings with several Congressional committees supporting the request, the funds were appropriated.

DHEW, with NTID/SS participation, managed the appropriations effort.

Administrative changes in DHEW affected the NTID Office. Francis Keppel, former Commissioner of Education, moved to the DHEW to become assistant secretary for Education. Legislation passed in early 1966 established a new National Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf (NACED), Office of the Secretary (DHEW). NACED held its first meeting in April 1966. By the end of 1965, the Babbidge Committee finished its work, and Winalski was appointed executive secretary of its board. Although the Special Office for the NTID was moved, administratively, to the office of the assistant secretary of Education, DHEW, the Office was still linked for project supervision to Des Marais, Office of Assistant Secretary for Legislation (DHEW). This required some minor changes in communication linkages, but project activities continued as scheduled.

Two weeks before the institutional representatives conference in Chicago, Rep. Carey asked to speak to the conferences about the project. All were delighted at the request, since the Congressman's presence would increase the event's importance and visibly strengthen the status of Congressional commitment to the project.

Much of the NTID/SS work now required legal assistance and review. The contractual aspects of the project required considerable legal attention. Consequently, the Staff requested that a general counsel be assigned to the project. DHEW assigned Dorothy Appel from the Office of General Counsel, DHEW, who was on call for legal assistance and was a great help to the NTID/SS. Appel attended the Chicago meeting to learn as much as she could, to become better acquainted with the NAB membership, and to hear the views of the institutional representatives at their conference. She was immensely interested in what was being proposed and became one of the project's strongest advocates.

Because of the two meeting schedules, as well as the number of special guests, speakers, and the large volume of people scheduled to attend one or both, preparations were worked on until the last minute. Both agendas were cleared with Kirk, who would serve as chairman of both the institutional representatives conference and the NAB meeting to follow. Both events were scheduled at the Palmer House in Chicago.

The conference agenda included a coffee hour for the 30 or 40 attendees, followed by speeches by Carey, Silverman, and Hoag. The remainder of the time, except for a lunch break, was planned for the trio to take questions from the floor.

The NAB meeting agenda was to include:
- Introduction of special guests to include:
  - Rep. Hugh Carey, if he remained to attend the meeting
  - Dr. James Garrett, assistant commissioner of VRA, DHEW
Dr. Morvin Wirtz, deputy assistant commissioner for the Disadvantaged and the Handicapped, OE, DHIEW
Dorothy Appel, Office of General Counsel, DHIEW
Dr. Boyce Williams, consultant for the deaf and hard of hearing, VRA, DHIEW
Dr. James Chalfant, chief, Section for Handicapped Children and Youth, OE, DHIEW
D'Alan Huff, newly assigned NTID/SS member
Dr. Leonard Elstad, Gallaudet College.

- Review of minutes of the January meeting
- Review of NTID/SS activities
- Discussion of general conclusions resulting from the Conference of Representatives of Institutions
- Review of "Policies, Guidelines and Application Procedures" document
- Establishment of the deadline for filing proposals.
- Finalization of NAB plans for internal review of proposals.

On February 24, 32 representatives from 24 colleges and universities assembled for the institutional conference. (Appendix I). After the "get-acquainted" session, Kirk called the conference to order and introduced Carey of New York.

Carey welcomed the conference and complimented the NAB and DHIEW staff for their work. He spoke about the history of the NTID legislation and stressed the importance of the project to the future of deaf youth.

Silverman next explained:
- the depth of the project and its objectives
- the population it was to serve
- deafness with respect to how the population appeared to him
- the probable success of students who would attend the institute
- institutional programs
- the need for sensitivity to the special social needs of deaf people, especially to their communication needs.

Hoag then explained:
- the proposed "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document
- plans for submitting proposals
- plans for NAB review of the proposals
- plans for conducting site visits.

Copies of the proposed document, which eventually would be the guide for institutions to use in preparing their proposals, were available for review. Comments regarding the appropriateness of requests for information about the institution, and the feasibility of responding in the manner and on the schedule suggested, were welcomed. The NAB needed timing information upon which to establish reasonable deadlines for filing proposals. Most of the conference agreed that no more than two months would be needed to prepare an initial proposal document.

The conference was informative and productive. Through documentation, presentations, and discussions--before, during, and after the conference--the Board provided information on the NTID project. Now the institutions needed to assimilate this and other information and respond according to their interest in sponsoring the NTID. The "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" was not published until March, so that input from institutional representatives could be included.
Kirk called the NAB meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., February 25, 1966. Because of a death in his family, Panara did not attend.

The first item on the agenda was the NTID/SS activities report, followed by introductions of Huff and Appel. Huff, consultant for facilities development as well as technical and vocational aspects of the project, was the newest staff member.

Since Gallaudet was an agency of the federal government with a particular interest in the NTID project, the college always sent a representative to the meetings. On this occasion, Elstad attended. He was asked to comment on his position paper, which expressed concerns of Gallaudet faculty members that the NTID project might have a negative impact on the college as a possible competitive force for what they assumed would be a limited population of students available to both programs. After a brief discussion, the NAB concluded that the pessimistic approach of the paper may have been partly due to the fact that it was written before complete information on the project had become available.

This was followed by a discussion of the Institutional Representatives Conference of the previous day. NAB members shared what they learned with the others, agreeing that the "institutional proposal" procedure should occur in two phases, thus eliminating the need for an initial, complete, detailed proposal from all applicants. The two phases were described as the initial proposal phase and the site visit phase. Only those institutions selected for a site visit would have to provide the additional information required for final evaluation.

Members also discussed the time necessary for institutions to prepare proposals, deciding that at least two months would be necessary for the first stage proposal.

Kirk then introduced the agenda item, "General Discussion Topics," the first of which concerned student qualifications for admission. The discussion concluded with the following statement:

We must not lose sight of the fact that we are concerned with the future population—not just with the present deaf population. We must consider both the present and future capabilities of students. The sole criterion for the admission of students into the NTID should be in terms of what can be done for each student.10

The next item for discussion was a letter from Jess Smith, editor of The Deaf American, official publication of the National Association of the Deaf, asking permission to present the Association's views on the project. The NAB decided to delegate such discussions to the Special Staff because of time constraints and because the NAB was not constituted as a board of inquiry. The NAB was open to suggestions, but preferred written information in the form of position papers, statements, or letters, all of which could be duplicated and mailed to members for their consideration.11

Members reviewed the final draft of the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document, which had been approved by the Office of General Counsel, DHEW, and the Contracts and Construction Branch of the Office of Education, DHEW. Members deferred adoption of the draft until the agenda called for resolutions and motions.

Members discussed the application, which was to include:
• A cover letter from the chief administrative officer, containing an expression of the institution's attitude toward sponsoring such a project.

• A discussion of how the project would be governed and the extent to which deaf students would be integrated into the institution's general population.

• A description of the institution's organizational structure.

• A discussion of how to handle admission policies. Policies then used by most colleges and universities would put deaf applicants at a great disadvantage and terminate the institute before it began. Criteria other than test scores on standardized examinations would have to be developed.

Some members expressed caution against requiring uniformity in the NAB review of institutional proposals, to prevent clouding members' viewpoints on educational techniques and project philosophy. Opinions about applying institutions should be shared, thus capitalizing on the expertise of the membership.

The suggestion was made that, upon receipt, applications should be forwarded to members for preliminary review, with rules for the review process not to be formulated until after this preliminary step, which would do for any rules decisions until the June meeting. In addition, it was decided that voting on the approval of applications for site visits be by secret ballot.

The most important motions and formal recommendations of the meeting were:

• Acceptance and approval of the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document (Appendix K).

• Direction that this document be printed and ready for distribution by March 15, thus setting June as the deadline for submitting "institutional proposals".

• Recommendation that six copies of the document be sent to all institutions represented at the Chicago conference; that one copy be sent to each college and university that had previously corresponded with the NTID/SS, that a copy be published in the Federal Register, to ascertain full coverage and distribution of information.

• Recommendation that copies of the document, along with an explanatory article, be sent to all schools and classes for deaf students, as well as to interested organizations.

• Recommendation that all information and discussions concerning application procedures and plans for the review of proposals be kept confidential until information is approved and released by the secretary, DH/EW.

• Recommendation that before the next formal NAB meeting, a subcommittee should meet to discuss and prepare proposed plans for site visits.12

The Institutional Representatives Conference and the third NAB meeting were important to the NAB’s planning. NTID Special Staff members wanted to be sure that the efforts required of institutions were justified and that requests for information about them were reasonable, feasible, and timely.

The Institutional Representatives Conference was informative and productive, demonstrating sufficient interest to suggest adequate participation. This was gratifying, considering that this was many Staff members’ first formal exposure to leaders of institutes for hearing students. From among the institutional leadership at the conference were those upon whom the Staff depended to take the risk of NTID sponsorship— at some considerable expense should they apply and fail to be selected. Their input was essential to the development of the selection process.
It was significant that the NAB approved, ordered published, and distributed the "Policies, Guidelines and Application Procedures" document, through which the humanitarian aspects of the project were reinforced. For example:

- Students would be selected solely on the basis of ability to benefit from the institute's instruction, without regard to sex, race, religion, creed, color, national origin, or place of residence.
- The sole criterion for the admission of students would be in terms of the benefits they can utilize.
- As operational concepts, these principles would have a lasting effect on deaf students of all ages for all times.

Board members displayed deep insight and skill in meeting every challenge. Working as a team and without extensive debate, they resolved all issues expeditiously. Although their biggest decision was still to come, with the accomplishments of this third meeting, the NAB had successfully passed a major milestone.
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CHAPTER VIII

THE BOARD SELECTS

The Chicago meeting ended on a high note of accomplishment. The NAB and the office were about midway in the schedule and on time. Cohen, Des Marais, and other involved executives and staff members were pleased with the progress. Preparations were made to select institutions for site visits, to which end a NAB meeting was scheduled in Washington, D.C. for June 20-22, 1966. At that time, the NAB would evaluate the proposals and decide which institutions to visit, then organize teams and procedures for the visits, and establish a schedule.

The NTID/SS completed final preparations for publishing and mailing the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" to interested colleges and universities. A guidelines document was mailed and published in the Federal Register in April. Interested institutions had everything they needed to apply for NTID sponsorship.

On March 19, the NTID/SS met with representatives from the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) to address concerns that NAD had expressed in a position paper to the NAB at the Chicago meeting in February. The NAB had assigned initial action on this item to the NTID/SS (Appendix I).

Representing NAD were Frederick Schreiber, executive director of the national office; and Jess Smith, editor of the NAD publication, The Deaf American. Winalski and Williams of OVR represented the NIH; Huff, Foin, and Hoag represented the NTID/SS. Silverman also agreed to attend.

NAD was not critical of the project; on the contrary, its members had supported the legislation. For the most part, their concerns focused on what they considered to be too small a representation of deaf persons on the NAB. They also believed that the NAB lacked a sufficiently broad representation of educators of deaf students. They felt that the one deaf person on the NAB, though well qualified, represented primarily the general community of educators of deaf students. Consequently, they thought that the non-educators—working deaf people, as a group—were not represented, and therefore were unable to provide input into a project that would affect their future. They hoped that more deaf individuals would have an opportunity to become involved.
now and in the future for the balance of the project. Other lesser problems expressed were based on misinformation, lack of information, and rumors.

Hoag briefed them on the NAB’s accomplishments to date. Some of the information was new to them—particularly the guidelines, recent news releases, and the Federal Register article. A question and answer period cleared the air, following which the NAD representatives seemed more content with what had been done with the project thus far. They were satisfied that the NAB had handled deaf people’s interests and concerns fairly. They expressed their intention to draw up a position paper to state their concerns, hoping that these would be considered when forming future boards to affect deaf people’s lives. The meeting ended on a positive note. The DHEW assured NAD representatives that the lines of communication between them and the NTID/SS would remain open, and that their input would be welcome. Subsequently, the NTID/SS received the position paper, which was distributed to NAB members May 31.

Meanwhile, the NTID/SS continued to process a persistent flow of correspondence from individuals, agencies, organizations, and congressional offices asking about the project. For the most part, this sustained interest was a reaction to news releases and to the distribution of the Federal Register containing the guidelines article.

Also during this period, some prominent national organizations with a bona fide interest in the enterprise asked for representatives of the NTID project to speak at their conferences. Kirk suggested that Hoag accept invitations from two: the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (CEASD).

The CEC was the major national organization concerned with education of children with disabilities. This organization, with a national office and 50 affiliated state organizations, had a membership of considerably more than 10,000, and usually attracted several thousand members to its national meetings. Hoag spoke to a section at a convention in April 1966 in Toronto, Canada.

The other engagement was to speak at the CEASD meeting in Hot Springs, Arkansas, later that month. Their meetings traditionally drew approximately 150 members, and as a past member, Hoag was acquainted with many of the individuals present.

On April 11, Francis Keppel, assistant secretary for Education, DHEW, held a meeting to resolve another challenge to the NTID project from Gallaudet College. Attending from Gallaudet were Dr. Albert W. Atwood, president of the board; Elstad; Detmold; and Dr. Orin Cornett, vice president for Long Range Planning. Gallaudet took exception to the provision that “instruction, board, room, instructional books, and materials [would] be furnished by the [NTID] without expense to the students.” At issue was the interpretation of the NTID legislation by the NAB that the NTID was to be tuition free. Gallaudet’s position was that the NTID, if free, would have the advantage in recruiting students.

The Staff prepared a position paper for Keppel, restating the position of the NAB, the NTID/SS, and the Office of General Counsel. The following items were highlighted:

The NTID Act, Public Law 89-36, AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, Sec. 2., states: "For the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for
successful employment, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a national technical institute for the deaf, including sums necessary for the acquisition of property, both real and personal, and for the construction of buildings and other facilities for such institution." [Underlining added for emphasis.]

The NAB had discussed the issue in its first meeting, in December 1965. In the January 1966, meeting, “it was moved, seconded, and passed that the operating expenses of the institute shall be fully borne by the federal government without cost of tuition, board, or room to the qualifying student.”

At the NAB meeting in February, Appel commented on the issue, stating that: “the Act ... states that the NTID will be a federally supported institution and [her interpretation of the law was] that students who are enrolled will attend without having to pay fees for tuition, room, board, or other educational expenses.”

The resolution was that the NTID student would attend without having to pay fees for tuition, room, board, or other educational expenses. Procedures for gaining federal financial assistance for students would be similar for both institutions.

The Planning Subcommittee of the NAB met May 7 to develop procedures for evaluating the institutional proposals and to develop plans for site visits to selected institutions. Present were Kirk, chairman; Silverman; Thornberry; Rathe; Baird; and Panara. The NTID/SS had drafted an evaluation form for use by the NAB in assessing the institutional proposals. The subcommittee worked with these to produce a final version. To help in the preliminary review of institutional proposals, evaluation forms were sent to NAB members with their copies of the incoming proposals.

The subcommittee then worked on plans for site visits. They decided to form two site visit teams, one to be chaired by Silverman and the other by Rathe. NAB members were tentatively assigned to the teams, with attention given to equal distribution of talent. More could not be done until the institutional proposals were evaluated and the number of site visits determined. They planned the visits for July and August. The subcommittee asked the NTID/SS to find out as soon as possible how many institutions planned to submit proposals.

Through a telephone survey, the NTID/SS identified eight institutions that were earnestly writing proposals. These included San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California; Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York; University of Tennessee in Knoxville; University of Pittsburgh in Pennsylvania; University of Illinois in Urbana; Southern Colorado State College in Pueblo; MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Illinois; and Oklahoma State Technical College in Okmulgee. Two others still considering applications were the University of Utah in Salt Lake City and the University of Texas at Arlington. This information was passed to the members.

By June 1, the Staff had received proposals from the eight institutions. Because those from Utah and Texas arrived after the June 1 deadline, they could not be included in the review. Before the NAB meeting, the eight proposals, with evaluation forms, were sent for member review.

Kirk called the NAB meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. June 20. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to decide which proposals best met the NTID requirements, thereby qualifying those institutions for site visits; and to establish site visit teams
and schedules. All NAB members were present except Burke. Also present were ex officio members Switzer; Wirtz, OE, DHEW; James Garrett, on Switzer's staff; all of the NTID/SS; Winalski, executive director of the newly established National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf (NACED), and her staff; Des Marais; Williams and Skelly, both from VRA, DHEW; and Appel. All were intensely interested in the results of the evaluation and selection proceedings, which would follow introductions and administrative business.

Winalski presented a summary of the responsibilities and activities of the recently formed NACED. NACED had little to do with the institute at this point, but at a later date, when the institute was established, NACED would be interested in its educational progress and effectiveness. Winalski introduced Elizabeth Hanford, a new staff assistant responsible for the National Conference on the Education of the Deaf, and Fein, an administrative assistant, formally with the NTID/SS. (Hanford later become Elizabeth Dole. She was appointed Secretary of Transportation by President Ronald Reagan and appointed Secretary of Labor by President George Bush in 1989.)

Hoag reported the NTID/SS activities since the last NAB meeting. Kirk then turned to the the NAB's main concern and reviewed ground rules for reviewing the proposals.

Ten minutes would be allowed for a general discussion of each proposal. Members would rate each proposal, using the Proposal Rating Check List with its scale of 1 to 10 (1 being minimum score). Using the same scale, each member would also give an overall rating for each proposal. After the ratings were totaled and displayed, there would be a second round of discussion on each proposal. Each proposal would be rated again, based on information gathered from the second round discussion. Final results would be displayed showing a numerical ranking.

Before the NAB started discussing the proposals, Des Marais suggested that, in its recommendation to the secretary (DHEW), the NAB list the top three ranking institutions. The reasons should be stated for the selection of the number one institution, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the second and third and the reasons for their ranking. At the time, no one commented on this.

The NAB followed its procedures, and, after the two rounds of discussion, produced a ranking of seven proposals. The others were ineligible primarily because of insufficient information or late arrival of information. Of the seven, four were voted eligible for site visits: University of Illinois; University of Pittsburgh; Rochester Institute of Technology; and University of Tennessee. This ended the first day's session. (Records of evaluations made by Board members are available in the NTID Archives.)

At the NAB meeting the next day, Silverman, chairman of the Planning Subcommittee, discussed plans for the site visits. Site visit teams were identified and dates established for each visit:

- University of Pittsburgh: July 11-13
  Rathe, chair; Baird; Orman; Vincent, Thornberry, Silverman
- Rochester Institute of Technology: July 19-21
  Richard Silverman, chair; Baird; Orman; Vincent, Thornberry, Rathe
- University of Illinois: August 3-5
  Richard Silverman, chair; O'Marra; Baird; Switzer; Thornberry; Keller; Panara; Burke
and direct discussion during the proposal review, but that the chairman
should refrain from voting.

- Keller was appointed to serve as temporary chairman during the discussion
  of the University of Illinois proposal.
- It was voted to hold the next meeting of the NAB in Washington, D.C.
  September 29 and 30, at which time the members would deliberate over site
  visits and make final decisions on the location of the institute.

Meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m., June 22, 1966.9

In short, by the time this fourth NAB meeting was over, the Staff felt prepared
for the final phase of the project—to select from the finalists. From the start, all
actions had been calculated to underpin this final plateau. The published guidelines
not only explained how to participate in the project, but also how to think about the
institute and its impact on the deaf community and the nation. As a result, some
excellent, well-respected, educational institutions were participating, guaranteeing
that the final selection would be an ideal sponsor for the institute.
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CHAPTER IX

THE BOARD VISITS

The first day of the second most important phase of this project—the site visits—was less than three weeks away. The NTID/SS tackled the logistics and supported the NAB; the NAB did its homework and prepared for action.

The four institutions were informed of their selection as finalists and of the NAB's intention to visit each of them. The NAB wanted to get to know the institutions and the community in an attempt to determine, among other things, the strength of interest in the project and the institutional capacity to execute it. Accordingly, the institutions provided the facilities and administrative needs requested, and they organized the meetings and conferences on the schedule suggested.

The mission was clear. The NAB wanted to know if the institution understood Congress and the NAB's concept of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf (as expressed in Public Law 89-36 and amplified in the "Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures" document) could successfully operate such an institute in-house; could so position the administration and governance of the institute as to provide the leverage of full university privilege with respect to the colleges; had, or could get, the resources to do the task; had faculty or staff who had the technical training and education of the deaf experience; understood the problems of deaf students; could accomplish the job on time; and was located in the right community.

The NAB was ready. All members had a full understanding of the legislation, guidelines, and the institutional proposal of the sites to visit. The extensive discussions of all the proposals at the June meeting had deepened their understanding of what was available. They had evaluation forms and questionnaires to guide the discussions, ensure complete coverage, and help report the results. Each site team had discussion topics and questions, which had been developed from a study of the proposal submitted by its institution. Perhaps all this strengthened each member's commitment to the desired outcome.

Still, the NAB was not quite ready to go. On July 8, Kirk announced his resignation from the NAB out of concern that his position on the University of
Illinois faculty might constitute a conflict of interest. Although he had been assured this was no problem—because the NAB had ruled that persons connected with an applying institution be excluded from voting or discussing their proposals—Kirk thought otherwise. He believed he should resign in fairness to public interest and the project's image. A valuable member of the NAB, he had worked hard to provide the leadership to complete the mission with distinction and on schedule.

This was a major problem. According to the law, the Board needed 12 members, and a chairman to handle the site visits already scheduled and in motion. The appointment of a chairman could not wait until the next meeting in September.

DHEW acted quickly. To fill the vacancy, the secretary appointed Dr. Harriet Kopp, principal of the Detroit Day School for the Deaf, and a faculty member at Wayne State University. A member of NACED, she had no difficulty preparing for the project, became a member of as many site visit teams as she could, and quickly went to work. The NAB was asked for recommendations for the chairmanship, and it was agreed that Rathe should be asked to serve. He accepted the appointment, and the selection process continued on schedule.1

The group had four institutions to visit: Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT); the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus; the University of Pittsburgh; and the University of Tennessee. Two teams as well as others from DHEW were invited to participate, which some did, as shown in the site profile reports that follow.

Because RIT was eventually chosen to sponsor the institute, a detailed report of that visit is included here. In the interest of historical harmony, profile reports of the strengths and weaknesses of all the institutions are included. However, in the interest of fairness to those who participated, no personal credits were attempted or intended.

RIT was visited July 19-21, 1966. Silverman led this team with Baird, Kopp, O'Marra, Schunhoff, Switzer, Vincent, Wirtz, and Thornberry. Hoag attended from the NTID/SS along with Huff, staff consultant; Fein, research assistant; Seale, administrative secretary; and Delahunty, clerk.

The agreed-upon agenda for the visit included the following meetings and activities.2

Site Visit Agenda
Rochester Institute of Technology
July 19-21, 1966

July 19, Tuesday
3 p.m.: executive session—Sheraton Hotel
6 p.m.: cocktails—Rochester Club
6:30 p.m.: dinner—Rochester Club
7:30 p.m.: meeting with Institute and community leaders—Rochester Club

July 20, Wednesday
9 a.m.: conference with Dr. Mark Ellingson of RIT, 50 W. Main, Room 300
10 a.m.: inspection of facilities, Downtown Campus
11 a.m.: tour of proposed NTID site—New Campus
Noon: Lunch—Eastman Building
1:30 p.m.: individual conferences, offices of deans and directors
4 p.m.: Executive Session—Downtown Campus, Room 300

July 21, Thursday
9 a.m.: individual conferences—offices of deans and directors
Noon: luncheon meeting with Ellingson, Eastman Building.
1 p.m.: Executive Session—Downtown Campus, Room 300
At the first executive session on July 19, the team considered what they had learned from their review of the RIT proposal. Silverman asked the members to consider five major criteria relating to this site visit: 3

- ascertain the extent of understanding about deafness.
- explore the diversity of technical opportunities.
- investigate the nature of the institution and the surrounding community for continuing and future support.
- determine the extent and quality of professional training resources and the kinds of professional personnel available.
- find out about the extent and quality of research that is being done. (RIT appeared to concern itself more with the processes of research than with its substance.)

Members had prepared specific questions, following their reviews of the RIT proposal, and they used them extensively. They were reminded to go into this visit, as in all others, with an open mind, and to mix with community members at the meeting planned for that evening. 4

That evening at the Rochester Club, Dr. Mark Ellingson, president of RIT, was keynote speaker at the meeting of distinguished community and industry leaders. Most also were members of RIT's Board of Trustees. Their presence was an imposing statement of united community interest in the NTID project. Attending were James Galloway, superintendent of the Rochester School for the Deaf; Wallace Ely, president of Security Trust Company; Walter Strakosh, superintendent of Eastman Kodak Company and member of the Board of the Rochester School for the Deaf; Howard Carver, executive vice president of Gleason Works and an RIT trustee; James Sebaste, assistant superintendent of the Rochester School District; Maurice Forman, president of B. Forman Company and an RIT trustee; Russel McCarthy, manager of the Industrial Management Council of Rochester and an RIT trustee; Paul Miller, president of Gannett Company and an RIT trustee; Arthur Stern, attorney and chairman of RIT's Board of Trustees; Robert Strasenburgh II, president of Strasenburgh Laboratories Division of Wallace and Tiernan Incorporated and an RIT trustee; and Clarence Wynd, vice president of Eastman Kodak Company and an RIT trustee.

Stern presided during the introductions and guest speakers, who included representatives of the Rochester School for the Deaf and its board. Then Ellingson described RIT, its history, and its establishment in 1829 by founders "concerned with the occupational values of a man's life." He described the transition from the diploma-granting institute of years ago to that of today, where associate, baccalaureate, and master's degrees are awarded. He reviewed the institute's progress to date and explained plans for the future. Program offerings were extensive and the institution's financial structure was impressive. After the formal portion of the evening, informal conversations focused on Rochester's special interest in the deaf population, and especially on educating deaf children. The city had its own school program for deaf children. Development and growth of the school directly resulted from community interest, support, and financial help. The group expressed its continued interest in the needs of deaf people, and stated that they, better than anyone else, could develop...
in their community, under RIT's leadership, an outstanding national program for the technical education of deaf students.

On the second day, the team visited RIT personnel and facilities. They toured the occupied RIT facilities as well as the site for the new campus, where they were briefed on plans for the new facility. In subsequent meetings, they had the opportunity to talk with RIT personnel, including Ellingson; Harold Brennan, dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts; Alfred Davis, vice president of Development and Public Relations; George Forbes, Public Relations; Harold Kentner, director of Evening College Extended Services; Robert Maurice, assistant director of the Evening College and Extended Services; C. B. Neblette, dean of the College of Graphic Arts and Photography; Dr. James Wilson, director of Educational and Institutional Research; and Ada Vernon, assistant to the president.

The final session with Ellingson was informative. Questions were answered with questions, and staff members' anxiety was high. People at RIT were as sincere in their desire to take on this project as they were naive about what they might have to deal with in the education of deaf students. The meeting covered such topics as the timetable for decision making faced by the NAB, the plan for dissemination of agreement information, budget appropriations and accessibility of funds, probable timetable for the appointment and training of staff members should the project come to Rochester, enrollment of students, construction of facilities, and plans for moving from segregated education to integration of deaf students into the institute's mainstream programs.

Meanwhile, Orman, a team member not present at the site, conducted a mail survey among leaders of Rochester's deaf community. In reporting the results to the NAB, he described Rochester's deaf community as unusual in many ways. Of the approximately 400 known deaf people, most were graduates or alumni of the Rochester School for the Deaf (RSD)—an impressive result of education and placement. RSD had been developed by the community early in the city's history and received considerable support from industry and Rochester's citizens in providing buildings and campus facilities. The city continued to support RSD students in its industrial and manufacturing hiring practices.

He reported that the job market for deaf people in Rochester was quite good. Economically, they seemed somewhat above par, in his view, when compared to deaf people in other urban centers. He attributed this to a continuing demand for a labor force, good acceptance of deaf people in jobs, and a good opportunity for further training—usually supplied or financed by employers.

Orman thought that the number of deaf people in the Rochester area who owned their homes was unusually large. A central cultural association of deaf people had their own club house and recreation facility. The Lutherans among them owned their church and partially supported its minister. There was a strong school alumni association that raised funds to support school activities at a level that Orman felt was higher than support given to other schools. All those he contacted, and many spoke for others, gave strong support to RIT's bid for the institute.

It was clear that the major strength of the RIT program was expertise in technical education and programming. Its impressive array of curriculum offerings covered a wide variety of technical areas. What clearly was lacking was knowledge of deafness, the educational problems that deaf people face, and the methods and procedures traditionally used in teaching and working with them. The support of the
The industrial and social services community was clearly evident, and the deaf community itself showed intense interest in the project.

In the final executive session at each site, the NAB prepared a schematic profile of that institution's strengths and weaknesses in terms of the NTID project. Profiles of each of the four institutions follow:

Profile of Rochester Institute of Technology
July 19-21, 1966

Silverman led this team with Baird, Kopp, O'Marra, Schunhoff, Switzer, Vincent, Wirtz, and Thornberry. Representing the NTIDSS, Houg attended with Huff, staff consultant; Fein, research assistant; Seale, administrative secretary; and Delahunt, clerk.

Regarding the Applying Institution

Strengths:
The Institution--As a privately managed facility, it had contractual autonomy; professional personnel exhibited unequivocal and pervasive enthusiasm; showed a demonstrative urge and ability to integrate, innovate, and create; exhibited high level of technical competence; excellent morale of RIT employees; very competent in use of funding; and demonstrated community support, acceptance, evidence of personalized national organizational relationship.

Program of Instruction--RIT's curriculum included high level technical programs; an excellent readily available evening program within the Institute; and a wide range of degree options.

Administration--RIT demonstrated competence; its source, contacts, and relationships were international; it appeared not to be overly administrative; demonstrated a sincere willingness to engage in training; a willingness to learn and to expand; a willingness to train staff; and had an atmosphere of easy intraschool movement; and flexibility.

Recruitment--The Institute had nationwide contacts.

Corollary and Special Services--The Institute showed a clear willingness and desire to employ qualified personnel in these service areas.

Physical Facilities--The Institute had excellent facilities and impressive future growth plans.

Location--The city of Rochester and surrounding community was located in an industrial area and was a multi-cultural community.

Social Environment for Students--RIT demonstrated an encouraging willingness to integrate at all levels.

Potential for a Student Placement Program--RIT had extensive contacts with industry.

Professional Training--RIT demonstrated a clear willingness to train and to exploit the possibilities of training people for this special area of education.

Research--RIT indicated that it had a positive attitude for pursuing that area in support of a program for deaf students.

Weaknesses:
The Institution--Demonstrated a realistic acceptance of a lack of familiarity with the problems of deaf people.

Instruction--There was a clear lack of experience in working with deaf people, and its curriculum contained no lower level programs in vocational or trade areas.

Special Services--The Institute was insensitive to problems.
Location—Poor location geographically on a national basis in terms of distance from the West Coast of the United States.

Professional Training—The Institute exhibited a total lack of experience in the area of training personnel in areas related to deafness.

Research—RIT showed little or no actual experience in the area of scholastic or academic research.

Profile of the University of Pittsburgh
July 11-13, 1966

Rathe led this team with Baird, Orman, Vincent, Silverman, and Thornberry. From the NTID/SS, Hoag attended with D'Alan Huff, staff consultant; and Seale, administrative secretary. From the DH EW staff were Winalski, NACE; and Dr. James Garrett, VRA, administrative secretary. 10

Strengths:
The Institution—Pittsburgh showed enthusiasm toward the project at all levels; demonstrated diversity and an abundance of offerings; had a tradition of work with handicapped people, including those who were deaf, and the future potential of the university looked hopeful.

Program of Instruction—Showed that Pitt had a very forward-looking philosophy, with excellent local resources; based on the attitudes shown, there was a diversity of offerings, easy accessibility, and good facilities for training personnel to serve the program; it demonstrated sensitivity to an evaluation of what needed to be done in a program of this sort; and offered an excellent plan for the integration of professional training with practical programming for deaf students.

Administration, Staff, and Training—Pittsburgh had an excellent plan for the selection of a program director; had the capability for training staff; proposed that the NTID program be administered directly under one of the vice chancellors; had access to information on deafness and deaf people within the University and from other institutions in the area; offered a plan for a free-standing institution (by intention of department level staff and in the proposal); and had excellent policies for personnel status and benefits.

Admissions Procedures and Recruitment—Control of admissions would be with NTID and Pitt had an active and effective student guidance program.

Corollary and Support Services—Showed noble and thorough intentions for effective student support and guidance program for the Institute.

Physical Facilities and Campus Location—Pitt had adequate and available proposed sites for an NTID facility off-campus, yet in close proximity to the campus, transportation, and the community with excellent community acceptance.

Social and Recreational Provisions—Local associations for deaf people had facilities for and had active social and recreation programs that would be open and available to students; all university’s recreation facilities would be open to students; and there was an excellent breadth and scope of recreational facilities available in the community.

Student Placement Program—The Institution offered a plan to gear the placement program to the needs of students; there existed a community record for placement.
outside of the area as well as within; and the placement program was planned to be an integral part of the overall program with a plan for long-term follow up.

**Research**--Pitt demonstrated strong possibilities for intradepartment cooperation; the program would be in close proximity to the Learning Research Center; and it offered a good plan for in-house research as well.

**Weaknesses:**

**The Institution**--The plan offered for the operational chain of command for the NTID was unclear; questions were raised regarding the possible extent of state control over the program in view of the current financial crisis facing the Institution; and general lack of understanding about the program on the part of some academic groups which exhibited less than positive attitudes about sponsorship of the NTID program.

**Program of Instruction**--Its plan showed that the program would rely heavily on tutor specialists for student training and educational support rather than on training instructors to work directly with deaf students; the Institution showed a lack of skill in teaching in technical areas; its plan included the use of diversely placed existing facilities for training in technical areas, posing logistical problems in the use of cooperating facilities.

**Administration, Staff, and Training**--Planned dependency on tutor interpreters rather than trained teaching staff was felt to be disadvantageous to the program; with an original plan to have the program administered as a service facility within the School of Education.

**Admission Procedures and Student Recruitment**--Felt that the Institution was planning to be overly dependent upon its own in-house rehabilitation training program and services; though thorough, it appeared to be very complex.

**Corollary Services**--The implementation of needed services was not clear and a plan for a mental health program for students was absent.

**Physical Facilities and Campus Location**--The plan for location of an interim program location for the NTID was vague; with eventual plan for the use of widely dispersed existing training centers for technical training considered to be an undesirable feature; the ability to purchase land for the central educational facility on two possible sites was uncertain; and the planned central urban location offered would be at a very high cost for land acquisition and construction.

**Social and Recreation**--There was a lack of adequate plans for recreational facilities on the planned NTID site.

**Professional Training**--There was an absence of detailed plans for the training of personnel; it was suggested that responsibility for setting standards for the training of technical staff may be placed in the hands of cooperating facilities, indicating a lack of university control over the training of technical staff.

**Research**--There appeared to be no budgetary provision in its plan for supporting or subcontracting for research with other facilities within the Institution.

---

**Profile of the University of Illinois**

*August 3-5, 1966*

Silverman led this team with Baird, Burke, Keller, O'Marra, Panara, Switzer, and Thornberry. From the NTID/SS, Hoag attended with Huff, Fein, Seale, and Appel.11

**Strengths:**

**Institution**--Illinois had excellent related services with expertise in deafness; with strong administrative enthusiasm and support; with competence in research;
competence in general intellectual sophistication; a very comprehensive total university environment; very forward looking approach to problems; strong political support; and a very prestigious institution that would be likely to attract students.

Program of Instruction--The Institution exhibited a good conception of sequential experiences; it used a cluster type of organization in programming; exhibited university wide support for program sponsorship; offered an excellent plan for selection of an advisory group; good distribution of related facilities; and availability of a baccalaureate education program.

Administration, Staff, and Training--The Institution demonstrated excellence in planning for the selection and employment of a program director; with assurance that the program head would report directly to the President; and had excellent institutional procedures for recruiting and training personnel.

Admission and Placement of Students--Demonstrated a clear understanding of the problem which was based on experience in research on the deaf.

Recruitment--The University had a comprehensive university-wide recruitment program and had good rapport with the deaf community.

Corollary Services--The University had excellent resources university wide and expertise in provision and supervision of counseling services.

Physical Facilities--The Institution demonstrated excellent skill in planning and developing facilities and exhibited a very positive attitude about the development of facilities for the NTID project.

Geographic Location--The Chicago campus was centrally located in the United States and was centrally located within the community, with generally good access to transportation.

Social and Recreation Facilities--The Institution had excellent on and off-campus facilities. The deaf community in Chicago also had numerous clubs and organizations that would be open to students attending the University.

Placement Services--The Institution demonstrated considerable experience in this process.

Professional Training of Personnel--Considerable evidence of sensitivity to the needs of training for personnel; extensive availability to resources university wide from associated academic disciplines.

Research--University competence in this area was unquestioned with an added advantage of expertise in research experience on deafness with plans readily consistent with the purposes of NTID.

Weaknesses:

The Institution--Lacked an adequate balance in the population ratio with respect to academic pursuits and technical education pursuits and lacked facilities and programs for technical education.

Instructional Program--The Institution appeared vague about how it would use needed other resources for technical training of students; and there was a question about the training for teachers of deaf students with respect to its location on the Urbana campus.

Administration, Staff, and Training--The evidence was clear that there was a lack of trained personnel in technical areas.

Geographic Location--Evidence of considerable social unrest in the environs of the University and surrounding area.
Social and Recreational Provisions. The University campus did not have residential facilities on campus so that the area was literally deserted on weekends and nights; and the area surrounding the campus was heavily urban and lacking in wholesome desirable nearby recreational facilities, as based on experience in research on the deaf.

Profile of the University of Tennessee
August 16-18, 1966

Rate led this team with Keller, Panara, Schunhoff, Thornberry, and Tracy. From the NTID/SS, Hoag attended with Seale and Delahunty. Thomas Skelly attended from OV, DHEW.

Strengths:

Institution - The University was comprehensive, showing a university wide open mind to sponsorship of the NTID project; and with a well-organized administrative structure.

Program of Instruction - Presented an innovative approach to education generally and as it relates to the deaf; showed a high level of competence and awareness with respect to the education, training, and rehabilitation of the deaf; with an educational laboratory school on the university campus.

Administration, Staff, and Training - The University president showed a willingness to upgrade the administrative recognition of the NTID project from what had been planned; showed considerable insight to communication problems of the deaf; demonstrated ability to recruit qualified staff for the project; and assured full faculty status for NTID personnel with premium pay to be considered for their services.

Student Placement - The University had its own operational program and planned to incorporate the NTID program into its existing program with specially trained NTID placement specialists; also with encouragement to students seeking their own employment.

Corollary Services - There existed on campus a fully developed speech and hearing facility for hearing-impaired individuals; complete hospital facilities; and students were already accustomed to and acquainted with deafness on campus, providing a potential for satisfactory social integration among students.

Physical Facilities - The university campus facilities collectively represented an ideal response to the intent of the proposal for the NTID in terms of potential campus life; cost was minimal; it was economically operated; there was a new building program in process; and the University made maximum use of all of its facilities.

Location - Geographic location somewhat east with respect to the West Coast, but central with respect to north and south location; locally, it was in an entirely wholesome and friendly environment with respect to the surrounding community, with easy access to community resources and services.

Social and Recreational Facilities - Excellent off-campus activities and facilities as well as facilities on campus for students; excellent outdoor recreation programs available.

Professional Training - The University appeared to have good personnel training facilities and programs; a laboratory school on campus; teacher preparation
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programs for teachers of the deaf and other handicapped children on campus; and a potential for expansion.

Research. The Institution was aware of the need and had a good range of experience to bring to the program.

Budget Planning -- Consistent with the plan for the multiple use of existing facilities.

Weaknesses:

- Program of Instruction. The Institution's presentation on planning for a pre-entry preparatory program was not very clear, somewhat vague, tentative, indefinite, and limited in scope.

- Administration, Staff, and Training. Placement for the program administratively was left uncertain; initially considered a low level placement for the program within one of the education departments; proposed a somewhat patronizing approach to the selection of an advisory board; department head and staff remained defensive of the position that the program be placed in their department; and lastly, were against the notion proposed for appointing an interim director.

- Procedures for Admission. The Institution proposed that admissions be run by their department of vocational rehabilitation and that all students be classified as active rehabilitation clients. This generated negative reactions to this plan on the part of the Board.

- Student Placement. The Board took a strong position against the plan that the University had for job placements. They were opposed to having this handled by procedures used by rehabilitation counselors, preferring a more normal approach to placement services offered to all college students.

These profiles were some of the tools that the NAB used to prepare the final report to the secretary, HIEW. In addition, team members contributed their individual impressions to the process. The challenge now was to quantify and evaluate into a usable instrument what had been learned on the visits.

In short, the visitation teams confirmed that the institutional world was far from recognizing the scope of the institute envisioned by the NAB, as an amplification of Congressional intent. The teams sought institutions that could provide a coeducational, residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for deaf students.

Congress intended that a broad, flexible curriculum be made available to meet the special needs of able young deaf adults who seek the opportunity for higher education and training. Adequately trained staff members were needed who were resourceful, flexible, and imaginative to operate this residential facility.

Congress also intended the institute to have a "sufficient number of flexible classroom accommodations to handle at least 50 groups or classes simultaneously; dormitories for 600 residential students equipped with recreation room, social center, reading and study areas; laboratory and shop facilities for all technological and occupational programs..." and other requirements (Appendix C). This was to be a sizable institution with an advisory group that included Congressional representation. It was not to be a sub-unit of a school department. It needed the clout to deal effectively with all departments, divisions, and management aspects of the sponsoring institution. These requirements were evident in the guidelines, the Congressional hearings, and the Act. The institution was to embody a national symbolism. Yet, not all institutions responded accordingly; some views were quite to the contrary.
• Some showed no interest in having technical education on their campus.
• Some would resist undergraduate professional training on their campus.
• For some, since there would be no "NTID" technical training facility on campus, the program would be spread throughout the community in many locations.
• Some would "farm out" students to junior colleges, high schools (probably not legal), and other vocational schools in the area. Some of these schools were for students going on to college and were unlikely to be terminal training facilities. The sponsoring institution itself would not be directly involved in vocational or technical education.
• A single facility, if built, would be primarily a support service and academic education facility. It would not be a technical training facility.
• The governance of the institute would be in the College of Education under the dean of that school--instead of under the president's office, with full university privilege to deal and work with all the colleges.
• The focus of the institute would be within departments that work with teachers of deaf students and with counselors.

Accordingly, the NAB had some major, fundamental issues to deal with before it could choose the sponsoring institution, as follows:
• the "farming-out" principle for program and work/study activities by three of the institutions; only one had all these programs in-house
• the focus of the project's governance within the structure of the sponsoring institution--a problem with all institutions
• the appropriate procedure for the appointment of an advisory group. Most institutions were open to suggestion on this.
• selection of a director and key staff; three institutions showed strength in this.
• organization and identification of the curriculum--a problem with three of the programs
• recruitment and admission of students; institutions were all over the map on this one
• getting a clearer picture about the need for a preparatory program for students
• attitudes about the eventual integration of deaf students into programs for hearing students

The NAB was prepared for the final challenge. Team members had learned much about universities and how they operate. A good image of what the NTID program would be like in each of the four possible settings had developed. All the members had their own ideas about where the program should go, and it was apparent that they did not agree. Thornberry was the only one who had been to all four institutions--most had seen two or three.

Thus, in order to more fully inform themselves, the members traded notes on their observations, and in this way, Keller learned of RIT's merits. Since he had not visited RIT, he arranged to go, to meet the people and see the facility.

The NAB members reinforced their understanding and appreciation of what a national technical institute for the deaf should look like--something that they had become so concerned about and dedicated to. After meeting with so many people in so many communities and universities, they generated, in those areas, a greater public
awareness about deafness and a better understanding and appreciation of the problems of deafness in the work place.

Site visit reports were mailed to each member promptly, and the final meeting of the NAB was scheduled for September 19. The Staff anticipated that the NAB would choose the sponsoring institution at that time, and that a final report would be drafted and submitted to the office of the secretary, DHHEW. The NTID/SS and General Counsel had done preliminary work on the content of a tentative agreement document. Now the NAB had to choose which institution would enter into the agreement.
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CHAPTER X

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS

On September 1, 1966, Dr. James Moss, former director of Research and Development, Division for Handicapped Children, Office of Education, DHEW, was appointed acting director of NTID/SS. Hoag, who now was superintendent of the Rochester School for the Deaf, served the office and the NTID/SS as special consultant at this meeting. The important task facing the NAB and the NTID/SS was to prepare for the final meeting, whose purposes were to select the institution best qualified to sponsor the NTID and to recommend this selection to the secretary, DHEW. The meeting was scheduled for September 29-October 1, following which the NTID/SS would continue working on the project until a formal agreement on the establishment and operation of the NTID was ratified by the sponsoring institution and the secretary of DHEW.

At 9:30 a.m., September 29, 1966, Rathe called the meeting to order in a room full of lighting, video camera equipment, and extra people to witness and record the event as had been done at President Johnson's signing ceremony in the Rose Garden. The filming was part of a documentary about the project.1

Rathe called attention to the changes in the NAB since Kirk's resignation. He introduced Dr. Harriet Kopp, who had been appointed to fill that vacancy. Kopp, also a member of the secretary's National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, was principal of the Detroit School for the Deaf in Detroit, Michigan. She also served on the faculty of Wayne State University, serving in its program for the preparation of teachers of deaf children. Her extensive professional background included service as a teacher of deaf children, receiving her doctorate in speech pathology and audiology; service in that field; and service as a program administrator in schools for deaf children.

Rathe announced his own appointment as NAB chairman.

He then introduced Dr. Paul Miller, assistant secretary for Education with DHEW—the position formerly held by Keppel. His office was in the administrative chain overseeing the work of the NTID/SS office. Miller, formally president of West Virginia University, served on several U. S. Presidential commissions. He was intensely interested in the project and most supportive and helpful. Miller eventually became the first NTID project officer for the Secretary of DHEW. He was a major
influence in developing the "Agreement" between DHHS and the sponsoring institution.

Miller addressed the NAB briefly, complimenting its members and staff for their unusual speed and efficiency. He expressed the hope that the NAB would make its final decision at this meeting, then make its recommendation to the secretary.

Houag reviewed the NTID/SS activities: staff members had participated in all four site visits, prepared follow-up reports, and completed the administrative actions required to terminate the visits and prepare for the meeting. Reports generated by the teams were published and distributed to all members prior to the meeting.

Houag reported that, in addition to the team visits, Keller had visited RIT; Winalski and Des Marais had visited the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois; and Des Marais and Rathe had visited RIT. One of the members had visited all four sites, four had visited three, five had visited two, and three had visited one. Members received all the reports and had access to all the team information and impressions.

By this time, the camera crews had left. The NAB discussed the procedures to follow in evaluating the site visit reports. Each chairman would report on his team's visit, summarizing his remarks according to an outline suggested by the NAB. Reports were to consider the following:

- **Commitment of the institution** with respect to level, breadth, administration, faculty, and personal commitment of the chief executive
- **Technical training capability** of the applicant, including basic, remedial, vocational and technical education ability and potential
- **Knowledge of deafness** and the possible effect upon curriculum, training of staff, research, and service to deaf students
- **Environment**, including personnel, physical plant, building schedule, on-site location, psychosocial status, and general geographic location

At this point, Des Marais reported Secretary Gardner's request for a report that would lend itself to a visual display of the four institutions' rankings.

In response to previous queries by the NAB, Appel submitted a memorandum which:

...contained legal opinions concerning (1) the operation of the NTID, and (2) the level of technical training and education at the NTID. Essentially, the opinions were that there must be control of the faculty and the curricula by NTID of any training that is farmed out to other institutions by the NTID, and that the level of technical training in the NTID must be postsecondary. Preparatory education is authorized prior to or concurrent with the postsecondary training but not in lieu thereof.

The NAB then evaluated the site visits, starting with the University of Pittsburgh. Rathe, chairman of this team, led the discussion, closing with this summary:

**University of Pittsburgh**

- **Commitment**: There was a strong statement of intention, but reservations on the part of the chairman [of the University committee] of their ability to fully implement their intentions in practice.
• **Technical Training:** The University considered technical education diverse and expensive and planned to take advantage of technical offerings in the community. The technical education curriculum would be farmed out, a strategy that the team thought would be difficult to control.

• **Knowledge about Deafness:** The University had considerable understanding of deaf people.

• **Environment:** The University offered a wide variety of cultural activities, and its location made it easy to reach. Environment was one of its strongest points.

Next, Silverman, who chaired the Rochester Institute of Technology team, led a discussion on its qualifications. A summary follows:

**Rochester Institute of Technology**

• **Commitment:** Silverman enumerated the points on which the Institute would be judged, namely level, breadth, and intensity of commitment. RIT’s plan would make the director the equivalent of a dean. Silverman explained that Rochester was a clean industry community whose future depends on its looking ahead. It was a community where deaf people already were employed in industry. RIT faculty members did not have the constraints that inhibited their peers at other colleges. The levels of commitment, breadth, and intensity were high.

• **Technical Training:** The theory under which IUT worked was that technical training was concomitant to all other training. The Institute was a going operation with considerable experience behind it. It seemed to be keeping up with the times and had a good relationship with industry.

• **Knowledge about Deafness:** RIT officials felt that their lack of experience was their primary virtue—if the fundamental training and motivation were good, they could learn what they needed to know about deafness.

• **Environment:** RIT suggested a buddy system. RIT’s student body had an *esprit de corps* not found in other colleges. RIT students would be interested in deaf students, willing to integrate with them, and would be comfortable with them. This was a technical institution and came closest to the ideal sought.

A discussion ensued about RIT’s accreditability. It was pointed out that the Office of Education recognized that the Institute had five professional schools, conferred bachelor’s and master’s degrees, and clearly met the definition of an institution of higher education under P.L. Law 89-36: *it has one or more professional or graduate schools*. The five-year program in chemistry, leading to a B.S. degree, had been approved by the Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society. Within a year, the Institute would be ready for accreditation by the Engineers’ Council for Professional Development (ECPD).

Next, Team Chairman Rathe led a discussion about the qualifications of the University of Tennessee. A summary of this discussion follows:

**University of Tennessee**

• **Commitment:** University personnel had a high level of commitment, and ability to live up to their aspirations.

• **Technical Training:** They proposed to do all the technical training on campus, starting with a few of the more popular subjects. The visiting team considered the interdisciplinary relationships within and among
departments to be weak. Although they seemed dedicated, they thought that much of the success of the program would depend on the nature and character of the charter class of students to be enrolled.

- **Knowledge about Deafness**: The chairman ranked them superior to RIT and equal to Pittsburgh. The University had many doctoral and master degree theses on problems of deaf and handicapped people.

- **Environment**: The University's proposal called for totally integrating deaf students into campus life. The location was good, and parents of deaf students would feel comfortable sending their young adults to this university.

Finally, Team Chairman Silverman led a discussion on the qualifications of the University of Illinois. The summary follows:

**University of Illinois**

- **Commitment**: The breadth of commitment to the project on the part of major divisional level administrators was difficult to assess. The chief motivation for the project came out of the Institute for Exceptional Children, which was located in Urbana, not Chicago. The planned status of the faculty of the NTID was a bit ambiguous. However, the overall commitment of the University to the project was rated as high.

- **Technical Training**: The major emphasis was in research. As to the farming out of major parts of the program as opposed to on campus or near campus facility for technical training, there seemed to be a shift in position from the central concept to the one of farming out programs contractually.

- **Knowledge about Deafness**: University research on deafness emanated from the Institute for Exceptional Children, and it was research that related well to the education of deaf children. The strength of the knowledge about deafness, however, existed at Urbana. How this was to be transmitted to the Chicago campus was unknown.

- **Environment**: The Chicago Circle Campus was a commuting campus located in a blighted area (there were no residential facilities on campus). While the cultural centers were a plus, the advisability of housing deaf students in this complicated environment was questionable, and the University did not own the land where it proposed to build the NTID.

It was pointed out in discussion by a Board member who had visited the site that the University of Illinois would have to go through state and city agencies to negotiate for the purchase of the land. This would involve evicting tenants, and securing the cooperation of the City Planning Commission to have parts of the land condemned, in order to purchase it.2

At the close of this discussion, Des Marais read a letter from Wilbur Cohen to Sen. Hill of Alabama. The letter replied to a question that Sen. Murphy asked Sen. Hill regarding the role of research in the NTID project. Following are excerpts from Cohen's letter:3

> The concept that the National Technical Institute for the Deaf should serve as a focal point for research related to the education of the deaf was thoroughly discussed in numerous planning sessions that preceded the presentation of our testimony in support of this legislation.
The institute would be an excellent proving ground for development and the evaluation of new and better ways for teaching deaf children. The knowledge that results would be useful to all programs where deaf children are taught.

Our plans definitely include recommending that the research component of the institute be charged with the responsibility for organizing, conducting, and interpreting research and for disseminating research information on all educational aspects related to the education of the deaf.

In our opinion, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act authorizes conducting research as outlined above.

Des Marais followed this with references to the research question by referring to portions of Switzer’s testimony, recorded in the report of the Senate Committee. Silverman referred to the “Guidelines,” which refer to the commitment of the project to research (Appendix K).

The point of this discussion was to emphasize to the NAB the importance of examining the candidate institutions in terms of their competence in the area of research.

Following lunch, the NAB agreed to a first-round vote by secret ballot to see if a consensus had been reached. Fourteen were eligible to vote and did, as follows:

- Rochester Institute of Technology: 9
- University of Tennessee: 2
- University of Illinois: 1
- University of Pittsburgh: 0
- Undecided: 2

Without further discussion of the vote, the NAB took a break, and when the meeting resumed, Keller moved that they go into executive session. This was seconded by Schunhoff and carried by a voice vote. The reason for this abrupt change in procedure on the part of the Board remained unexplained until the report of the executive session was published. This was the explanation they gave:

Following a vote to sample consensus of preference, a motion was carried to reconvene the Board with only vote-casting members present. This was done to facilitate discussion of differences with the smallest required group present, and to restrict further participation to only those persons permitted to vote on motions.

Seale was asked to stand by to join the Board when called, in order to record their subsequent deliberations. It was not until after Secretary Gardner received the report that the minutes of the executive session and the report itself were made available to the general staff. In the executive session, the NAB had recorded discussions that occurred before the final vote. The discussion centered on two key points: the importance of technical training competence; and clarification of what is meant in having the NTID institution “have knowledge about deafness.” Various members addressed themselves specifically to these points:

Schunhoff stated that the prime consideration in the decision must be the immediate availability of an ongoing program of technical training within the walls
of the institution to receive the NTID. He said it was feasible to recruit to the institution qualified personnel in the field of deafness. He stressed the point [on research] that existing programs related to deafness in other applying institutions other than RIT were in research and in the training of elementary and secondary-level teachers of deaf students. They were not involved in technical education or in the training of teachers in technical areas. He stated that RIT's lack of tradition in the field of deafness would set the stage for exciting new possibilities. It could be considered a definite asset.

Panara's comments were directed at communication. He expressed doubts about RIT's ability to develop communication skills in the staff members who would work with the students. He noted that RIT admitted having little understanding of the communication problems and psychology of deaf students, which underscored his concern lest it be misled in such matters as staff recruitment, communication training methods, and maintaining an unbiased approach to the problems involved. His comments brought assurances that qualified, open-minded, staff members with flexible attitudes about communication methods could be brought to the program. The NAB agreed with Panara that this point was worthy of attention. They assured him that the institute's national scope would enable it to attract leadership that was worthy of the enterprise.

Thornberry indicated that many features of RIT had drawn a favorable reaction on the site visit. She was impressed with its commitment to idealism, its warmth, enthusiasm, and innovative programs. Also of paramount importance to her was the prospect of a comfortable, congenial atmosphere for the students, who, for the most part, would be entering with the equivalent of an eighth-grade education. The size of the institution and the city was not so large as to intimidate students from sheltered environments, she thought. As strongly as she felt about these points, however, she did not reach a final affirmative decision until she knew that the other NAB members, who were experts in the field of education of the deaf and technical education, chose RIT as the site for NTID.

Baird said that people not intimately associated with a technical institute could not completely understand the nature of its operation. Vocational schools and community colleges thought they are doing the same thing, he said, but they are not. RIT was a large, technical institute with the basic philosophy and traditions of a such a college as well as the esprit de corps of a student body often found in this type of environment.

On the other hand, a strong director with knowledge of deaf students could attract high caliber staff members who were specialists in education of deaf students. They, in turn, would be able to train a staff of technical educators in the methods of communicating with and teaching deaf students. Therefore, Baird believed that RIT could secure what it lacked much more easily, quickly, and effectively than any of the other three institutions.

In support of RIT, O'Marra said that as to the importance of knowledge of deafness, the most important qualification for the institute's successful operation would be technical faculty members skilled in communicating with deaf students. None of the applying institutions possessed this capability at the time, and even those universities with some degree of deaf awareness indicated the need to train faculty members for periods of from three months to one year.
Keller said that although he did not vote for Rochester on the straw vote, he felt that RIT could do the work, and, compared to the other institutions, had the best experience at the technical level. Since those NAB members with experience in the deaf community have stated that "the knowledge about deafness" phase of the program could be developed efficiently within the institution, he would vote for RIT. He further believed that any one of the four institutions could do the program, but the immediacy of the problem led him to believe Rochester should be selected. Dr. Keller's remarks and some remarks by other members have been edited here in order to make clear the intent of statements made during the executive session. (The accuracy of the statements as written has been reviewed and accepted for accuracy by both Silverman and Panara, both of whom were present during the session.)

The next item for discussion was the mechanics of voting. When the vote was taken, there was unanimous agreement. A motion then was passed to recommend to Secretary Gardner that the National Technical Institute for the Deaf be awarded to Rochester Institute of Technology.

The NAB then developed a format for the final report to give the secretary clear, convincing reasons for the selection. Regarding the protocol for transmitting the report, they agreed that the NAB chairman should simultaneously deliver it to the secretary and to the NTID/SS, and that no report of any kind be made prior to or other than as stated above.

The NAB reconvened with full staff at 3:30 p.m., October 1, at which time they gave the NTID/SS the information necessary to prepare the NAB report for the secretary. They also gave instructions as to its handling. The chairman directed the report be prepared, with Scale's assistance, by a subcommittee comprised of Silverman, Kopp, Thornberry, and Chairman Rathe. The report was to be written the next day (Sunday) and delivered personally by the chairman to the secretary on Monday. And it was.

Rathe thanked everyone for their support throughout the period of the NAB's work. Keller moved that the chairman prepare a letter to the secretary, commending staff members for their excellent support. The motion was approved and Rathe agreed to write the letter. Panara spoke in behalf of the interpreter/translators who had been involved with the project throughout the Washington, D.C. meetings.

The mission was accomplished on time. The NAB found a home for the NTID, a significant step toward establishing the institute and influencing its operation. This event culminated a well planned sequence of fast-moving actions with never a step backward or a tactical diversion. In this last meeting, the NAB not only unanimously recommended a sponsoring institution, but also verbalized some valuable operational concepts, which later influenced the final development of the agreement document.

The NAB had published its Policies, Guidelines, and Application Procedures, representing its thorough understanding of the legislation's intent and its awareness of the problems of deafness, the complexities of technology, and the demands of education. Although no institution met all of the guidelines' requirements, the challenge was to find the one representing the best combination of characteristics to do the job.

Since no institution then taught technical education to deaf students, the dilemma was whether to choose a proven technical institution, or one with credentials for educating deaf students. Was it more logical to train a deaf educator to be an engineer or technician, or to train an engineer to teach deaf students? Members with
educational backgrounds, especially education of deaf students, were looked to for preference.

RIT was the only institution that had operated an ongoing technical institute for a considerable time. Its competence was widely recognized by employers, which would considerably enhance the acceptability of deaf graduates. Because of this in-house operation and capacity, RIT was in the strongest position to exercise complete, direct control over the technical programs and the students. There would be no "farming out." The law insisted on NTID control, which favored an on-campus and in-house operation. Since the deaf student body was likely to be drawn from rather sheltered environments, the NAB insisted that the student environment be risk free. RIT's student body demonstrated a constructive and congenial atmosphere for well-rounded development of deaf students. The surroundings were not overwhelming, but would present the students with realistic challenges.

All institutions needed to develop an understanding of deafness as it related to providing technical education to deaf students. Although RIT had no experience with education of deaf persons, they could acquire staff members who had this understanding. A small number of deaf students had been trained over the years without special accommodation. This was particularly noteworthy at RIT, where appropriate faculty members looked forward to entering a period of training in the required communication skills.

The NAB reached its decision to recommend RIT after careful review of the proposals, site visits, and extensive deliberation. In the process, it provided a scholarly dialogue of the factors bearing on the project for those who would establish and operate the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
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CHAPTER XI

IN SUMMARY

The intent of this part of the "NTID Story" is to describe the events and circumstances that led to the selection of RIT as the home for NTID. The story of implementation and the first 20 years of operation has yet to be told: how did the project move from the RIT agreement with the government to what it came to be in 1989. Twenty years of operation should provide clear evidence of its influence on the education of deaf students at NTID and elsewhere; and on the intellectual, social, community, and occupational circumstances of deaf people everywhere.

Most of the credit for NTID's success belongs to those who produced and implemented the agreement on behalf of RIT. The NTID/SS, under the supervision and leadership of the assistant secretary for Education, Dr. Paul Miller, started early in October 1966, with Ellingson and his staff at RIT, to prepare the Agreement document to serve as the guideline for implementation.

The official announcement of RIT's selection as NTID's future site was made by Carey on November 14, 1966. The next day, Secretary Gardner's office announced that RIT "...was the only applying institution meeting the requirement of the act that operates an ongoing technical institute and has done so for a considerable period of time and that it was]...in the strongest position to exercise full, complete, and direct control over technical programs for deaf students." RIT would receive an initial grant of $323,000 to be used in planning for the establishment of NTID with the expectation that it would be fully operational sometime during 1969.¹

Members of the NTID/SS, Miller, Ellingson, and the RIT staff members combined forces to complete the Agreement document: an Agreement for Establishment and Operation of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf between the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and Rochester Institute of Technology. Gardner had the document completed and signed by December 20, 1966, less than three months after the NAB had made its report to the Secretary.²

The Agreement contained a five-phase schedule for implementation. Phases II, III, IV, and V dealt primarily with land acquisition and construction and included directed and suggested time lines.³

Among other things, Phase I provided for the appointment of a National Advisory Group (NAG) to advise the director in the establishment of the facility and
in its subsequent operation. Ellingson submitted his recommendations for membership on the NAG in February 1967, and the NAG held its first meeting in July of that year.4

In addition, Phase I directed the organization and staffing. RIT had decided that the new program's head administrator would be a member of the RIT administrative staff at the vice presidential level. Dr. Robert Frisina was selected to be NTID's first vice president, reporting to work February 1, 1967.

By mid-1968, Frisina had added 14 administrators to his staff, including Dr. William Castle, his assistant, who later became NTID's first dean. During the year, NTID's staff members prepared for the arrival of the first students, and in the fall of 1968, in temporary quarters, the Institute's doors first opened to almost 100 deaf students.5

This supportive structure and attitude continues today. NTID is the world's largest technological college for deaf students. It is one of nine colleges of RIT. Of NTID's 1,200 students, many study and live with 12,000 hearing students at RIT. In some curriculum categories, through cooperation with RIT colleges, qualified students can earn bachelor's or master's degrees. Thousands of students have studied for careers including applied art, business occupations, construction technologies, data processing, electromechanical technology, industrial technologies, optical finishing technology, printing production technology, and social work.

In addition to technical courses, students take courses in communication, general education, and liberal arts. NTID gives special instruction in reading, writing, use of residual hearing, speechreading, speaking, and manual and simultaneous communication. The Institute also provides such services as communication skill assessment, hearing aid selection, a hearing aid repair shop, and individual communication advising. A communication advisor helps students design programs of communication courses to meet career development goals. In the classroom, students and instructors use all methods of communication, including sign language, speech, fingerspelling, facial expression, and body language. Learning centers provide individual instruction in mathematics, physics, communication skills, reading, and writing. Special support services like notetaking, interpreting, and tutoring also are provided. General education courses help students to develop personal and social skills and to understand and appreciate culture, leadership, the world of work, outdoor living, and community service.

Cooperative work experiences are required for most career offerings. They are important parts of the courses and provide valuable on-the-job experience and opportunities to test skills. Successful work experiences with good grades and help from employment advisors contribute to students finding good jobs upon graduation. As many as 98 percent of the NTID graduates find jobs, and 95 percent find them in positions matching their training. Recent (1986) information indicates there is no significant difference in the after-graduation salaries of hearing and deaf RIT graduates. Should this condition prove to be widespread, it would indicate considerable progress being made by deaf students to reach equal status with their hearing peers in the working world.6

Another part of the NTID story yet to be recorded is abundantly before us in almost every postsecondary education facility that receives some form of federal financing. The federal government—partially reacting to the precipitous increase in the number of deaf children during the rubella epidemic of 1963-65—acted to finance
additional programs for children with disabilities by passing a civil rights and equal
rights law for people with disabilities.

The following is a quote from an American Annals of the Deaf article on
postsecondary education by Drs. James DeCaro, Michael Karchmer, and Brenda
Rawlings:

Another trend in postsecondary education for deaf students has been a
dramatic growth in the number of programs. From 1964 to 1982, the
number of postsecondary programs specifically designed for deaf
students grew from fewer than 10 to more than 100. In large part,
government involvement has spurred this growth. One example is
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1975, which requires any
institution receiving federal funds to make its services accessible to
persons with handicaps.

In response, many institutions set up programs and established offices to assist
deaf students. At the time that NTID came into being, there were not more than 500
deaf students in the nation involved in postsecondary education. About 400 of these
were enrolled at Gallaudet College. The other 100 or so were enrolled in a handful of
programs throughout the country and were virtually unassisted by the institutions
they were attending.

By 1985, more than 5,900 deaf students were enrolled full time in some 145
postsecondary programs in the United States, and 1,100 more attended part time. Dr.
Ross Stuckless, director of Integrative Research at NTID, estimates that in 1989, there
will be some 11,000 deaf students in colleges and universities. Of these, 3,000 would
be in Gallaudet and NTID. The other 8,000 would be enrolled in a variety of programs
throughout the country including non-degree vocational and technical programs, two-
and four-year technical and liberal arts programs, and graduate programs. NTID's
contribution to these activities has been enormous.

NTID was the model for these new programs. It was an established and
operational facility and had a trail of successes to prove the worth and effectiveness of
its operational style. NTID personnel developed the first training program designed
for interpreting in educational programs. They designed the first model notetaking
pad for use in support of deaf students in the lecture hall. They trained people who
then took what they learned at NTID to the new programs. NTID staff members have
been available to individual schools, meetings, conventions, and special workshops
attended by people from all kinds of programs. Their influence has been felt on school
curricula, teacher education, rehabilitation, research, and in many other intangible,
immeasurable ways throughout the nation—and in Japan and Europe. Gallaudet
University, as well, has played an important role in providing outreach services to
schools and programs.

It was a stroke of genius for RIT to have selected Frisina to become the pro-
gram's first director. He assembled the best people, starting the project with the best
team available anywhere. Castle, the first dean, was a major force in making the
program work from the beginning, and in accomplishing what it has since. Ellingson,
as head of RIT, made it possible for all things to happen. RIT fulfilled its commitment
to the nation and its deaf citizens with distinction. NTID has earned the respect of
leaders in the field of education generally and of the educators of the deaf throughout the world.

It is clear why the National Advisory Board chose RIT. But why did RIT choose NTID? The first serious thoughts about RIT becoming NTID’s sponsor are credited to Mrs. Hettie Shumway, a prominent Rochester citizen. She served on the Boards of Trustees of RIT, the Rochester School for the Deaf, Strong Memorial Hospital, and Rochester philanthropic organizations. Coincidentally, at a social event in that city in January 1966, Mrs. Shumway first learned about the NTID project. The next day, after a meeting with the Board of the Rochester School for the Deaf, Hoag explained, at her request, the NTID project and how RIT could apply for the project. Much earlier, RIT, along with other institutions, had learned about the project.

A letter of intent followed the Rochester incident, and Harold Kentner attended the Institutional Conference in February representing RIT. After finding out about the project, Mrs. Shumway worked, successfully, to convince Ellingson and the Board of Trustees that RIT should bid for the project. Then she convinced the city of Rochester that RIT would be the best place in the nation for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. And she was right.
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