DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 985 RC 019 158

AUTHOR Fishkin, Anne S.; Sullivan, Michael
TITLE Reforming Special Education.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 11p.; In: Montgomery, Diane, Ed. Rural America: Where All Innovations Begin. Conference Proceedings (Savannah, GA, March 11-13, 1993); see RC 019 153.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Government School Relationship; Mainstreaming; Rural Areas; *Rural Education; School Restructuring; *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS America 2000; Empowerment; *Reform Efforts; *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

This paper describes education reform as an integrated effort to modify not only the structure and elements of the education system but also the culture or belief structure of that system. Central to any discussion of school reform are the elements of restructuring, empowerment, and change. Current reform efforts in restructuring revolve around a top-down management approach that contradicts true education reform. In order to transform and empower rather than simply restructure, expectations for schools must be matched with current practice. It is essential that clearly defined goals are jointly developed by all involved stakeholders. In addition, change requires allocation of fiscal and human resources and teacher support systems if continuous improvement is to result. In West Virginia, a predominantly rural state with a large percentage of small schools, several tiers of "reform" activities are uncoordinated and contradict basic premises of successful reform. Although recent legislation established faculty and school improvement councils to involve schools and communities in education decisions, a state agenda aimed at downsizing school systems has effectively preempted local decision-making. Additionally, West Virginia has driven headlong into the regular education initiative that promotes inclusion of exceptional students with their peers but fosters a top-down management approach as opposed to a quality management approach. This paper predicts that inclusion models may be the single greatest special-education-related issue threatening a quality management approach to school reform. (LP)

REFORMING SPECIAL EDUCATION

Anne S. Fishkin and Michael Sullivan
West Virginia Graduate College, Institute, WV

Since 1989, the issue of school reform has been a hot topic for both general and special educators. Armed with the assumption that the current economic state of the country was the result of a decline in the quality of schools, the Bush administration proposed a set of sweeping reforms generally known as America 2000. While the usefulness of a set of national education goals is endorsed by both the educational community and the public, the most recent Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll on attitudes toward public schools clearly indicated that few (less than 30 percent on average) Americans have even heard of the six goals of America 2000 (Elam, Rose & Gallup, 1992). These goals are:

1) By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.
2) By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%.
3) By the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography.
4) By the year 2000, American students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
5) By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the skills necessary to compete in a global economy and to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
6) By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

(U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

What do We Mean by Educational Reform?

To proceed with any discussion of "reform," it is important to first define and then operationalize the term. This may be one of the most difficult of tasks, given the current flurry of educational activities attributed to reform efforts - cooperative learning, the regular educational initiative, whole language, effective schools research, assertive discipline approaches, alternative schools, and others. Recognizing that all of these activities are arguably desirable to some degree, they nonetheless generally lack systematic application and tend to be here today and gone tomorrow (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Goodlad, 1992). As such, they represent "change(s)" but because these efforts tend to lack coordination with one another within the context of a clearly defined goal for the system, they do not qualify as reform. Reform may be better described as an integrated effort to focus not only on the structure and elements of the system but also to address the basic need to modify the culture, or the belief structure, of that system. Accomplishing this will require massive, coordinated change at the federal, state, local, school and community levels. One colleague prefers to identify the needed process as "transformation" rather than "reform" because of the more descriptive nature of the first term. Regardless of one's preference for terminology, however, the reform processes must bring about systematic and continuous improvement so that the current movement does not wither and die, leaving behind an increasingly alienated and cynical public which would harbor the belief that reform efforts are basically politically motivated.

How Might Education be Transformed?

In order to truly understand reform, educators must thoroughly recognize that they are dealing with complex issues and must deepen the way in which they think about change (Fullan & Miles, 1992). In order to bring about continuous improvement it is not sufficient to superficially state that we understand the change process. Instead, the basic knowledge of how successful change occurs should become internalized so that we may be able to habitually act upon such knowledge. Fullan and Miles offer seven themes associated with successful change:

1) Change is learning - loaded with uncertainty;
2) Change is a journey, not a blueprint;
3) Problems are our friends;
4) Change is resource-hungry;
5) Change requires the power to manage it;
6) Change is systemic;
7) All large-scale change is implemented locally. (Fullan & Miles, 1992).

These orientations toward change can clearly be seen to demand a fundamental rethinking of the process of reform.

One way of transforming management of educational planning is based on principles of quality management. Educators traditionally plan curriculum and experiences for students by first determining what goals, objectives, and outcomes are expected. This is a method of management that focuses on the final product, the student's skills. Such products are typically measured by some standards of performance (Holt, 1993). In the name of accountability, performance standards such as minimum competencies may be given as assurance that a student has mastered these skills.

A totally different approach to management, emphasizing the quality of the process rather than examination of the end product for deficiencies, was a major factor in the transformation of Japanese industry. J. Edward Deming's insistent focus on quality, for its own sake, throughout the process is the basis for the "total quality management" concept. Deming was concerned that change should occur as a way of facilitating necessary improvements, but not as an end in itself. Deming's emphasis on improvement throughout the process requires a fundamental rethinking of management in its applications either to industry or to education (Brandt, 1992; Holt, 1993).

True use of the principles of quality in management mean that quality emanates from top management and is pursued for its own sake, is defined by the customer or end user, and occurs through understanding and continuous improvement of the process. In addition, in the process of reform, each unit conducts a self-examination to develop an inventory of its own internal resources. Through the process of inquiry, theory and practice are brought together and solution of problems is considered to be an important task for all of those involved at all points in the process. An essential underpinning of Deming's quality management is that trust among all parties is vital, and that accountability as measured by typical methods of assessment tends to undermine trust (Holt, 1993). Management of the educational system, as a true application of Deming's principles of total quality management, thus can be seen to be revolutionary to the present management of educational systems.

In Education, are We Looking at Reform, or Simply at Change?

In practice, we are seeing several efforts in current reform movements. These, and others stated earlier, include the recognition and reward of excellence, cooperative learning, middle school movement, increased stress on accountability, alternative forms of assessing student behavior, emphasis on master teachers, achieving excellence through teams, encouragement of teacher autonomy and entrepreneurship, and school-business partnerships (Gallagher, 1991;

Herman, Aschbacher & Winters, 1992; Treffinger, 1991). Central to any discussion of school reform is the need to address the elements of restructuring, empowerment and change. Without simultaneous attention to each of these elements, critics maintain that the current reform agenda is doomed to failure (Tye, 1992; 1987). There appear to be widespread and deep deficiencies in understanding that the process of change requires continual improvement, regardless of the name of the bandwagon or wave of reform. Attempts at educational reform may result in change rather than in systemic transformation for reasons such as the following: 1) The big picture or map for how change is to occur is faulty (for example, use of top-down mandates); 2) Complexity of the problems is underestimated; 3) Symbols of change are valued over substance when an appearance of innovation is likely to bring about political success; (4) In response to the demands to quickly prevent crisis in the schools, impatient public and administrative officials accept superficial solutions that may create more profound problems; 5) Resistance from others is considered to be responsible for the slow pace of change, rather than being recognized as a need to affect attitudes and behaviors as a necessary element in the change process; 6) Attrition of successful reforms occurs in individual innovative schools whose districts or states lack an institutionalized understanding of innovation; and 7) Knowledge about the change process is misused in partial applications rather than as systemic transformation (Fullan & Miles, 1992).

We will explore dimensions of some of these issues. One such example of the dangers of superficial solutions is the narrowing of curricular scope to raise standardized test scores in response to the demands for accountability. Responding to these pressures, in the name of reform for schools and students at risk, results in legislation and policies impatiently implemented without adequate consideration for negative consequences.

The notion of restructuring is one that can be both attractive and threatening, depending on one's frame of reference. Many organizations, including educational ones, become enam with the belief that all that is needed to improve performance is to tinker with the existing structure. As a result, committees are formed, lines of authority are reorganized, shifts of personnel occur, folks emerge with new titles which fit their renamed unit and someone inevitably displays a new organizational chart. With rare exception, after varying periods of disruption, the players fall back into the same routine activities. According to organizational theory, the reason that such attempts are often unsuccessful is that inadequate effort is made to institutionalize a new set of behaviors which are consistent with organizational expectations (Getzels & Guba, 1954). In short, the culture of the organization is not affected and ambiguity regarding expectations and roles inevitably leads to conflict. Such conflict may threaten the restructuring effort to achieve reform goals.

Current reform efforts in restructuring have revolved around the principles of decentralizing the decision making process and moving toward school site-based management. These aspects of reform lead toward greater autonomy and contribute to teacher empowerment and therefore exemplify a change of structure which is more compatible with the total quality approach. These restructuring efforts may be contrasted to the earlier "top down," 1980's policy prescriptions for change which might be considered as the first wave of educational reform. Such efforts were superseded by the second wave of reform calling for the effective schools movement (Holt, 1993). Some say, however, that even the practice of site-based management is insufficient. The change in structure alone is still a superficial reform; it permits schools, and perhaps teachers, freedom only to determine their own methods. The "all-important purposes of education remain the property of legislators, who turn them into 'standards' and hammer them home through assessment" (Holt, 1993, p. 386). Structural reforms can be politically correct, quick fix solutions which are "no substitute for the hard work, skill, and commitment needed to blend different structural changes into a successful reform effort" (Fullan & Miles, p. 748). In

order to transform and empower rather than simply restructure, there is a need to critically examine the match between expectations for schools and current practice. It is essential that clearly defined goals for the unit have been jointly developed by all involved stakeholders. Only then can the management of decisions regarding program improvement occur. For this to happen, state authorities, local school district administrators, teachers, and consumers will have to accept a facilitative and involved role rather than the more traditional, directive approach.

Decentralization, of course, requires empowerment. Empowerment, if it is to be effective, involves abandonment of the top-to-bottom flow of authority and decision-making processes referred to earlier (Brandt, 1992). Empowerment also requires a massive change in the way we've traditionally conducted our educational business. Decentralization cannot be productive as long as decisions regarding what is to be taught and how success is to be measured, accountability, are centrally controlled (Goodlad, 1992). Empowerment without such accountability has the potential for counter productivity. Changing "control" issues requires that all players, e.g. administrators and teachers, acquire common group leadership, goal-setting, communication, problem solving and conflict resolution skills. Lack of skill development in these areas may be one of the biggest threats to current, decentralized, restructuring efforts.

Needless to say, significant change must occur for reform efforts to become reality. Conventional wisdom maintains that educators are resistant to change. Examining resistance to change makes little sense unless a corresponding review of expectations for teachers occurs. In his Phi Delta Kappan article, Kenneth A. Tye (1992) challenges this presumption. He maintains, and we agree, that the everyday demands of schools create a "grueling ordeal" for most teachers, too much is expected of them for too many students, resources are too few, and the pace may be too fast. Typical demands for teacher time include extracurricular activities, child and drug abuse programs, developing curriculum writing teams, dealing with discipline, a variety of testing programs, federal programs, implementing individualized education programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs and the list goes on and on . . . . Change, most experts would agree, is a very time-intensive process, particularly when it involves group leadership, decision making and school-level management which are all characteristics of the current reform movement. Allocation of necessary fiscal and human resources and teacher support systems will require a renewed commitment on the part of both the public and school administrators if continuous improvement is to result. Failure to make this commitment may well result in the failure of the broader educational reform agenda.

What Reform Practices Occur in Rural States?

Exploring efforts of reform within the framework of the broader national reform agenda makes sense for those of us who function in states which are largely rural and for which small schools are the norm. West Virginia certainly meets the criteria for being considered both predominantly rural and for having a large percentage of small schools. Practices regarding the reform movement may not necessarily reflect national activities because of the rural nature of the service configuration in which such initiatives occur. In fact, two or more levels of reform efforts appear to occur simultaneously without an overall coordination function.

We have discussed, elsewhere, the need for a change in the traditional top-down decision making and policy development style so inherent to educational systems. Nevertheless, the state educational agency via the West Virginia State Board of Education continues to engage in a proliferation of policy statements designed to "guide" local school districts and individual schools toward national goals. At the same time, recent legislation established local measures such as faculty councils and school improvement councils as a means of empowering individual schools and communities in the decision making process. Still another tier of decentralizing effort has

been engaged by the central office of local school districts in order to balance the level of control from the state agency, on the one hand, with that of the local school or community, on the other.

The net result of these three tiers of "reform" activity may be indeed contradictory to the basic premise of successful reform efforts. That is, grass roots efforts at producing a sustained attempt to implement best practices to achieve realistic goals might be sacrificed to the need to retain authority and control at the school district and/or state agency levels. An example of this dilemma is the current West Virginia effort to downsize school systems in terms of both the number of schools and the number of educators employed. State standards for optimum school enrollment, facility size, and staffing patterns have presented local school districts interested in reform with no alternatives to those which are prescribed. Non-compliance is "rewarded" by loss of funding. By the time individual school programs are restructured to fit the state agenda, empowerment in the form of decision-making regarding curricular and instructional issues has already been preempted.

Like many rural states, West Virginia has become engaged in establishing program accountability by means of the use of standardized, group testing results. Obviously, the state-level role in evaluation, as a means of establishing accountability, leaves neither local school districts nor individual schools the autonomy needed to meet goals within the specific needs structure of the educational communities they serve. Of course one of the largest criticisms of the America 2000 initiatives is the over-reliance on achieving world class standards by measuring competencies for all youngsters and only by group tests (Goodlad, 1992; Renzulli, 1991). It appears to us that this process may lead directly to a loss of differentiated instruction for individual students. The net result could well be that whole groups of students, both exceptional and non-exceptional, will be treated as a class rather than as individuals. For students who already resent the in-step process of traditional schooling, the result of applying national or state standards as measured only by national or state standardized competency tests is likely to hasten their departure from the system at age 16.

Where Does Special Education Reform Fit Within Broader Context of Reform?

Like many rural states, West Virginia has driven headlong into the regular education initiative (REI) (Maheady & Algozzine, 1991). Billed as the Integrated Education Initiative (IEI), this movement has been largely generated and promoted at the state education agency level (West Virginia Department of Education, 1992a) and is being implemented in a wholesale manner in many school districts throughout the state. In most of these situations, active resistance has been generated by general and special educators alike. Several reasons for these concerns are offered below.

Like in many states, West Virginia educators are typically not opposed to the concept of educating most exceptional students, whenever possible, with their non-exceptional classmates. However, those necessary elements which are positively associated with change may not be in place. For example, because of the relatively recent arrival of REI as an educational practice, the majority of inservice special and general educators, principals, supervisors and other service providers did not have training in the collaborative skills necessary to implement this model as part of their initial preparation. Almost without exception, major complaints from those teachers involved center around the common theme of identifying their respective roles and responsibilities in attempting to deliver integrated programs. As they seek help, many principals and supervisors appear nearly powerless to be of assistance to these teachers. Obviously, there appears to be a gap in the structure of staff development and/or continuing education in this regard.

Other barriers to inclusion tend to be more administratively driven. Unlike many states, student-teacher ratios in West Virginia tend to be greater for programs which are inclusive in nature (West Virginia Department of Education, 1992b). This seems somewhat paradoxical given the fact that, when integrating exceptional students, the accompanying collaborative needs are greater and consequently more time intensive! In a state in which funding cutbacks have become the rule, higher student-teacher ratios have reduced the total number of teachers required and have become an attractive administrative tool to use for staff reductions. This, of course, provides a short-term, "economical" solution to a set of very complex problems.

Still another barrier to implementing the current rush toward more integrated programs is the very organizational structure in which both the state agency and local school districts operate. The state agency, as is typical of many rural states, has been the primary mover behind the renewed emphasis on integrating exceptional student programs. This agency, while actively promoting integration is, organizationally speaking, very segregated. The special education unit is organized outside the general education units serving general and vocational programs. In most cases, the same organizational structures are found on a smaller scale in the local school district. It is not surprising then, that local school districts and the individual schools within them are resistant when nudged toward more inclusive programming!

Several of the efforts in the current reform movements have differing impact on the quality of service to different categories of exceptional students. The goals of America 2000 repeatedly declare that the focus is on all students. A broad focus on all students is related to efforts to detrack schools and is reflected as well by reforms associated with the excellence movement, such as cooperative learning, and perhaps some aspects of the middle school movement. Interpretations of practice and of the research on cooperative learning tend to result in widespread abuses of mixed group cooperative learning as a strategy when used with gifted learners (Robinson, 1990). Likewise, the middle school principle of emphasis on developmentally appropriate goals frequently derives from an over-emphasis upon generalized beliefs about age-appropriate needs with a lack of consideration for significant variation among different learners (Tomlinson, 1992). In practice, this focus on generic students frequently leads to setting standards where most expectations are then geared to a "typical" learner. This reflects insensitivity and a lack of understanding of the unique needs of students who are so exceptional that they are very significantly different from their age or grade mates.

Obviously, the majority of students involved with this movement toward full inclusion are either mildly involved in terms of their exceptionality or are gifted. When fully integrated, the expectation is that they will become totally immersed in the groupings and strategies appropriate to their non-exceptional peers. While this approach has a lot of surface appeal, it is our fear that whole groups of students, e.g. mentally impaired, gifted, learning disabled, behavior disordered, will be treated as a class rather than receive the individual attention, differentiated instruction, and modified curriculum appropriate to their exceptionality. This concern becomes magnified when one considers the implications of the march toward "full inclusion" for more severely and profoundly involved exceptional students.

Beyond the effects of inclusion of many students with disabilities, we see more severe implications for those students at the extremes of the intellectual ability range. We have seen efforts to integrate severely and profoundly mentally impaired students in a regular classroom on a full-time basis. Regular classroom teachers in our rural state are frequently inadequately prepared to appropriately differentiate instruction for many children with special needs. In fact, the emphasis on all children leads some administrators to insist that each child in a classroom will be working in the same textbook, and at the same pace. We see severe deficiences in services for gifted when such practices are associated with an effort to end ability grouping. There

appears to be a widespread confusion between detracking the schools in the name of equity and an effort to end grouping students by ability for subject specific instruction, an empirically demonstrated necessary structure for gifted students (Kulik & Kulik, 1992; Rogers, 1991).

We maintain that because current staffing ratios for each placement are set by the state bias may enter IEP development and student services. This top-down approach is certainly inconsistent with the Deming-like approach cited earlier. Any setting identified in the continuum of alternative program options by the placement committee should be legitimate for an individual student, as long as the decision is supported by that student's assessment data and the IEP.

What Might the Future Hold for Reforming Special Education?

It is always interesting when one has the opportunity to speculate upon what may or may not materialize in the relatively near future. Considering the future direction of the education reform movement is exciting and perplexing.

Obviously, as one considers the future of America 2000, it is critical to examine the transitional effects of the new Clinton administration. As co-chair of the 1989 education summit in Charlottesville, Bill Clinton must have a bias toward support of America 2000 goals. Yet, if one examines his pre-election position (Clinton, 1992), some other emphases appear to emerge.

First, although he endorses world class standards, President Clinton leaves room to address disciplines other than English, mathematics, science, history and geography. This, we feel, is very positive. Coupled to this emphasis is a system of national testing which represents a centralized form of control that is incompatible with the decentralization of the school reform effort. This may well become a problem.

The second area of emphasis addresses preschool programming. Certainly this is desirable because it provides an entry-level opportunity to address the equity issues related to socio-economic, racial, and ethnic differences among students as well as a means to stimulate at risk children. President Clinton's discussion of safe, drug-free environments within school settings lacks direction, as if he recognized that such a cultural change must come about as a result of the educational process - no short term fixes here!

President Clinton's third area of emphasis relates to the increase of graduation rates to 90% by the year 2000. This is a lofty goal - one which is likely to occur only after a broad range of reform changes address the individual needs of students to the extent that those at risk see the relevance of the schooling process. Our fear is that the national testing process may well generate another lock-step standardization of curriculum and instructional processes which will stifle both students and teacher efforts.

Finally, the fourth Clinton emphasis addresses two areas. One element is the development of a system which provides any youngster desiring a college education the opportunity. Experience in a rural state with well below a 40 percent college-bound rate for high school graduates leads us to hope that more opportunities will be present for other post-secondary educational choices. The second form of opportunity relates to a proposed requirement for American business to earmark 1 - 1.5 percent of their payroll for job retraining. We doubt that the collective lobby of such enterprises will allow this to become a reality. Far more effective in the long run, we think, to involve the private sector on the front end by development of school-business partnerships more characteristic of bottom-up local school reform initiatives.

Keeping in mind that a reform plan was promised in the first 100 days of the Clinton administration, it will be interesting to see how education fares in the press of other national influences. Renewed problems abroad and other social reforms at home consume enormous amounts of time and energy. Pressing concerns related to health needs, unemployment, and the national economy will compete with the education reform agenda for attention.

As stated earlier, there are some aspects of school reform efforts which could receive more immediate attention. For example, it is important to recognize that grass roots reform efforts are occurring daily at local levels. Those already engaged in such efforts as decentralizing the decision making process, modifying curriculum and differentiating instruction resent charges of stagnation. It is important, however, for these efforts to occur in the context of transformation of the educational system. It is essential for the efforts to be designed to develop the processes needed to attain the desired goals. After all America 2000 only points out the direction, not how to get there! Yet a second key effort may be the diversification of instructional activities to meet individual student needs, rather than just those disciplines measured by standardized tests. This need for broader measures to satisfy accountability is especially marked for exceptional children. Finally, if any of the broader reform efforts are to be successful, it is critical that they be understood, and supported by the general public, the consumer group that will determine long-term success or failure. This aspect may well be the most challenging because it will require broad social and cultural changes which acknowledge the inherent worth of the educational process.

Reform efforts in special education are the most difficult to predict because they have tended to be somewhat transient when viewed historically. Some questions, thus, have not yet been adequately addressed. To what extent are all of the goals of America 2000, and of the concurrent reform efforts, consistent with best practice views for exceptional children? For example, can the noble goals of competency in challenging subject matter, of literacy, and of skill to compete in a global economy be translated into attainable goals for mentally impaired or other severely disabled youngsters? And, conversely, might the efforts to bring about these implied levels of proficiency translate into restrictions in the degree of growth for gifted youth? That is, we have seen attempts to set levels of attainable competency turn into pervasive practices of significantly lowered reading level in many adopted texts. This widespread "dumbing down of curriculum," perhaps in the name of equity, results in an appearance of competency for students at risk and a concomitant loss of appropriate challenge for students of average ability, and an extreme lowering of expectations for the nation's brightest students (Renzulli & Reis, 1991).

Nevertheless we see both some positive, as well as some not-so-positive movement in the field. Examples of positive changes associated with these reform efforts include expansion of, and accessibility to, special education services. We note that some local school districts have developed model interagency efforts to serve handicapped preschoolers which may be emulated at the state and/or national level. Regarding public education solely as the prerogative of school systems is an outmoded concept.

Another promising joint effort of the private and public sectors has occurred in many transitional programs designed to move special education students from schools to the community and the world of work. Most such programs began as grass roots efforts designed to meet individual needs long before the mandate for such efforts existed. These provide a starting place to pull together the constituencies necessary to make many general reform efforts successful.

At the other range of the exceptional spectrum we see a ripple effect into curriculum for regular education classes of practices which originated in services for gifted students. For example, Goal #5 is rightfully interpreted as a thrust to facilitate development of creative and critical thinking skills in students of all abilities, not only in the gifted (Treffinger, 1991; West Virginia Department of Education, 1992c). Likewise, we see a movement away from the special education paradigm of identifying students as eligible for gifted services and then only serving those students with differentiated curriculum. There is a move toward "talent development," providing differentiated, enriching services to a much broader segment of children so as to facilitate development of gifted behaviors (Renzulli & Reis, 1991; Treffinger, 1991).

Yet another positive effort is the emphasis on authentic assessment as a cornerstone of the education reform movement (Herman, et al. 1992). A heightened emphasis on alternative forms of assessment which use tasks that reflect meaningful instruction, real products, and higher levels of thinking are spreading through regular education. Innovative practices such as writing across the curriculum and whole language instruction tend to use, for example, portfolio assessment. Such practices as curriculum based assessment are increasingly occurring in special education for instructional planning purposes. We predict that there will be an increased movement in special education to use such informal and other alternative assessment procedures which can obtain much fuller pictures of a child than an over-reliance upon standardized measures alone for purposes of eligibility determination (Frasier, 1992).

We predict that inclusion, particularly "total inclusion" models, may well be the single greatest special education-related issue for the next 3-5 years. Lack of planning, staff development at all levels, and examination of empirically based data on best practice for some of the exceptionalities tends to threaten progress toward successful programming for students for whom an inclusion model is appropriate. Central to our concern is the growing tendency to treat exceptional students of all ability levels as a class rather than as individuals with unique and differing needs. This poses a threat to the basic presumption that appropriateness of programming and the differentiation of instruction is the foundation for special education. Within the context of our consideration of reform efforts, this trend represents a movement away from a quality-oriented system of program management and toward the classic top-down methods so widely criticized by Deming and others. Our hope is that the pendulum will swing back toward individualization. We just hope that the potential for negative consequences of some current practice can be minimized before that occurs.

References

Brandt, R. (1992). On Deming and school quality: A conversation with Enid Brown. Educational Leadership, 50, 28-31.

Clinton, B. (1992). The Clinton plan for excellence in education. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 131-138.

Elam, S., Rose, L., & Gallup, A. (1992). The 24th annual Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 41-53.

Frasier, M. M. (1991). Disadvantaged and culturally diverse gifted students. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 14, 234-245.

Fullan, M.G., & Miles, M.B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 745-752.

Gallagher, J.J. (1991). Educational reform, values and gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly 35, 12-19.

Getzels, J., & Guba, E. (1954). Role, role conflict and effectiveness: An empirical study. American Sociological Review, 19, 164-175.

Goodlad, J. (1992). On taking school reform seriously. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 232-238.

Herman, J.L., Aschbacher, P.R. & Winters, L. (1992). A practical guide to alternative assessment. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Holt, M. (January, 1993). The educational consequences of W. Edwards Deming. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 382-388.

Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C.L.C. (1992). Meta-analytic findings on grouping programs. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36, 73-77.

Maheady, L., & Algozzine, B. (1991). The regular education initiative: Can we proceed in an orderly and scientific manner? Teacher Education and Special Education, 14 (1), 66-73.

Renzulli, J.S. & Reis, S.M. (1991). The reform movement and the quiet crisis in gifted education. Gifted Child Quarterly,35, 26-35.

Robinson, A. (1990). Cooperation or exploitation? The argument against cooperative learning for talented students: Point-counterpoint-cooperative learning. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 14, 9-27, 31-36.

Rogers, K. (1991). The relationship of grouping practices to the education of the gifted and talented learner. Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on Gifted and Talented Education, University of Connecticut.

Tomlinson, C.A. (1992). Gifted education and the middle school movement: Two voices on teaching the academically talented. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 15, 206-238.

Treffinger, D. J. (1991). School reform and gifted education - opportunities and issues. Gifted Child Quarterly, 35, 6-11.

Tye, K. (1992). Restructuring our schools: Beyond the rhetoric. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 8-14.

Tye, K. (1987). The deep structure of schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 281-284.

U.S. Department of Education (1991). America 2000: An education strategy. Washington, D.C.: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education (1992a). West Virginia's integrated education initiative. Charleston, WV: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education (1992b). Regulations for the Education of Exceptional Children. Charleston, WV: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education (1992c). Building our own railroad tracks: Education reform and special education. Charleston, WV: Author.