

FOCUS ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Aspects of General Education Governance and PL 94-142 Implementation

Ellen A. Herda

Implementing the intent of PL 94-142 calls for insightful leadership and governance on an integrated and expanded basis involving the total school system. In many instances, current social demands on and subsequent shifts in general educational governance undergird the mainstays of public laws. Implementation of PL 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 can have — and in many Local Education Agencies (LEAs) is having — positive and supportive impact on general education administrators facing social, political, and educational demands.

Administrators' activities in today's schools encompass more than the neutral tasks often associated with administration. Governance — which perhaps better describes a major portion of these activities than does "administration" — involves carrying out policy decisions. In several areas of implementation, PL 94-142 provides an impetus for and coincides with such activities. Even though many school systems have made strides, implementation remains a highly complex, problematic process. Currently, far more questions, concerns, and unresolved issues exist than alternative courses of implementation based on assertive, confident actions.

Implementation of federal and state regulations mandating a free and appropriate education for all students deemed to need special services cannot always be separated from other pressing social and political-based issues like desegregation, minimum performance standards, declining enrollments, school finance reform, and various special interest groups, in addition to the equity demands of minority and handicapped individuals. These issues are further compounded as current educational governance takes place in a post-affluent society with no prospects for any economic changes reflecting the affluent days of the 1950s and 1960s.

In short, the general education administrator is responsible for implementing a mandate that yields a multitude of interpretations and ambiguities while governing a "declining industry" in a country facing social, economic, and political unrest. This feat is to be accomplished in collaboration with special (or exceptional) education administrators, many of whom are holding onto long-time "turfs" and established empires and at the same time struggling to come to terms with the new "faces" of exceptional education.

Dr. Herda is Associate Director of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Educational Administration, Ohio State University. She also was Project Coordinator for the BEH-funded SAGE Project (see footnote on page 3 for a description of that project).

The leadership training needed to understand this complex situation and to execute the legal mandates places heavy demands on administrative in-service education. But in-service programs cannot be responsive without addressing the context in which general educational governance takes place.

In the integration of exceptional and general education, exceptional education personnel have a two-fold charge. They first have to be aware that the shifting of major cornerstones in general education has had a profound impact on schools and their governance. The monopolistic control of education by a social and economic middle class has been challenged, and the result has been the development of new sets of priorities, policies, powers, and forms of governance. Second, special educators must develop some common understandings about the nature of education given the implementation of PL 94-142. These understandings have to emerge along with an awareness of current demands on general educational governance.

The movement within special education is part of a total picture of the last 25 years that reflects ongoing critical examination of America's educational institutions and leadership. Schools must operate in a radically different context today than they did a few decades ago. Watson (1977) identified the most significant aspects of this new context as

... the demythologizing of education — putting to rest the fiction that education is apolitical — the unprecedented involvement in education by the courts and the federal government, the balkanization of school personnel, and the mobilization of client (student and community) interest power (p. 73).

FOCUS ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN (*ISSN 0015-511X*) (USPS 203-360) is published monthly except June, July, and August as a service to teachers, special educators, curriculum specialists, administrators, and those concerned with the special education of exceptional children. This journal is abstracted and indexed in *Exceptional Child Education Abstracts*, and is also available in microfilm from Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Subscription rates, \$12.00 per year. Copyright 1980, Love Publishing Company. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or part without written permission is prohibited. Printed in the United States of America. Second class postage is paid at Denver, Colorado.

Executive and Editorial Office
1777 South Bellaire Street
Denver, Colorado 80222
Telephone (303) 757-2579

EDITORIAL BOARD

| | |
|--|---|
| Edward L. Meyen University of Kansas | Glenn A. Vergason Georgia State University |
| Richard J. Whelan University of Kansas Medical Center | |
| Carolyn Acheson Senior Editor | Stanley F. Love Publisher |

Perhaps no federal involvements in the school reflect the underlying timbre of emerging national trends as much as do the problems and potential benefits of PL 94-142 implementation. The legal mandates on federal, state, and local levels are in response to demands for social and political forms of equity in the name of the "least restrictive environment" in education. This concept has widespread implications for both exceptional and general education. Implementing PL 94-142 in most cases demands a close examination of general education conditions by both general and exceptional educators.

Implementing legal mandates cannot take place apart from the general education classroom, students, teachers, administrators, and community. Gilhool (1976) has indicated that "... if the directions taken by the special education [court] cases are to be fully realized, general education, to which special students shall be integrated, must itself take on characteristics of individualization" (p. 13). But educators are currently in no position to provide individualized education to each student. To do so, as Lortie (1976) pointed out, would require a complete overhauling of current schooling practices. It would be naive to expect any major changes to "occur rapidly or easily as the outcome of legal pressure" (p. 18).

Somewhere on a continuum with individualization at one end and cellular group process learning at the other will come negotiated forms of education that meet students' needs more appropriately than they are being met today. The expectations placed upon administrators to provide some guidelines through this process demand an examination of the nature of the challenges and force individuals to draw upon forms of governance and leadership, at all levels of education, that can accommodate societal fragmentation, disunity among educators, and the decline of institutional authority. An increasingly popular position among many educators is that legislation in the name of exceptional education can provide some bases for those guidelines.

Educational administrators in local education agencies hold major responsibility for implementing PL 94-142 and Section 504. But the majority of administrators in the field, including both exceptional and general education administrators, did not receive pre-service training designed to meet such responsibility. In fact, the affluent era during which most current administrators received their training relied on a self-containing bureaucratic and hierarchical model of administration that placed heavy emphasis upon maintenance functions.

Credentialing is changing at the state level, and several institutions of higher education are revising administrative pre-service education curricula and integrating exceptional and general administrative training. Several years, however, will elapse before there are enough

administrators in the field to carry out (or, by that time, carry on) implementation. For this reason, administrators in local education agencies must assume responsibility for professional growth and development through in-service education.

The professional growth and development of exceptional and general education personnel are integral to implementation of PL 94-142 and Section 504. Staff development experiences will not automatically ensure handicapped individuals appropriate educational rights and opportunities, although these experiences are important steps toward achieving integration and coordination of efforts among general and exceptional educators. In turn, these efforts cannot operate in a separatist fashion apart from the total school system nor in isolation from an awareness of the larger socio-political context of educational governance — for it is in this larger context that implementation of PL 94-142 actually takes place.

To aid in achieving the intent of that law, Section 121a, 380 of PL 94-142 requires that all personnel engaged in education of the handicapped receive appropriate training. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) has placed high priority on in-service education and has funded numerous staff development projects. A BEH-funded project,¹ Special and General Education Leadership, provided several education agencies with funds specifically targeted for administrative staff development. Based upon information obtained from needs assessment instruments and information gained by informal means, administrative in-service education programs were developed in each education agency participating in the project. Planning and implementation of the administrative staff development programs in each of the participating agencies reflected the specific context and needs of the agency. The national level effort, however, did indicate several global issues and concerns that arise in implementing PL 94-142.

The remainder of this article focuses on the following three issues and concludes with a discussion of some implications for administrative in-service staff development:

- 1) A total system approach toward implementation of PL 94-142;
- 2) Integrated and expanded forms of administration; and
- 3) Governance, policy, and implementation at the building level.

A TOTAL SYSTEM APPROACH TOWARD PL 94-142 IMPLEMENTATION

In efforts to implement PL 94-142 and Section 504, administrators of both general and exceptional education face several challenges including the re-examination of administrative and organizational structures, curriculum and pupil personnel services, and administrator and teacher staff development programs. Traditionally, general and exceptional education administrative and teaching responsibilities were carried out in separatist fashion. Where dual administrative systems between general and exceptional education still exist, PL 94-142 implementation necessitates an eventual breaking down, to some degree, of that dualistic system. One must recognize that not just exceptional educators are responsible for implementing PL 94-142 and Section 504 but that implementation rests upon the responsible acts of *all* educators.

General education administrators have difficulty acting on the belief that they are suddenly able (and required) to respond to exceptional education concerns. This may be better understood in remembering that for years special education students relied on personnel with specific training and were taught in facilities separate from the general education student population. In other words, special education turf was "protected" from general education by specialized training and isolated housing. This turf was not always held in awe by general educators. In fact, acknowledging the type of classrooms often assigned to special education personnel and students, special education could be thought of as general education's stepchild. At the same time, though, it was thought of as *specialized* education — if for no other reason than that special education language and vocabulary differed from that of general educators.

Today, it is assumed at times that if rooms containing handicapped students are located within regular school facilities, the least restrictive environment concept has been achieved. This may be a step up from teaching students in church basements, but for many children it does not fulfill the intent of the law.

A number of problems currently facing school administrators are further aggravated by a separatist approach toward exceptional and general education. Areas

¹ The Special and General Education Leadership Project (1976-1979) was sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration and funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The participating education agencies and local coordinators included Dade County Schools, Miami, Florida — Wylamerle Marshall; Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona — Carolyn Raymond; Metropolitan School System, Nashville, Tennessee — Phyllis Shutt; Milwaukee Public Schools — William Malloy; North Carolina State Department — Lowell Harris and Fred Baars; and Tacoma Schools — Henry Bertness. Staff development efforts and the interchanges and exchanges between education agencies and institutions of higher education involving professors of both exceptional and general educational administration were major components of the project.

of concern that must be approached on a system-wide basis include desegregation, minimum competency standards, and unionism (Malloy, 1979). Some special education classes, such as for the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, contain an over-representation of minority groups. Many of these children really belong in general education classes. Questions arise about the legality and morality of applying the same minimum competency standards to handicapped and nonhandicapped students. And unions, for example, are encouraging teachers to refer "problem" students to special education classes to lighten the burden on the regular classroom teacher. These problems have no simple solutions and are highly emotional subjects for teachers, administrators, and parents.

The total school system approach can provide a good avenue for action concerning these problems — as opposed to the dualist approach, which perpetuates the attempts of exceptional and general education administrators to solve such problems independently. The total system approach does not necessarily mean the complete unification of exceptional and general education programs. Rather, it refers to collaboration between and among exceptional and general educators to generate alternative solutions to problems that are better solved together than separately. This requires that administrators first identify the problems and then assume responsibility to work on alternative solutions on a participatory and collective basis, recognizing when and what kinds of changes in general and exceptional education are needed. It also demands trust and respect among the various operating divisions within a school system, which derive from open and working communication lines among superintendent, assistant superintendent, and their administrative teams.

For a variety of reasons (e.g., new mandates, union encouragement, inappropriate curriculum and instruction programs, program experimentation) movement of students among various learning situations is inherent. This involves students' going to and from exceptional and general education classes, as well as intermediate settings including resource rooms and general and/or exceptional classes on a part-time basis. This fluidity is integral to carrying out the intent of PL 94-142, but it represents one of the most complex problems related to implementation, touching virtually all of the components and personnel within a school system. Referrals, evaluations, conferences, and re-referrals, re-evaluations, and more conferences take up enormous amounts of personnel time and involve voluminous amounts of paperwork. The whole process often bogs down and perpetuates the backlog of students needing evaluation as well as the noncompliance status of many LEAs.

Student backlog is often identified only in terms of the numbers of students needing evaluation. These data may give an indication of the problem but do not begin to provide the kind of information needed to propose guidelines for reducing the numbers of these students. Further examination reflects the nature of the problem as it affects both general and exceptional education personnel and students on the following issues: the use of grades as indicators for needed exceptional education services; over-burdened diagnosticians at certain times of the school year; inappropriate referrals; and in-service education content.

During spring quarter the number of referrals in a school system often increases drastically as teachers realize that certain students are "failing" or receiving low grades. This pattern can indicate that grades are being used for identification of students needing exceptional education services, rather than identification relying on classroom observation, intermittent teacher assessment of students' learning, and so forth. Emphasis on grades earned instead of intervention and preventive measures can also indicate the inappropriate use of or lack of classroom teacher skills.

Since many of these referrals come at the end of the school year, diagnostic personnel and evaluation teams are subject to unrealistic expectations. If a State Education Agency (SEA) had mandated a timeline to follow in evaluating referrals, the chance of meeting that timeline is slim. And it automatically ensures that the LEA will be out of compliance.

Building level referrals by teachers using inaccurate measures result in many inappropriate referrals and thus contribute to excess paperwork and wasted person-hours. A system-wide perspective on problems of student identification procedures, student referral processes, and diagnostic services is essential for initial remediation steps and subsequent preventive steps.

The system-wide, or total system, approach entails "ownership" of these responsibilities by both exceptional and general education. SEAs can enhance this type of ownership by defining compliance as it relates to a total system instead of just the Division of Exceptional or Special Education in an LEA. Compliance should be defined in terms of initial identification procedures by general and exceptional education personnel and ongoing diagnostic and evaluation processes. Anything less places unrealistic expectations on the Division of Exceptional Education. Compliance, commonly thought of as the responsibility of the Director of Exceptional Education, involves both exceptional and general education personnel. Also, compliance has system-wide implications for the least restrictive environment for all students. More appropriate and accurate referrals on the

part of regular classroom teachers, for example, would be a reflection of higher quality teacher preparation (via pre-service or in-service education).

The planning, development, implementation, and impact of teacher in-service education can foster a total system approach. The implications for such in-service education are many. The tradition of patchwork-type workshops and one-shot in-service meetings, coupled with an inadequate amount of research on in-service education, offers scant basis to rely upon, especially considering the magnitude of the task at hand. In recent years, though, the federal government has funded programs to aid SEAs and LEAs with their in-service needs; and the current flurry of in-service activities throughout the nation indicates some available monies along with an awareness of the need for staff development programs.

Current emphasis on developmental in-service models rather than deficit models reflects a reliance on the strengths of education personnel and attempts at further development of those strengths. But this process needs to be complemented with appropriate content that will make a difference to teachers, administrators, and students at the building level. Deciding specific content (based on the needs of the particular LEA) is the responsibility of both exceptional and general education personnel.

In times of scarcity of resources, mistakes show up more easily. In-service educators now have less time and fewer resources with which to work than during any recent period in educational history. And demands to make available quality in-service education are intimately connected with legal mandates. The above discussion demonstrates this connection — by indicating the need for classroom teachers to become skilled in appropriate and accurate assessment and evaluation of students. Meeting this need does not entail educating all teachers to use highly specialized evaluation tools; rather, it places an emphasis on observation skills and analyses of individual students' actions and attitudes, on intervention and preventive forms of teaching, and on appropriate use of support personnel and services.

Packets distributed during in-service meetings often contain massive amounts of required reading for teachers (and in some cases administrators) with role playing and simulation activities attached to provide a "feel" for what the IEP and the Safeguard Procedures (due process) involve. This kind of information and activities helps the recipients understand some aspects of implementation, but in-service education must go beyond information-giving and role-playing levels. It should be based on careful assessment, both formal and informal, of the needs of a particular education agency and also on a conceptualization of what education might be like

given implementation of PL 94-142. The various facets of implementation also must be considered in view of the larger context of education and society.

To illustrate this larger context — in-service teacher education that would include attention to assessment, intervention, and prevention is highly appropriate to child find and preventive care movements in other service agencies, many of which are now combining their efforts with exceptional children divisions in local and state education agencies. One indication that these have not been primary emphases in either pre-service or in-service education is the necessarily heavy emphasis on remedial education.

By focusing on assessment, intervention, and prevention of educational problems, the IEP concept can be part of an overall approach toward education instead of an aspect of exceptional education services alone. This would provide some basis for ownership of the idea behind the IEP process. Assessment would result in placing a particular child on a continuum of handicapping and nonhandicapping conditions; and the individual learning program for the child based on that assessment would indicate the nature of his or her program. The IEP, or some variation of it, then would be an important element of an appropriate education for all children.

Within this framework, the IEP process is not taught to teachers as something extra attached to handicapped students, but as part of an approach toward providing the least restrictive environment to all students. The kinds of resources and activities devoted to developing a child's individual learning program, IEP or otherwise, and the follow through, would be relative to the complexity of the student's learning procedures and his or her place on an educational continuum of emotional, social, and physical conditions. The emphasis would be on the development of individual students and less on moving students through grades. By following a developmental rather than a deficit process, instruction and learning for educators and students alike eventually can go beyond remediation and assume a preventive stance toward socio-educational problems.

When problems initially appear to be related to a certain division in an education agency but upon closer examination turn out to reflect needed changes on a system-wide basis, resolutions require joint ownership of responsibility and support among and between exceptional and general education personnel. The above discussion points out the need for administrators and personnel in various divisions within an LEA (curriculum and instruction, health services, etc.) to work closely together. In working out potential and alternative solutions, administrators have to rely upon leadership styles

that respond to the nature of the demands. Problems can no longer be treated as if the bureaucratic and hierarchical system, by virtue of its design, designates what is a problem and how it is resolved.

INTEGRATED AND EXPANDED FORMS OF ADMINISTRATION

In an attempt to provide the least restrictive environment for handicapped individuals, general and exceptional education personnel face certain problems (as mentioned above) that cannot be easily separated. These problems would appear to be approachable through collaborative and participatory recourse over a period of time. Implementation of PL 94-142 not only promotes the integration of exceptional and general education, but also places schools in partnership with other sectors of society (e.g., vocational rehabilitation centers, child find agencies) and in specific partnerships with community members (e.g., parents of handicapped children). Integrated and expanded forms of administrations are not unique to education but are also viable options in business, unions, and government. They have a sound and broad basis in practice.

Various captions are used to express integrated and expanded forms of leadership in education. The team concept abounds at all levels in a school system — Management Teams, Administrative Resource Teams, Multidisciplinary Teams, School-based Resource Teams, and other such teams. The art of participatory team leadership calls for the leader to stand back and let others share the role while he or she still assumes major responsibility to justify the actions of the team, if necessary, to advocates of various interest groups, clients (teachers, students, parents, etc.), school boards, and other teams. The leader has to establish a code that appeals to the members and meets needs for participation, individualism, and equity. Members of teams who assume some leadership functions and requisite responsibility make the task of leadership easier. The combination of increased competition, demands for cost reduction and new programs, changes in government regulations, and continuing increases in client militancy requires a higher quality of leadership than ever before.

Assembling a team can be accomplished in a relatively short period, but a certain amount of time is needed to establish principles that allow for trust, cooperation, and negotiation to become integral parts of a working team. Michael Maccoby (1979), Director of the Harvard Project on Technology, Work and Character, suggested that during this era of social and character changes in America, "the primary tasks of leaders are to understand

both motives and resistance to change, and to establish operating principles that build trust, facilitate cooperation, and explain the significance of the individual's role in the common purpose" (p. 20). The significance of individuals in a team or an organization cannot be overestimated.

Public education agencies are traditionally thought of as service organizations. The emphasis is on the client. While this is an important tenet to hold, working conditions of teachers, administrators, support staff, para-professionals, volunteers, etc. are taking on more significance in light of a "declining industry" that is offering fewer opportunities for advancement. Advancement up a career ladder is no longer automatic. A decline in student population and public sector retrenchment are reasons for this switch in the nature of mobility. Patterns of lateral and upward mobility are increasingly becoming qualitative concerns. As Gappert (1979) pointed out:

Job satisfaction is likely to be a major issue as the work force becomes "tenured up" and opportunities for even lateral mobility are reduced. It should also be noted that, in the 1980's, the Bulge Generation will be maturing onto their late 30's and the associated life style changes can be significant" (p. 2-3).

The focus for the near future will be on improving one's performance of, and satisfaction in, a current position. This focus is on individuals rather than on groups. Negotiation of individuals' rights and responsibilities in an organization will include reference to less restricting conditions for personal development rather than to those conditions found in more traditional bureaucratic and hierarchical modes of organization.

New attitudes exist today on the part of workers in most organizations, stemming from the movement for individual rights, demand for equity, and interest in self-development and self-determination. Many workers, or "subordinates," will no longer accept directives merely because they come from a "superior." The state of willingness of individuals to participate fully in their own position or as a team member is a serious issue for educational, corporate, and business leaders alike. In schools, as in most places of work, unwilling or unhappy employees can pose serious problems to the administrator who is responsible for changes mandated by laws.

These changing values, evidenced currently by the numerous advocacy groups, play an important role in determining attitudes at work. "Unless leaders understand [these shifts in values]," wrote Maccoby (1979), "they may bring out the worst rather than the best in the [nation's] emerging social character" (p. 19). In his research with leaders who are developing new modes of organizations in education, business, industry, and unions, Maccoby reported two personal characteristics that these leaders have in common — characteristics

that may be essential for a new "model" of leadership to bring out the best in individuals working in organizations. These leaders:

1. have developed or are developing a philosophy of management which is rooted in a concern for their workers and resentment of wasted human potential. This rooted conviction, in contrast to a rigid ideology, provides a basis for pragmatic experimentation and satisfaction in step-by-step gains. Although most of these leaders share the gamesmen's respect for strategy and tactics, they do not share the need for perpetual adventure and drama.
2. are students of the organizations they lead and are willing and able to "problematize" both the mission (definition of the product or service) and the control systems. They take time from the tiring managerial tasks of responding to crises to question whether the mission serves society and individuals. They are not willing to gain power or money by appealing to the worst in people. They are engaged by the task of analyzing and reconstructing the organization (p. 22).

Maccoby concluded that time spent in participatory decision making is well spent if decisions are made and if the commitment to results is based upon analyses of problems and willingness to give up control and power.

The notion of participatory management, leadership, and decision making is conceptually vague. With the present emphasis on the team or participatory approach toward administration, one must exercise care so that the words "team" and "participatory" do not become merely catchwords — popular usages masking disagreement over substance with apparent agreement over form. A genuine commitment must be made to expanding the bases for decision making and problem identification. The results of expanding these bases, however, ramify themselves in a way that create further situations requiring attention.

A case in point is the battle for the public's or the client's "right to know," which has resulted in information being available to people who did not previously possess such information. But gaining access to information without concurrently gaining understanding of its potential uses can perpetuate the "information-rich, knowledge-poor" syndrome. For example, parents who now have more information than before also have to come to understand the implications of identification, evaluation, and educational placement of their child. In short, information is a necessary but insufficient condition for participation in an IEP development process or any other participatory type of activity. In the case of the parent, the challenges include a search for realistic and satisfactory balance between the role of the school and the role of the parent. These challenges extend to other forms of participation and have implications for policy issues as well.

These challenges will probably be met through negotiations that could lead to less restricting environments

for team members, other staff members, students, parents, and anyone else who participates. In negotiations, the balance between individual rights and least restrictive environment is precarious, dependent upon shifting values, sources of information, and interpretations. But the concept of least restrictive environment is an important tool and can be applied to many situations in which negotiations are the main resource in making decisions. We must exercise care that this concept does not outlive its usefulness before we have moved beyond our present problems to new ones!

The concept of least restrictive environment, as pointed out, need not focus solely on exceptional children. Each child and adult is faced with continually learning to assume personal and social responsibility for sustaining a quality life in the face of the social and political limits to growth in Western society. The least restrictive environment is a right mandated by a law applying to handicapped individuals, but before the intent of this law can move beyond technical compliance issues, the concept of least restrictive environments has to be understood in terms of reaching beyond the mechanical elements of implementation. It must be understood as a *responsibility* assumed by individuals before it can be a *right* for anyone.

In the pressing need to survive in a society beset with ambiguities, complexities, and stresses, our efforts should focus on ways in which satisfaction can be gained by quality living and working rather than solely on competitive advance Hirsch (1978) has suggested that the mismatch between current expectations and resources in our society is qualitative rather than quantitative. He cautioned that we must not "set up expectations that cannot be fulfilled, ever" (p. 9). This statement is not contradictory to the concept of least restrictive environments for exceptional individuals. It addresses the issue of recognizing the nature of individuals' environments and providing the least restrictive alternative for all persons. Handicapped individuals and, for example, professionals in non-mobile positions all have the right and responsibility to design quality lives for themselves.

Speaking to a more specific issue, which is at the same time related to a larger context, Skrag (1979) suggested that "special education administrators will provide leadership for needed curricular changes. In the years ahead, millions of Americans may move beyond materialistic values and choose an outwardly more specific and inwardly more rich life style" (p. 9). When these changes occur, they must be accompanied by organizational changes and must also coincide with an awareness that the least restrictive environment connotes realistic expectations in socially and politically equitable forms.

Facing the issues of appropriate forms of administration, individuals' rights and responsibilities, and the least restricting environment for staff and students is an ongoing and unending task for administrators. This task will not be automatically undertaken systematically or rigorously. It requires a vehicle to provide the impetus for looking closely at the nature of changes and the consequences of such changes. A law as pervasive as 94-142 can serve as that vehicle. It reaches out to virtually every division in an education agency and expands into the community. It can be used to examine and change many aspects of schooling, governance, curricular content, staff development, and school and community settings. A law, however, can only motivate (strongly, at times) people to follow legislative guidelines. In the end, providing individuals with least restrictive environments for work and learning relies on individual commitment to quality administration, teaching, and lifelong learning, and on discovery of ingenious ways to finance appropriate programs and services.

Implementing PL 94-142 to provide each handicapped child a free and appropriate education entails massive changes in our education system. If our present education system had already provided least restrictive environments for the nonhandicapped and now it were only a matter of appropriately identifying the handicapped who belong in the mainstream of education, the task would still be arduous and difficult enough. But educators are faced with the larger task of finding human, material, and financial resources to create least restrictive environments for handicapped and, in many cases, nonhandicapped students as well. Who gives up what in order to accomplish this task will rely on long-term negotiations among educators, members of the community, the courts, and federal and state governments. Within this context, negotiating and interpreting policy are well-entrenched activities at all levels of schooling.

GOVERNANCE, POLICY, AND IMPLEMENTATION AT THE BUILDING LEVEL

Schools were for some time (and in many cases still are) considered to be institutions in which effective management is based on apolitical activities. The governance structure was traditionally built upon separation of politics and administration. Neutral competence and avoidance of conflict were held at a premium. Several conditions have made this position no longer (if it ever was) credible in describing educational governance at any level within an education agency. The change has

been perpetuated by various factors including increasing court intervention and governmental control demanding changes that often carry highly emotional and political overtones; an increasingly vocal constituency and supportive client group; and a fragmentation of educators through unionism and special interest groups. The school district, including building level entities within a district, can no longer operate under the assumption that decision making can be separated simply into administrative decisions and policy decisions.

For many of their everyday decisions, principals and teachers need several kinds of information, along with an understanding of potential political and legal consequences of those decisions. This is particularly true of issues related to due process procedures. The distinction between politics and administration is far less clear today than during the era when schools were believed to operate autonomously, independent of the larger socio-political context. Now, the scope of potential and real conflict clearly extends beyond the building level administrator.

Because of the variety of social and political changes (such as citizen dissatisfaction at the local level, which in turn created national level attention, pluralism, the proliferation of narrow interest advocacy groups, increased state level funding, collective bargaining, and a loss of local monetary discretion), the administrator has to rely on different forms of governance than the hierarchical and bureaucratic structures of past recent decades. The overall political and social unrest today threatens the claims to expertise and the power bases at all levels, and at the same time places additional demands upon administrators' participatory and coordinative skills.

Laws and the implications of their impact have rapidly moved to the foreground in governance concerns today. Awareness of this larger picture is not to be reserved for only the top management of local education agencies. Schooling and its governance have for some time been the business of far more people than solely the superintendents. Local level building administrators, division directors, teachers, and community members (in addition to board members) are becoming important players in the process of schooling governance.

The governance process at all levels is highly complex and demands more responsibility and assertive, yet participatory, administrative styles. Principals, in their attempts to follow mandates and administer programs, rely on policy actions. And policy is becoming less oriented toward what should be done and more directed at everyday problems in building level units. Local building level policy is subject to standards and

values that are constantly shifting, depending upon the group giving input and the particular situation. Principals' actions in following a policy are part of a political process that includes expanding and interpreting the policy. As Everhart (1979) has suggested, policy has to be able to fit a variety of circumstances. Further, even if policy does fit a variety of circumstances, decisive leadership is necessary at all levels of an education agency. But administrators, particularly at the building level, often are caught in a frustrating position between emerging participatory governance demands and fragmentation of total school programs.

The principal's role, of course, is of primary importance in implementing innovations, but it is complicated by the fragmentation resulting from a multitude of simultaneously ongoing building level programs like Title I, bilingual/bicultural, vocational development, exceptional education, and special services personnel programs. Many of these programs receive directives from personnel other than at the building level. This situation places the principal in a position that demands strong coordinative skills — offset by administrative formats of the various programs that often prohibit decision-making powers, participatory and otherwise, from resting with the principal. Roles can be played in appropriate fashion but the strength of, and current demands for, participatory administrative styles is lessened by acute fragmentation among various building level programs.

Traditionally, the principal had a significantly stronger power base in the more hierarchical and bureaucratic administrative framework of the past. Decisions made at the school level were often concerned purely with management activities, while policy decisions were made "downtown." This situation is changing somewhat because of "grassroots" involvement at the building level and also because of participatory activities mandated by laws. In any case, more power has to be extended to the principal if he or she is to be successful in participatory forms of governance. Personnel in individual buildings in a local education agency reflect needs that in turn require autonomy and a certain amount of independence in order to meet the demanded changes. Principals' obligations have shifted from being solely managerial to providing leadership in coordinating individuals from a myriad of sectors, along with their respective programs. Least restrictive environments can be created more easily if policy decisions are integral to everyday activities coordinated by an administrator who has autonomy and support from the central office to establish the most appropriate overall building level program.

Exceptional education personnel can play a signifi-

cant role in providing support and knowledge to building level administrators in their attempts in participatory forms of governance. But advocates among general education administration are often thwarted in their efforts in this behalf, by having to assume passive roles in developing least restrictive environments for handicapped students. Exceptional education personnel are assumed to have (and in fact do have) certain kinds of expertise, but the changes needed in a given school involve more than just exceptional education personnel. The knowledge and experiences of general educators are equally important in contributing toward the least restrictive environment for handicapped and nonhandicapped students. Appropriate governance structure and willingness to cooperate, along with the autonomy to decide upon appropriate actions, are requisite for PL 94-142 implementation at the building level.

IMPLICATIONS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

In-service for administrators is not appropriate without integrative efforts that include the members of teams for which they provide leadership. In-service focusing entirely on one group at a time, whether principals, vice principals, or guidance personnel, leaves important facets of in-service education unattended. Activities involving implementation do not divide themselves neatly among the various groups of educators. Categorization of in-service education according to different groups, though, can be appropriate in initial stages of the overall in-service education program. For example, general information and broadly-based interpretations of the innovations sometimes merit presentation to groups comprised of one division of personnel. And certain kinds of technical information and understandings are more directly related to principals, for example, than to other groups of personnel.

In-service programs, however, must also address mixed groups including general and exceptional administrators and teachers and support personnel. This composite more closely reflects the configuration of individuals facing implementation. Ultimately, in-service programs must respond to needs of the specific schools. These individual schools represent highly appropriate in-service sites for such in-service activities because they involve the people who carry on everyday affairs of schooling in a particular building. This approach requires a certain autonomy from the rest of the education agency in developing in-service education programs.

Central office staff, area and building level administrators, classroom and support personnel, paraprofessionals, volunteers, parents, and the like should play major roles in discerning their own in-service require-

ments. Their being asked to help determine their own in-service education may prove to be far more motivating and positive than in-service given on the basis of credits received or money paid to the participants. As Hutson (1979) pointed out, "The research literature does not support the notion that extrinsic rewards such as extra salary credit, extra pay and so on, will induce teachers to work hard planning or participating in in-service programs if professional motivation is absent. The effective implementation of in-service requires, in a word, *human support* . . ." (p. 1).

Perhaps the most significant role education agencies can play in PL 94-142 implementation is to develop highly comprehensive in-service education programs based on their own unique context and problem identification. But pre-service education, for the most part, has not prepared educators for the current needs and demands. Most educators were trained in programs based on different assumptions than those needed for responding to the highly complex social and political contexts in which schools operate today. In-service education must continue the growth and development begun, or not addressed, in pre-service programs — which in turn requires open communication between practicing administrators and professors in exceptional and general education.

In providing in-service education for administrators, one must first conceptualize the kind of administrative education needed to address current demands for participatory leadership. But in-service education cannot be assumed to have positive results and impact without some concomitant changes in the organizational structures to help support the new kinds of information and knowledge gained through local education agency education programs. This may involve restructuring the organization by, for example, establishing working communication channels, changing staffing patterns, unifying disparate support service programs, and giving more decision-making powers to individuals at building level units.

Good leadership is critical for the 1980s. Encouraging adaptability to major socio-educational changes is a different challenge than is developing in-service education to train personnel who lack the necessary skills to do an effective job. In-service education must include not only explanations of new mandates and technical information but understandings and interpretations of the nature of problems facing educators today. The exceptional education movement reflects these problems through concrete legislation mandating changes in the schooling process for exceptional children, but it is also an impetus for providing concrete, positive changes for *all* children.

Least restrictive environments for exceptional children will be possible when least restrictive conditions are part of the program for nonhandicapped students also. This goal entails more than the "band-aid" approach to in-service. It means looking at the wider picture and envisioning what education should be like in this broader view. It forces exceptional educators to arrive at some common understandings about exceptional education, along with the integrative aspects of exceptional and general education following implementation of PL 94-142. Views among exceptional educators are currently so disparate that it is difficult at times to determine in-service content that reaches beyond purely technical aspects. General educators, too, have an important responsibility, to look at the implications of PL 94-142 for general education and develop responsive in-service education programs in collaboration with exceptional educators. Figure 1 presents some examples of present and future aspects of general education governance and PL 94-142 implementation that could serve as common denominators among general and exceptional education personnel.

In-service education programs should reflect the specific situations and contexts of individual education agencies, but some general implications for administrative in-service may be applicable to a variety of contexts. These are summarized as follows:

1. *Both technical and nontechnical information and knowledge are needed by administrators.* Administrators must thoroughly understand technical information in order to minimize the possibility of legal or compliance complications. Implementation also requires awareness of the kinds of problems that improved human relations skills can avert or "solve." Group process and interactional talents are as important as knowing the rules and regulations and are requisite for participatory leadership.
2. *Administrators should have the opportunity to "problematize" the mission and services presently existing in their education agency.* Ownership of a jointly identified problem is an important initial step to establishing alternative courses of action.
3. *Vertical and horizontal administrative in-service provides awareness of other administrators' problems and can set the stage for more effective communication channels.* Often, elementary school principals participate together, as do junior and senior high principals. A continuum of concerns and issues can help provide a broader perspective on the nature of education concerns for all administrators if some of the in-service programs include a mixture of administrators from the different school

AREAS OF CHANGE IN LEAs

- Increased lateral and vertical integration among various divisions and levels (e.g., administration, curriculum, top level management, middle management, etc.) within LEAs.
- Increased aggressive union activity such as demands for classload formulas to distribute fair teaching assignments.
- Increased union activity in integrating exceptional and general education efforts.
- Released time in some form for diagnostic work, IEP preparation, and conferencing.
- Administrative staff bargaining for increased number of support staff in relation to number and kinds of students and available resources.
- Integrated and expanded leadership styles.
- Recognition and capitalization of advocates for handicapped among general education personnel.
- Increased emphasis on individual differences in all students; not necessarily meaning an IEP for each student, but group instruction based upon individually determined student needs.
- Curriculum concept including education programs for students and professional and paraprofessional staff.
- Back-to-basics movement eventually to include examination of the need for everyone to read in the traditional "basic" way. Technology will play an important role as an aid to "basics" (not everyone has to read in the same way).
- Inclusive continuum of learning conditions to meet needs of more students, eventually challenging the current dominant system of grade-by-grade advancement.

- Least restrictive environment concept flowing over into lives of all students and staff members; quality work and learning situations considered as important as quantifiable accountability systems.
- Economic considerations and acknowledgment of differentiated value systems to be curriculum mainstays in Total School System development.

INTERFACING AMONG SCHOOLING, COMMUNITY, AND FAMILY

- Increased demands by parents for accessibility to "special" programs for nonhandicapped students.
- Expanded basis for in-service education to involve parents. Eventually, family therapy, family needs, and maintenance will be part of schooling programs.
- Continued and increasing movement toward inter-agency cooperation with emphasis on training programs in collaboration with medical, preventive care agencies, and work-related agencies.
- Shift of resources from support services for handicapped and others requiring support, to programs that eventually create opportunities for clients to work, pay taxes, and maintain themselves. Change in attitude toward handicapped will accompany this shift.
- Quality life styles and lifelong learning opportunities to assume more importance in total expanded schooling programs. "Seamless curriculum" will speak to individual needs before, during, and after formal schooling.
- Continued emphasis in the "celebration of diversity" in human beings and pluralism of cultures and interest groups.

RESOURCES AND SERVICES

- Increased interaction between SEAs and LEAs; federal funding to LEAs via state department formulas.
- State regulations imposed will reflect input from LEA and community.
- More unified and equitable accountability measures and funding formulas among state departments.
- More equalized federal involvement with states in noncompliance issues, as in future state monitoring with LEAs.
- Regional based service systems providing high cost delivery programs, taking this financial burden off LEAs.
- Continued competition for federal funds among various equity-based federal programs; e.g., Title I bilingual/bicultural, vocational development program.
- More carefully defined resources to differentiate between chronological time and quality time (amount of human effort required) demand in different tasks; e.g., paperwork vs. individual and program assessment.

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLING

- Continued and increasing input from community members and parents influencing the types of schooling available. Governance to be more broadly based; e.g., various voucher plans.
- Increased student attendance in private and/or church related schools.
- Eventual court cases related to issues of church/private/state education rights and responsibilities. Issues of morality will be decided in courts.

Figure 1. Present and Future Issues in Education Governance and PL 94-142 Implementation.

levels. Central office administrators and directors should take part in in-service programs, too. Not only do they need the information and experiences of the in-service education programs, but principals, for example, must realize that the issues discussed at in-service meetings merit the attention and interest of top level administrators. This, of course, places time demands on the central office administrative staff since the most effective in-service occurs in small group sessions.

4. *Administrative and non-administrative personnel should take part in in-service programs together.* Along with emphases on participatory governance and the team approach to problem identification and decision making, there must be opportunities for the team approach to be "practiced" on various levels throughout the school system. Different attitudes are required toward participatory activities than toward hierarchical and bureaucratic activities. The multidisciplinary approach emerging in education should be complemented with in-service education that is multidisciplinary.
5. *School site in-service relates to specific building level concerns.* The school site offers the advantage of being highly job-related. Each school has some unique strengths and areas of concern that may be resolved more easily at the local building level.
6. *In-service programs should include joint efforts by school personnel and other service agencies.* The worlds of preventive medicine, work, law, science, and humanities are important corollaries to educators' efforts. Issues of ethics and values are part of the larger context in which administrators and other educators work; and these issues are often intimately tied to both education and these other worlds.
7. *In-service programs must address the self-education and quality living issues facing administrators.* Administrators are part of the larger society whose members are facing these issues. The work place is becoming an increasingly important issue for individuals in organizations. The concept and mission of "education" must be extended to students and staff.
8. *In-service education related to PL 94-142 implementation should reflect the expertise of both exceptional and general educators.* The implementation of PL 94-142 requires the best of both worlds of exceptional and general education.
9. *Pre-service and in-service education programs based on partnerships among local education agencies and universities can promote a growth and development continuum for educators.* Training administrators for a total system approach and participatory

forms of leadership should begin in pre-service education. Demands on current school administrators are different from those facing administrators several years ago. Working communication networks among schools and universities can aid in appropriate preparation of personnel.

In-service education programs can set important directions for the future of education. Anticipating and contending with socio-political pressures on traditional forms of governance and society are part of the larger context that educators must address. Educators may never have the opportunity to become highly proactive in this larger context, but they obviously are becoming increasingly active when an education law as pervasive as 94-142 can be interpreted as reflecting social, political, and educational imperatives.

The impact of PL 94-142 upon general education governance extends to changes in the schooling for all students. Possibilities for these changes are innumerable. Deciding which courses of action are most appropriate includes negotiating in good will. It also requires envisioning education in the larger social context and making decisions based upon conceptualizations of the future. The future involves "problematizing" education, making choices, parlaying strengths, and transforming present conditions to less restricting conditions.

REFERENCES

- Everhart, R. B. *Ethnography and educational policy: Love and marriage or strange bedfellows?* *Anthropology & Educational Administration*. Tucson: Sander de Juana, 1979.
- Gappert, G. *Does educational administration need a revolution in training?* Policy development paper prepared for the May workshop on school administrator training, U.S. Office of Education, April, 1979.
- Gihool, T. K. *Changing public policies: Roots and faces. Mainstreaming: Origin and implications*, Spring 1976, 2 (2). (Minnesota Education Series, University of Minnesota)
- Hirsch, F. *Social limits to growth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Hutson, H. *PAR in in-service. Practical applications of research*, June 1979, 1 (4).
- Lortie, D. C. *Discussion on Gilhool's remarks. Mainstreaming: Origin and implications*, Spring 1976, 2 (2). (Minnesota Education Series, University of Minnesota)
- Maccoby, M. *Leadership needs of the 1980's, Current issues in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.
- Malloy, W. W. *A total school system approach to the management of exceptional education programs*. Paper presented at Syracuse University Colloquy, April 19, 1979.
- Skrag, J. *A year of progress: What lies ahead? Dimensions of the future and the challenges of change*. Report of the National Association of State Directors Annual Meeting, 1978, 6-10.
- Watson, B. C. *Issues confronting educational administration, 1954-1974*. In L. Cunningham, W. Hack, R. Nystrand (Eds.), *Educational administration: The developing decades*. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon Publishing Corp., 1977.