Barbara Haller and Alice (Lehman) Roush reminisce after an assembly program on the history of the Maryland School for the Deaf.
Calendar of Events

MARCH
1-2—E.S.D.A.A. Girls' Basketball Tournament at White Plains, N.Y. (February 28 and March 1-2)
7-8—National Prep Wrestling Tournament at Lehigh University
9—Winter Alumni Day
14—Afternoon in-service for staff
15—Drama Presentation, "THE UNINVITED", Ely Auditorium, 7:30 p.m.
23—Hancock Track Invitational, away, 2:00 p.m.
29—Track Meet, M.S.S.D., M.K.S.D. and St. Andrews, here, 4:00 p.m.

MAY
1—Track Meet, Mercersberg Academy, away, 4:00 p.m.
6—Track Meet Brunswick, away, 4:00 p.m.
10—Frederick County Track Meet, at Linganore, 9:00 p.m.
17—E.S.D.A.A. Track Championships at Rome, N.Y.
26—Memorial Day Holiday
27—Staff Work Day and students return to school
28—Classes resume
29—Class Night/Honor Awards

JUNE
1—Commencement and Graduation
2-5—Final Examinations
12—Last day of school for students
13—Last day of work for staff
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Is The Treatment Worse Than The Disease?

Stories of overkill, overreaction or overtreatment are legion. We tell jokes and stories about people who “use a shotgun when only a fly swatter is necessary”, people who assume if one pill does some good, then several must be better. Invariably, in situations like this, we tend to come back to the traditional wisdom that moderation in all things is often the best and most appropriate approach.

We tend to believe that the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, has the shotgun out again. In August of 1985, the OSERS people disseminated one of several manuals for use by states in monitoring compliance with PL 94-142. Manual 10 is devoted to a discussion of the least restrictive environment. Although the document is in draft form, the implications of these interpretive manuals are frightening. We assume that since they are draft form, we are in a period in which open comment is appropriate. As a result, this column is being used to alert parents and others to the ramifications of these new interpretations, should they be adopted.

A little historical perspective is perhaps in order. Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, resulted in extensive regulations being established for implementation. Those first rules and regulations were disseminated in 1977. Our readers are certainly well aware of the definitions of “least restrictive environment” being a key component of the Act. In its original form, the sections dealing with least restrictive environment stated: “Each public agency shall insure (1) that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped and, (2) that special classes, schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature of severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aides and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily”. It is the interpretations of the above that have often given deaf educators the most trouble. The generalist typically believes that regardless of the handicapping condition, a school setting closest to the home will be better for the child than a residential school. While that position has great emotional appeal, it tends to disregard the fact that residential schools have successfully educated deaf children for many, many decades. It also tends to disregard the fact that a residential school in fact may be less restrictive than the neighborhood school. These discussions and arguments have been advanced for the last ten years and there is very little need to rehash the typical arguments that are made in support of residential facilities. Although we cannot speak for the nation as a whole, we believe that experiences at the Missouri School for the Deaf are quite similar to those in other states. One particular item of interest is the fact that very little due process has been generated as a result of placement decisions being made at the local level which refer children to the Missouri School for the Deaf. These decisions are carefully and thoughtfully made and have resulted in many students attending school without the necessity of first experiencing defeat and failure in a so-called least restrictive environment.

While the referral procedure remains cumbersome and often can delay the beginning of schooling for an individual child, the interpretation made by individual states does offer local school districts the opportunity to work with parents through the IEP process in determining that a residential school may in fact be the least restrictive environment.

So, what is the problem? The problem is simply that the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services has issued some new proposed interpretations of the rules and regulations for use by states. If adopted, these regulations would impose on state departments of education a greater responsibility to insure that local school districts are making even greater attempts to place children in schools nearer home before referring them to a “more restrictive environ-
ment.” If our information is correct, what the new interpretations are saying is that a child would first have to fail in a local school mainstreaming program before any consideration would be given to the possibility of referral to a more restrictive environment. (While we are using the term more restrictive environment to be consistent with the language of the regulations and interpretations, we do not believe that a residential school is necessarily more restrictive for a given child.)

Not only would the child have to fail in the mainstream setting, the school district would have to provide “compelling evidence” that his or her failure in the mainstream is due to being placed with non-handicapped peers. The district would have to prove that necessary services found in the more restrictive environment could not be made available in the mainstream setting and that removal from the mainstream would result in a superior placement for academic purposes. In addition, factors such as instructional methodology would have to be eliminated, and could not be considered as contributors to non-achievement.

This scenario sets children up for failure. It further puts local school districts in the untenable position of having to make tremendous investments of time and resources to prove a point which may not even be in question. That is to say, a family and a child who are perfectly content with a residential school placement would no longer be able to continue that placement without first having met the tests suggested by the interpretations.

While we are willing to acknowledge that the protections afforded some handicapped younger by 94-142 are appropriate, it would appear that the Office of Education is exercising an extreme interpretive measure in order to force greater compliance with the concept of mainstreaming. We find that position indefensible when viewed in the light of a child having to fail before other approaches can be considered. This added burden for local school districts, state education agencies and parents. We believe that the federal government has gone too far this time, and suggest that some consideration be given to modifying these proposed interpretations.

Least Restrictive Environment

David M. Denton, Superintendent, Maryland School for the Deaf

The concept of a least restrictive environment has become the major point of focus for educators concerning Public Law 94-142, The Education of the Handicapped Act, since it was signed into law in 1975. The phrase, least restrictive environment, even though it does not appear in the body of the law itself, has become perhaps the most controversial aspect of the law in its implementation. It is within the federal regulations which govern the implementation of Public Law 94-142 that the term least restrictive environment appears. Education of the handicapped child within the least restrictive environment implies to many educators education within the mainstream. Thus, Public Law 94-142 is often referred to as the mainstreaming law. Since a basic goal of education is the ultimate social, cultural, and economic integration of the individual into the mainstream, the concept of providing an education in the mainstream for handicapped persons has assumed major significance, and that significance increased today. Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, at a conference in Washington, D.C. on January 8, 1985, spoke pointedly on the subject of least restrictive environment. The following statement by Mrs. Will suggests that the full implementation of Public Law 94-142, with respect to least restrictive environment, will become the major policy issue for the near future at the federal level. “Education in the least restrictive environment (LRE) is what I envision as the last barrier to full implementation of Public Law 94-142. This concept is becoming the cornerstone upon which federal special education policy is being built. It certainly is the core around which my own beliefs about special education have evolved in terms of early childhood programming, school age programming, transition services and adult services. In my own mind all have evolved with the concept of least restrictive as the core concept.” This statement of policy by Mrs. [THE MARYLAND BULLETIN]
Will raised questions of profound importance to children enrolled in residential schools for the deaf, to their families, and to those persons responsible for the operation of these schools, especially when considered in conjunction with two basic principles identified by Mrs. Will as the least restrictive environment principles of Public Law 94-142. According to Mrs. Will the first of these "is a presumption in favor of placement in the regular educational environment—the regular classroom setting or the regular school setting". She continues, "Thus, the first principle requires an educationally compelling justification for any proposed separate schooling of handicapped children". The second principle identified by Mrs. Will provides that "to the maximum extent appropriate handicapped children must be educated with children who are not handicapped".

The position taken by the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services concerning least restrictive environment is strengthened by a 1983 U.S. Court of Appeals case in Ohio. In this case, Roncker v Walter, the most frequent justifications for placement in a separate school were rendered unacceptable. These justifications are:

- that related services are more easily provided in the separate setting;
- that special equipment is available in a separate facility or there is a specially designed facility;
- that better qualified teachers and professional and support staff are available in a separate facility;
- that a particular program or curriculum is only offered in a separate facility; and
- that more intensive services are available in a separate facility because of smaller teacher-pupil ratio.

In Mrs. Will's address it is pointed out that the reasons or justifications listed above are all administrative in nature and that the burden is "on the school system to make a pro-active effort to bring about these changes and to explain why the particular ingredients of a program were not available the least restrictive environment". In the Roacker case the court yields to "very strong congressional preference" for mainstreaming reflected in Public Law 94-142.

When handicapped children are considered in a non-categorical sense, much of what is stated in Madeleine Will's address is both rational and justifiable. However, in considering the implications of a more strenuously enforced policy by the federal government concerning least restrictive environment, those of us at the Maryland School for the Deaf are faced with perplexing and challenging concerns. Our cause would be poorly served if educators continue to retreat into entrenched positions from which their specific kinds of programs can be defended and promoted. There is a compelling need for a more creative understanding of how educational environments vary depending upon the needs and dissimilarities of specific groups of handicapped children. If the justifications herefores offered in defense of separate programs are now rendered unacceptable and perceived as administrative in nature, it is time that we set forth justifications which deal more with the personal process of living as it is experienced by children who are faced with a wide variety of obstacles to education and habilitation determined by the nature and the severity of their particular handicap. Fundamentally, handicapped persons are dissimilar. Each specific handicapping condition presents its own different set of obstacles to the education and habilitation process. The isolation and segregation experienced by children who are blind is possibly more strongly related to the problems of mobility than to the more fundamental process of human communication. By contrast, the isolation and segregation faced by children with early profound deafness is a direct result of a severe interruption in the development of a communication system. The isolation and segregation experienced by the child who is blind can be dramatically reduced by the placement of this child in a regular public school setting alongside children who are not handicapped without introducing into the educational environment other more subtle problems. Such placement for that child would certainly be in the least restrictive environment. For the child with early profound deafness such placement may not reduce the isolation and segregation experienced by this child at all but could increase the social and psychological isolation faced by this child, thus, compounding his sense of differentness and introducing additional, more subtle obstacles to be overcome. A deaf child who is indiscriminately integrated into a regular school program even though he may be functionally unable to initiate or maintain
social, psychological, or educational contact with his seatmates is in a most restrictive environment, even though this same educational setting may be least restrictive for the child who is blind even though both deafness and blindness are sensory handicaps. In this comparison, the two handicapped children mentioned above could be placed in the same classroom. Theoretically, this would constitute placement within the least restrictive environment for both of them. What appears to be, theoretically, at least, identical placement for these two children could be, in the real sense, placement in educational environments which are perceived and experienced by these two children as "inherently unequal" to borrow a phrase from Chief Justice Earl Warren. Chief Justice Warren’s choice of the term “inherently unequal” was made, ironically, with reference to separate educational facilities. He went on to say, “This inherent inequality stems from the stigma created by purposeful segregation which generates a feeling of inferiority that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.” That is precisely the point of our concern in the illustration above. Because of the dissimilarities among handicapped individuals and among groups of handicapped persons, assumptions about the inherently unequal nature of separate schools or about the presumption in favor of placement in the regular educational environment, or about the principle that handicapped children must be educated with children who are not handicapped may continue to present serious problems for us, unless we define more precisely and clearly what constitutes an educational environment which is restrictive or non-restrictive for each differing group of handicapped children and for what reasons such an environment is restrictive or non-restrictive. To discuss handicapped children in a non-categorical sense is to fail to recognize their absolute uniqueness as individuals and as groups of individuals loosely tied together by the over-used and under-defined term “handicapped”. Since the two guiding principles of the powerful concept of least restrictive environment are: 1) a presumption in favor of placement in the regular educational environment—regular classroom setting or the regular school setting, and 2) that “to the maximum extent appropriate handicapped children must be educated with children who are not handicapped”, the sweeping implementation of this concept may place certain groups of handicapped children at extreme risk educationally, socially, and psychologically. This writer, in doing independent evaluations of the placement of handicapped children, has witnessed situations in which deaf children were integrated into a regular classroom setting in a large metropolitan elementary school system, and during the course of a full school day experienced not a single conversation with any other child in the school, hearing or deaf. Even though these children were theoretically placed in a least restrictive environment and being educated alongside non-handicapped children, the extent of social and educational interaction which actually occurred was practically nonexistent, while the degree of isolation, social, and psychological segregation which they actually experienced was, in the judgment of this writer, extreme. In the example used here, the school officials were under the mistaken impression that these deaf children were placed more appropriately with respect to the concept of least restrictive environment than if they had been placed within a large day school program for deaf children located just moments away. In this example it becomes clearer to us that the shades of meaning of the two basic principles of the least restrictive environment concept can change quite dramatically when we examine thoughtfully how individual children suffering from different handicapping conditions attempt to deal with the situations in which they find themselves. There is simply no single educational setting that is, by its nature, least or more restrictive. If this contention can be supported on the basis of logic and experience, then perhaps the basic principles of the least restrictive environment concept...a presumption in favor of placement in the regular educational environment and the presumption that handicapped children must be “educated with children who are not handicapped”...are discriminatory for some handicapped children even though the intent is just the opposite.

The confusion and misunderstanding surrounding the least restrictive concept and the two statutory principles which it fosters are based, in part, upon confusion and misunderstanding surrounding the use of terms which are much more fundamental to this discussion...terms like “handicap” and “disability”. These terms are often used interchangeably and that probably just adds to the confusion. These two words do have fundamentally different meanings as they
are applied to children in need of special education. This matter can be illustrated using deafness as an example. In attempting to define deafness as a disability, perhaps we could agree that deafness constitutes serious hearing dysfunction. This, of course, tells us something but it doesn't tell us nearly enough about the meaning or implications of deafness. If we attempt to define deafness as a handicap, perhaps we could agree that it manifests itself as a serious interruption in the development of basic human communication skills—receptive and expressive. This definition tells us more but it still doesn't tell us enough to make reasonable, thoughtful, and intelligent judgments about such matters as education. If we can agree upon a limited definition of what the disability is and a limited definition of the handicap created by the disability, then perhaps we need to seek clearer understanding and possible agreement upon what specific obstacles this handicap presents to the individual and to those responsible for his care and education, be they physical, intellectual, social, psychological, or educational. A major obstacle presented by early profound deafness is the isolation of the individual created by a rupture in the process through which people normally establish interaction, communication, and language. Ironically, since this particular obstacle to normal development is not obvious it may go unnoticed even by the deaf infant's parents while critically important time is slipping away. ... time during which the foundations for normal communication and language development would have been established. This characteristic of deafness is perhaps the least evident and, by contrast, possibly the most important one. To restate the problem, over-use and under-definition of common terms such as "disability" and "handicap" clouds and confuses the deeper issues involved in making intelligent educational decisions regarding children requiring special education programs. (The definitions offered here are offered only for purposes of illustration.)

It seems almost contradictory that those children who may find themselves most in need of separate schooling are those whose need may be least obvious to the casual observer. Again, deaf children are being used as examples of this seeming paradox. This situation is perhaps best illustrated by the Special Olympics which provide opportunities for wholesome and equitable athletic competition among different groups of handicapped children and youth. Deaf children and youth taking part in Special Olympics activities seem almost non-handicapped when compared with other groups of handicapped children and youth taking part in such activities. Appearances, however, can be quite misleading. Participation in athletic competition by deaf persons does not reveal or even suggest the profound difficulties faced by deaf persons educationally, socially, and psychologically.

A basic goal of education is the ultimate social, cultural, and economic integration of the individual into the mainstream. But how is such integration measured and what are the characteristics of those persons who achieve it. Ultimately, integration into the mainstream for the deaf person is measured by economic independence on the part of the adult who is free to move socially and culturally among those persons whom he chooses, including those who are deaf and those who are hearing. Integration occurs on the basis of competence and competence is acquired on the basis of early and continued success, both in school and out.

In closing, observations will be offered which may shed some light on those characteristics identified with successful deaf persons. A local Rotary Club has sponsored a student of the month program for several years. In this program, two outstanding students from a local high school or college attend the Rotary Club each week for a month. During the course of their stay with the club these students interact with the members, take part in club activities, and at the final meeting of the month these students are asked to address the club and to share their feelings and impressions with the members. Each year the students taking part in the program from the Maryland School for the Deaf seem to be particularly impressive in the manner in which they interact with club members, in the way they present themselves, and particularly in their final remarks to the club. In observing this phenomenon down through the years, it has occurred to me on a number of occasions that the quality of excellence, which seems to characterize these students, their appearance, and their behavior, is not excellence in terms of appearing "normal" or without those characteristics that one would typically associate with the handicap of deafness. On the contrary, their deafness is very much in evidence as witnessed by their dramatic and effective communication style utilizing American Sign Language and their
strong identification with the deaf culture. The quality of excellence that one senses in observing these persons and being around them is characterized by the release of potential, the development of pride in self, and a clear sense of cultural identity, including obvious respect for the culture, its language and its traditions. It appears that these students think of themselves not so much as members of a group of handicapped people but, instead, as members of the deaf culture bound together by a common language and a common heritage. Perhaps these characteristics are not just the characteristics of successful deaf students from the Maryland School for the Deaf but more generally the characteristics of deaf persons throughout our society who are “making it in the mainstream”. If this is true it is important that we recognize that it is through the network of educational programs for the deaf all across America, particularly the state residential schools, that the deaf culture is transmitted from one generation to the next.

Unique Program

“It’s a Deaf, Deaf World” was the theme for a recent program at the Columbia Campus. The program was unique as well as very informative since it included features that deaf people use in their daily lives.

The program included skits involving the use of decoders, TDDs, smoke detectors and door alarms. One of the skits was about a family whose Christmas presents were stolen on Christmas Eve with the next scene showing the following year using a burglar’s alarm with a blinking light to show when the burglars made the same attempt to steal Christmas gifts. The skit closed with happy scene of children being able to enjoy their gifts because of special equipment designed to help deaf people.

Brochures about equipment with special features for deaf people, provided right after the program, were quickly picked up. Feedback from parents indicated that the program was really an enjoyable, yet educational one.
Preventing Drug Abuse, Through Family Communication

Editor’s Note: Although this specifically mentions drug abuse, communication such as this would be good at preventing any kind of problem.

I. Good family communication begins with parents in developing their own skills. . . . if Mom and Dad can communicate with each other their chances of communicating with the children are much better. “Safety of expression” is a goal to strive for in which all family members feel it is safe to show how they feel.

II. Spend time talking together. . . . it should begin when the children are small. Have private talks—have “feeling talks.” Doing things together fosters family unity and communication. Children who enjoy doing things with their parents are less likely to go into drugs.

III. Communicate what you expect of your children! . . . . they need to know your opinions (especially about drugs and drinking) and how you expect them to behave. Be very clear, firm, and positive. Firm and loving discipline leads to good self-discipline. Wishy-washiness, permissiveness, and parental inconsistency represent to the child weakness and confusion.

IV. Examine your own attitudes towards pleasure-seeking and self indulgence. . . . many kids are unable to say “no” when offered drugs. Where does this begin? Why is seeking a “high” and “turning on” so popular nowadays? Examine your own values and priorities in life; look at how pleasure-seeking and your own use of alcohol and drugs fit in.

V. Parents—discuss with each other your handling of drugs and alcohol. . . . you can’t separate your pill- and drug-using habits from the children’s! You can’t separate your drinking habits from theirs. What purpose do these serve—what message do the kids get? The example you set communicates much. Saying one thing and doing another ruins communication with the younger generation. Practice what you preach.

VI. Discuss drugs with your children—but be well informed. . . . be honest. Do not leave out information you don’t agree with. In a matter-of-fact way present the consequences of drug abuse. Discussions must be open and information presented so that kids can make their own decision about drugs (they will anyway).

VII. Don’t turn the kids off. . . . create a climate in which your child feels it is safe to talk to you — listen first! Accept that your child may be exposed to drugs and may experiment—don’t cut off the lines of communication. Tell children what you expect from them.

VIII. Communicate trust, confidence, and dignity in your child. . . . give your child responsibility and recognition. Treat her/him with courtesy and patience. Be optimistic and believe in their abilities. Avoid a critical attitude, sarcasm, and talking down to them. Don’t forget them. Show an interest in their activities—become aware of their existence and their world.

Lola Silvestri Receives Award

Recently, Lola Silvestri was named Woman of the Year for 1985 by the Catonsville Business and Professional Women's Club. In making this award the chairwoman for the program remarked, “Lola was chosen Woman of the Year by our organization for her outstanding achievement in her career, for her guidance to youth and young career women, for her efforts on behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment, and for her outstanding community services. Her dedication, high integrity, and ability has made her an asset to her family, our organization, and to the community.”

In addition, Delegate Nancy Murphy, a fellow member of the BPW said: “Wherever there’s a need in the community, she seems to be on top of everyone’s list and always gets the job done. She is typical of that person who, no matter how busy, will always lend her support to a worthwhile project.”

In recognition of this honor, Baltimore County Executive Donald P. Hutchinson proclaimed October 15, 1985, as Lola Silvestri Day.

Lola has been employed by the State of Maryland as an accountant/auditor for 18 years and is presently working on the Columbia Campus of the Maryland School for the Deaf. We are proud of Lola’s accomplishments and we offer Lola our congratulations.
A Wayward Letter . . .
(Reprint from On the Green,
Gallaudet College, 1/6/85)

Once upon a time, a little boy named Sean
O'Brien, a student at the Maryland School
for the Deaf, wrote a letter to his good
friend and former babysitter, David Martin,
a student at Gallaudet.

Sean, nine years old, told his friend that
he missed him very much, and said that he
would like David to come and see him play
midget football. "I work very hard in
school," he said. "I was a very good boy this
month," he added.

What Sean didn't know is that there are
two David Martins on campus. One is a
freshman and a member of the football
team. The other is the dean of the School of
Education and Human Services, Dr. David
Martin.

Sean's letter ended up on Dr. Martin's
desk. Because he takes all his correspondence
seriously, Dr. Martin drafted a reply to
Sean.

"Dear Mr. O'Brien," he wrote, "I have
received your letter of Sept. 25. I understand
that you are a member of the football team,
and I appreciate your invitation to me to
come and watch you. I will not be able to
attend because I must be at another school
(the Western Pennsylvania School for the
Deaf in Pittsburgh, Pa.) on that day."

"However," Dr. Martin continued, "I will
mention this event to our coaches so that
they will be aware of your game. Thank you
very much for letting us know about your
game, and you have my best wishes for a
successful season with number 84. Sincerely,
Dr. David S. Martin."

Sean's teacher, who had helped him write
and send the original letter, was puzzled by
the reply. "I tried to figure out why David's
letter was so formal and so very generous," said
Marcia Corbett. When the truth dawned
on her, she wrote a letter to Jack Gannon,
executive director of Alumni Relations and
Advancement, telling him the story of the
wayward letter.

Gannon wrote her back: "I was amused
by what happened but pleased to learn that
Dr. Martin responded so well. I think his
response reflects his commitment to his job
and to deaf people. He is a fine person to
work with, and I know you would enjoy
knowing him, too."

Dr. Martin later realized that Sean's letter
had been meant for the other David Martin,
whose mail is sometimes mistakenly delivered
to his office, and he passed it on.

Sean, meanwhile, may have learned a
small lesson about titles like "Mr." and
"Dr." And maybe about adults who take the
time to treat youngsters like people.

The Reverend Kenneth Schnepp, Pastor of St.
Mark's Lutheran Church for the Deaf, in
Towson presented Dr. Richard Steffan and
other staff members with $1,300 worth of
materials to assist in the After School Religious
Education Program. These materials were
donated under the auspices of the local and
national offices of the Aid Assistance for
Luthers.
TeleCaption II—The TeleCaption II Adapter is smaller, lighter in weight, easier to transport, has a digital readout panel, and sports a sleek new look. TeleCaption II is cable ready and can tune 181 channels.

A More Affordable Decoder is Here

Lottie Gateswood, Public Affairs Specialist

The National Captioning Institute (NCI), in keeping pace with the latest in technology and responding to consumers’ needs, has developed a second generation decoder: TeleCaption II.

Remote Control—Telecaption II, the second generation adapter, has a remote control pad which allows the consumer to change channels from the comfort of an easy chair. Any of 181 channels can be selected by remote control.

TeleCaption II is smaller, lighter in weight, and sports a sleek new style. It is cable ready with 181 channels, can be easily connected to a VCR, and has remote control. These features give TeleCaption II a state-of-the-art look while bringing consumers many hours of entertainment each week.

NCI is offering TeleCaption II at an affordable price of $199.99. This price was made possible in part by a $1.5 million subsidy grant from the U.S Department of Education (ED).

NCI has invested over a quarter of a million dollars and several years of research and development to perfect the technology used in TeleCaption II. ED’s $1.5 million grant to NCI helped cover the cost of the development and production of the first 50,000 decoder modules. These modules are the circuit boards within the adapter which do the actual decoding and form the heart of the closed captioning decoding system.

Both the older model and the new adapter will give the same high quality captions that viewers have come to expect.

TeleCaption II will be available through the catalog departments of Sears and JC Penney, a dealer net work of over 80 distributors including home video retail outlets and local hearing aid dispensers beginning January 1, 1986.

For more information on where to purchase TeleCaption II, write: TeleCaption II Adapter, National Captioning Institute, 5203 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041 (703) 998-2400 (Voice and TTY). Information can be obtained at MSD by contacting either Tom McKenna or Rick Schoenberg.
A Trip To Mrs. Thomas' House

We left our classroom at 8:15. We all got in Van II. Mr. Schaberl had to drive in the fog. Mr. Schaberl forgot which road was Mrs. Thomas'. We arrived at the house at 8:55. Her house is in the country. We met Mr. Thomas. Both Mr. and Mrs. Thomas showed us their beautiful home. We sat down in their porch. They had a really neat swing!!! Then we sat down in the dining room. We ate doughnuts and drank hot chocolate. They were delicious.

We made some gifts. Mrs. Thomas gave everyone a plastic bag. We put dried flowers and herbs in the bag. One herb was called lavender. Another herb was called lemon balm. We also put orris root and rose oil in the plastic bag. Now the smell would stay in the bag for a long time. We shook the bag so the flowers, herbs and oil would be mixed up.

We got some material (cloth) and cut out some circles. We put the dried flowers and herbs on the cloth. We tied up the cloth with a ribbon. We smell the flowers through the cloth.

We were happy with our gifts. We drove back to MSD.

---Gerina Barkley, Ricky Belcher, Angela Forsythe, Jim Gastine, Devon Gibson, Joe Mass, & Kelly Wilson

Advanced Department
Honor Roll—Second Quarter

PRINCIPAL'S LIST
Sara Lee Heitzig
Darla Jean Milner

ACADEMIC
Matthew Albrecht
Cindy Blair
Tobin Daniels
Sharlene Deiterich
Damita Gross
Gary Resch
Eric Roberts
George W. Savoy
Eric Woods

CITIZENSHIP
Therese Baer
Julie Bartee
Robin Daniels
Maher Eshghi
Ramesh Garjian
Patricia Jacobs
William Mastin
Pete Richte
Holly Schubert
Cantrec Simmons
Edward Stull
Sudhir Walla

Intermediate Department
Honor Roll—Second Quarter

PRINCIPAL'S LIST
Donald Belcher, Jr.
Joann Gregor

ACADEMIC
Karen Bosley
Eleanor Finnicum
Devon Gibson
Mark Muir
Kenneth Quick
Brenda Shaffer
Adrienne Smith
Michael Smith, Jr.

CITIZENSHIP
Catherine Boswell
Melissa Curry
Johanna Davis
Angela Forsythe
Richard Gokey
Heather Heitzig
Melissa Heitzig
Melissa McClain
Robin Rozga

The great Preschool cookie bake-off.
Our Trip to the Animal Control Center

We went on a trip Wednesday, January 8, 1986.
We went in the white van.
We saw many dogs and cats.
We saw the dogs go to the bathroom.
We heard the dogs bark.
A woman read us a story.
Joann had two dogs. One dog was big.
One dog was little.
One dog listened and could sit, stay, and come.
One dog knew math.
We had to hug the big dog.
We got coloring books.
We said thank-you.
We had fun.

—Robin Miller's class

A puppy receives students' love and attention.

An Animal Program

On Wednesday, February 26, 1986, my class had an Animal Fair for the Primary Department. I enjoyed teaching the Primary students. We had a bat, bear, cat, elephant, fox, panda, rattlesnake, sheep, snake, tiger and gorilla. Many kids liked the gorilla and snake. We showed them books, maps, movies, drawn pictures, reports and animal statues.

—Philip Henry

Animal Fair

My class made and painted animals. We wrote jokes about the animals. We worked on the computer to write about the animals. We made maps to show where the animals lived. The animals we made were: a bat, brown bear, elephant, snake, rattlesnake, panda, gorilla, cat, sheep, and tiger.

We invited Primary students to the Animal Fair. They looked at the different animals at the Fair in the Seminar Room. The Primary Department enjoyed playing with some animals. Those kids loved to play and learn. They asked us many questions.

Miss Staab brought animal cookies for the Primary students. They ate the cookies. The Primary Department loved to eat cookies. We gave five or six cookies to the kids.

—Lisa Jones

Matthew Albrecht helps Primary students, Laticia Ensor and Jeff Oswald learn about wild life during the Animal Fair.

A Museum Trip

Our class went to Washington, D.C. to look around and enjoy ourselves. We drove one hour to the museum. We saw dinosaur bones. The mean dinosaur had big teeth!

—

An Indian necklace is interesting to MSD students.
The duck and horn dinosaurs were good. We saw a dinosaur egg. Hank, Christina, Leslie, Darrius and Janelle wish dinosaurs were alive now!

We went to see the Indians. We saw a turkey, an owl, some eagles, ostriches, swans, baby bears, baby deer, a wolf, a buffalo and a moose. We saw a baby Indian papoose, the baby couldn't move. The woman Indian wove. The Indians had deer costumes to fool real deer and kill them. We saw two big totem poles. We saw an Indian teepee. We touched a buffalo skin.

—Ms. Hoke's class

---

MSD Receives Bequest from the Estate of Mary Alice Benson

All of those persons who knew and loved Mary Alice Benson and the Benson family, which was for so many years associated with the Maryland School for the Deaf, will be pleased to learn that Mary made a very generous bequest to the School in her will. Specifically, the will stated that this bequest was to be made to "Maryland School for the Deaf Athletic Department in memory of Harry G. Benson". The amount of the bequest was $34,800. The Maryland School for the Deaf will certainly respect her wishes in the use of this memorial gift and ensure that it is used to strengthen and improve the athletic program for students in the School.

Mary's father, Mr. Harry G. Benson, was a loved and respected coach at MSD for many years and all members of the Benson family had a deep love for athletics. All of us associated with the School are touched and moved by the thoughtfulness of this family and we are deeply grateful for Mary's generosity.

---

Pictures of "Old Main"

At a recent assembly the Louis W. Foxwell, Sr. Deaf Foundation, represented by Foxwell's son, Louis, Jr., gave the Maryland School for the Deaf a restored painting of the Old Main Building. Little is known about the painting except that it was done in 1894 by H. P. Arms. The picture has been in the possession of the Baltimore's Christ Church for the Deaf for many years and was rediscovered when the Church recently moved to a new location. The picture will be on permanent loan to the School and is presently hanging in the Ely Building where it can remind students and staff of the School's heritage.

A limited number of colored prints have been made and may be purchased in the Principal's Office at the School. 5x7 prints are $3.00 and 24x28 prints are $25.00.

Barbara Haller and Alice (Lehman) Roush recall school days they spent in the old Main Building and Barbara points to the old horse hitching posts which have been relocated to the entrance of the Ely Building.
MSD Hosts Regional Workshop

The Maryland School for the Deaf hosted the first of six regional workshops entitled "Putting It All Together" one weekend in January. MSD cooperated with the Department of Education, Pre-college Programs, and the College for Continuing Education, Gallaudet College, Washington, in sponsoring this workshop for classroom teachers, administrators, educational interpreters and parents of hearing impaired children. Approximately 75 people representing residential and mainstreamed programs for deaf students from as far north as Maine and as far south as North Carolina participated in this workshop.

One of the workshop goals was to provide participants with techniques for combining American Sign Language (ASL) and Manually Coded English in the classroom. American Sign Language, the traditional language of America's deaf population, has its own structure and rules of grammar which differ basically from English. Manually Coded English is a manual representation of the English language following English word order and grammatical structure.

It was particularly appropriate that MSD host this first workshop on combining American Sign Language and Manually Coded English because of the school's role in the initiation and implementation of the concept of Total Communication.

The spread of Total Communication throughout the nation is primarily responsible for the dramatically increased interest in American Sign Language and in the development of Manually Coded English. In recent years American Sign Language has grown to become the fourth most used language in America after English, Spanish and Italian. Before the spread of Total Communication in America, American Sign Language was a comparatively obscure language.

As public interest in sign language grew and as the language of signs was used in more and more educational programs, there was dramatic increase in the number of signs being used by deaf persons, educators and the families of deaf persons. In the early 1970s, a number of sign systems were developed to make it possible for sign language to be used in the instruction of deaf children in a way that allowed signing to follow English word order and grammatical structure.

This workshop focused on ways of combining American Sign Language and Manually Coded English for effective communication.

A featured speaker for the workshop was Gerilee Gustason, a professor in the Department of Education, Gallaudet College. Dr. Gustason is the co-developer of Signing Exact English (SEE), one of the more important systems of Manually Coded English.

Another featured speaker was Dennis Davino, an experienced educational interpreter. He is chairman of the Special Interest Group for Educational Interpreters of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. The kick-off speaker was David Denton, Superintendent of our school and a leading proponent of the international spread of sign language.

The planning and coordination of this workshop was handled by Ms. Kerri Lawler-Davis, educational planner at the Maryland School for the Deaf. Ms. Lawler-Davis is also a skilled interpreter.

Naturally?

I must not interfere with any child,
I have been told;
to bend his will to mine,
or try to shape him through some mold of thought.
Naturally as a flower he must unfold.
Yet flowers have the discipline of wind and rain,
and though I know it gives the gardener much pain.
I've seen him use his pruning shears,
to gain more strength and beauty for some blossoms bright.
And he would do whatever he thought right.
I do not know . . . yet it does seem to me that only weeds unfold just naturally.

(Author unknown)
Sportscope

MSD Girls Track
Team National Champs

The 18th Annual National Deaf Prep Girls Track and Field Honor Roll has just been released and according to the results, the Maryland School for the Deaf has won the national championship with a record 178 points.

The 1985 Track season actually started in the spring of 1984. After being shut out from two Eastern Schools for the Deaf Track and Field Championships, the girls headed for Rhode Island determined to recapture the championship trophy and this they did. This set the stage for the World Games for the Deaf tryout in Austin, Texas. Ten girls made the trip to Austin, nine of the girls made the finals in their events with five girls qualifying for the 1985 Deaf Olympic Team.

With this strong nucleus, the 1985 school year started off with a strong Cross Country season which then moved into Indoor Track. With the main group of runners having run since fall, the opening of track season started with talk of trying to capture the first national track championship in the history of the school. A total of 36 girls came out for track in the spring and they all worked very hard to help the team. Each girl gave more of herself than was asked and each helped pave the way for the record-setting performance.

As the season progressed, the girl’s performances improved. The girls won the Hancock Invitational over 11 other high schools and set four invitational records. The girls finished the season undefeated in dual and triangular meets. The girls finished in fifth place in Frederick County, their best finish ever.

The girls next set their sights on retaining their hold on the Eastern Schools for the Deaf Track and Field crown. They successfully defended their championship and set five ESDAA records.

When the 18th Annual National Honor Roll was published, the Maryland girls had set three national relay records and a record for team points. Records were set in the 800-meter relay by Tiffany Williams, Debbie Anderson, Canteese Simmons and Paula Smith with a time of 1:49.9. Another record was set in the 1600-meter relay with a time of 4:19.7. Thirdly, the 3200-meter relay team of Elena Gee, Darla Milner, Julie Barteec and Tiffany Williams set a National record with a time of 10:19.7. The Maryland girls also set a national record for total number of team points with a total of 178 points.

The girls also set five school records in running events; two school records in field events and seven school records in relays. All of these records are the result of hard work and dedication on the part of the girls. They worked very hard for their achievements.


THE MARYLAND BULLETIN
Track Team
Third in Nation

The 43rd Annual National Deaf Prep Boys Track and Field Honor Roll has the boys track team placing third in the nation. Texas placed first and Tennessee finished in second place. This is the highest finish for our boys in the history of the MSD track program.

This is good news for the boys as we have a very young team, only two boys were seniors last year. The boys are eager to start track to try and improve on their third-place finish. The boys’ high placement in the National standing was due to a lot of hard work by the boys and by the team in general. The team seemed to improve and become stronger as the year progressed. The boys placed sixth out of the nine schools in The Hancock Invitational Track Meet. In the Frederick County Track Meet, the boys were fourth out of eight schools. The boys track team defended its second straight Eastern School for the Deaf Track & Field Championship. The boys also set five school records on their way to their national ranking.

★ ★ ★

MSD Hosts
Wrestling Tournament

The Maryland School for the Deaf hosted the tenth annual E.S.D.A.A Wrestling Tournament recently. Results for the eight schools participating were as follows:

- Model Secondary School for the Deaf
  1st with 176 team points
- Lexington School for the Deaf
  2nd with 151 points
- Maryland School for the Deaf
  3rd with 116.5 points
- North Carolina School for the Deaf
  4th with 89.5 points
- New York (White Plains)
  5th with 61.5 points
- American School
  6th at 34.5 points
- Marie Katzenbach School (New Jersey)
  7th at 27 points
- West Virginia School
  8th at 18 points

Individual MSD wrestlers scoring were Dennis Gladhill and Eric Woods first with a 12-2 decision and a pin respectively; Alex Hagedorn and Sidney Claggett, second; Tim Baylor and Maher Esqui, third; Charlie Baumer, Sudhir Walia and Paul Gilbert, fourth. In addition, in the non-scoring, 94 pound class, Kelly Wilson won by pinning his opponents in 1:17 of the championship bout.

We were pleased at the successful tournament and we are especially pleased with how well our boys did in it.

Dennis Gladhill tries his best and wins his match.

★ ★ ★

The girls’ team has a busy basketball schedule.
Alumni & Others

Robert Proctor (Class of 1978) and his wife, Doris, are the proud parents of a daughter, Kimberly Ann, born December 9, in Los Angeles, California. The happy father reports that Kimberly Ann is strong and beautiful.

Maryland Deaf Senior Citizens Enjoys Picnic

Recently deaf senior citizens had a picnic on the grounds of Fort Meade here in Maryland. Over one hundred people were in attendance. This successful picnic was largely due to the efforts of Gini Rambomut and the following members of her picnic committee: Henry Holter, Heimo Antila, Marcia Corbett, Katherine Matthews, and Charles Knowles. A delicious lunch was contributed by Giant Food and Coca-Cola Bottling Company, as well as individual senior citizens.

Regina Kline spoke to the group regarding the American Association of Retired Persons. This was followed by prizes which were humorously presented by Marica Corbett:

Alonzo Phillips for being the oldest attendee (83).
Alonzo Phillips for coming the longest distance (Salisbury).
For having the bulkiest head, Leon Bogucki won over several aspirants.
Henry Holter won with the most great-grandchildren (3).
Charles Waters had the most grandchildren (32).
Nettie Elliott’s handbag produced the most items, some of which she thought were lost!
Alonzo Phillips won another prize for being the oldest graduate.
Mrs. Gladys Leitch was the oldest woman graduate.
Charles Waters won for being the other half of the longest married couple.
Mrs. Mary Richey won the title for having the third generation of deaf children.

These prizes were all donated by various business establishments in the Metropolitan Washington area.

Every one had a grand time renewing friendships and enjoying the delicious refreshments. There was general feeling among the attendees at this picnic that it would be a nice idea if we could make this an annual affair.

Contributed by Heimo Antila

Maryland Deaf Culture To Be Celebrated This Year

A small group of dedicated deaf Marylanders, known as the Maryland Friends of Libraries, have met from time to time over the past few years to discuss plans for encouraging a greater awareness of the deaf people in Maryland. The founder and chairperson of this group is Alice Hagemeyer.

In order to reach its goal, the group plans to sponsor a “Maryland Deaf Culture Celebration” this year. It is hoped to hold the event in each of the 23 counties in Maryland with public speaking and publication of the activities and accomplishments of the deaf in Maryland.

All the information about deaf people in Maryland will be published in a resource book. When completed, the resource book will be helpful to libraries, educators and social workers in Maryland. The book will also help program chairpersons, advisory bodies and leaders of Maryland organizations which are interested in identifying deaf people and their talents and skills. In this way, deaf Marylanders can serve as speakers, advisors, writers and role models.

Last December, in cooperation with the Maryland Association of the Deaf (MDAD), the Maryland Friends of Libraries mailed questionnaires to the “Voice”, the official organ of MDAD. Readers of “Voice” are urged to fill out the questionnaire that came in their copies of the December issue and mail the questionnaire to: Francis C. Higgins, 10508 43rd Avenue, Beltsville, Maryland 20705.

Your cooperation in returning the questionnaire, all filled out, will be a big help in making “Maryland Deaf Culture Celebration” this year a huge success.

Contributed by Francis C. Higgins