

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 467

EC 303 235

TITLE Office of Special Education Programs' Annual Technical Assistance and Dissemination Conference Proceedings (4th, Washington, D.C., January 27-29, 1994).

INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 94

CONTRACT HS93033001

NOTE 51p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; Mainstreaming; Systems Development; *Technical Assistance; Transitional Programs

IDENTIFIERS Diversity (Student); *Office of Special Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This document presents the proceedings of a conference attended by Project Directors (or their designees) of projects funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and having a significant component of technical assistance (TA) and/or dissemination activities. The conference was designed to provide new information to projects, to promote networking between projects and the sharing of products, and to share information among projects and between OSEP and projects. In addition to an overview of the conference and closing statements, the following papers are presented: "GOALS 2000, The Reauthorization of ESEA, School-to-Work, and IDEA" (Patricia J. Guard); "Inclusion/LRE--Changing Systems To Include Students with Disabilities" (Luanna Meyer); "OSEP's Vision for TA & Dissemination in a Time of Reform and Restructuring" (Thomas Hehir); "Changing Systems To Promote School Completion and Transition to Successful Adult Outcomes" (David Johnson); "Changing Systems To Address the Needs of Diverse Students with Disabilities and Their Families" (Debra Spotts Merchant); "Presentation of Technical Assistance and Dissemination Questionnaire Results" (Richard Horne and Debra Price-Ellingstad); "Systems Change from a Policy Perspective" (Ray C. Rist); and "Creating Linkages" (Robert M. Stonehill). Appendices contain a copy of the agenda, participant list, results of small group activities, and questionnaires. (JDD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 373 467

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL
SPECIAL EDUCATION BOARD

4th Annual Report
1980-1981
NATIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION BOARD

EC 303 235

**PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS'
FOURTH ANNUAL
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND
DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE**

**WASHINGTON, D.C
JANUARY 27-29, 1994**

Compiled by:

**The Federal Resource Center
for Special Education
Suite 900
1875 Connecticut Ave N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
March 31, 1994**

Table of Contents

Acronyms	iii
Preface	iv
Overview of the Conference	
Nancy Safer	1
GOALS 2000, The Reauthorization of ESEA, School-to-Work, and IDEA	
Patricia J. Guard	1
Inclusion/LRE - Changing Systems to Include Students with Disabilities	
Luanna Meyer	4
OSEP's Vision for TA & Dissemination in a Time of Reform and Restructuring	
Thomas Hehir	6
Changing Systems to Promote School Completion and Transition to Successful Adult Outcomes	
David Johnson	9
Changing Systems to Address the Needs of Diverse Students with Disabilities and Their Families	
Debra Spotts Merchant	11
Panel Presentations:	
Verna Morrow	12
Hugo Galindo	13
Reginald Jones	13
Diane Powell	14
Presentation of Technical Assistance and Dissemination Questionnaire Results	
Richard Horne and Debra Price-Ellingstad	15
Systems Change from a Policy Perspective	
Ray C. Rist	15
Creating Linkages	
Robert M. Stonehill	17
Closing Statements	
Dawn Hunter	18
Appendix A Agenda	18
Appendix B Participant List	20
Appendix C Results of Small Group Activities	27
Appendix D OSEP Technical Assistance and Dissemination Questionnaire	33
Appendix E SEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination Questionnaire	39
Appendix F Selected Bibliography	45

Acroynms

BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
CMSE	Center for Minority Special Education
CSPD	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development
ERIC	Educational Resources Information Center
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
HCBU	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
OMI	Other Minority Institutions
OPBE	Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
RRFC	Regional Resource and Federal Center
RFP	Request for Proposals
SED	Severe Emotional Disturbance
TA&D	Technical Assistance and Dissemination

Preface

The Office of Special Education Programs' Fourth Annual Technical Assistance (TA) and Dissemination conference was held on January 27-29, 1994. The two-and-a-half-day conference began promptly at 1 p.m. on Thursday, January 27, and adjourned on Saturday, January 29, at 12:30 p.m. (See Appendix A for the conference's agenda.) The participant attendees were the Project Directors, or their designees, of the projects OSEP has defined as being technical assistance or/and dissemination projects or those having a large component of their activities devoted to technical assistance and dissemination. (See Appendix B for a list of conference participants.) Dynamic speakers were selected to address four topics and provide an overview of new areas of change and development. Following presentations by the speakers, participants met in small groups to discuss specific questions and strategies. (See Appendix C for reports from these small groups.) The goal of the conference was to look at the following topics selected by OSEP:

- Inclusion/LRE
- Transition/School completion
- Multicultural concerns
- Systems Change

A poster session/social gathering was scheduled for Friday, January 28, from 5:30 p.m. to 7 p.m. Each participating project was requested to bring their project's materials specifically related to the conference topics — Inclusion/LRE, Transition/School completion, Multicultural concerns, and Systems Change — to display during the poster session/social gathering. A farewell "roast" was held for Dr. Nancy Safer during the session. Dr. Safer had departed her position at OSEP as Division Director, Division of Educational Services. Having worked for nearly 20 years with the Department of Education, specifically with the Regional Resource Centers and, as Division Director, with the majority of the technical assistance and dissemination projects, she accepted a position with the Council for Exceptional Children as Deputy Director.

The Federal Resource Center for Special Education (FRC), a project of the Academy for Educational Development, was responsible for the logistical arrangements for the annual conference. The purpose of the conference was to provide new information to projects; to promote networking between projects and the sharing of products; and to share information among projects and between OSEP and the projects.

A planning team, consisting of staff from OSEP and the FRC, provided input during the initial planning stages. The OSEP team representatives included: Don Blodgett, Project Officer, Division of Personnel Preparation; Sara Conlon, Project Officer, Division of Educational Services; Peggy Cvach, Project Officer, Division of Educational Services; Jane Hauser, Project Officer, Division of Innovation & Development; Dawn Hunter, Chief of the Severe Disabilities Branch; Marie Roane, Project Officer, Division of Educational Services; and Nancy Safer, Director of the Division of Educational Services. FRC representatives included: Carol Valdivieso, Director; Debra Price-Ellingstad, Assistant Director; and Kelvin Mims, Program Assistant.

The conference was held at the Crystal Gateway Marriott Hotel, 1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202.

This document represents the proceedings of the Office of Special Education Programs' Fourth Annual Technical Assistance and Dissemination Conference, coordinated by the Federal Resource Center for Special Education, held at the Crystal Gateway Marriott in Crystal City, Virginia on January 27-29, 1994. This Proceedings Document was developed through Contract #HS93033001 between the Academy for Educational Development and the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Federal Resource Center, the Academy for Educational Development, or the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This information is copyright free unless otherwise indicated. Readers are encouraged to copy and share it, but please credit the Federal Resource Center for Special Education.

Overview of the Conference

Nancy Safer

The conference began with welcoming remarks by Carol Valdivieso, Director of the FRC. Nancy Safer, of OSEP, then presented an overview of the conference. "Emphasizing networking among TA&D projects," Ms. Safer said, "is a major part of this meeting's intent. OSEP feels that this network of projects is critical to ensuring improved outcomes for students with disabilities as we move toward the year 2000." She encouraged projects to share what they are currently doing and to discuss where improvements might be made and where they might work together.

Ms. Safer identified the specific themes of the conference as:

- Transition/School Completion (e.g., increasing the number of students with disabilities who complete school and move on to effective participation in the community);
- Inclusion/LRE;
- Multicultural issues and concerns, and
- Systems change.

Ms. Safer asked participants: "What contributions do TA&D projects make to the goal of changing systems?" She indicated that throughout the conference the Federal perspective on systems change and the other conference themes would be shared with participants, so that the TA&D projects would be informed as to what initiatives were planned or happening at the Federal level and how these relate to the activities and goals of the TA&D projects.

Ms. Safer reiterated OSEP's stated conference objectives, which were included in participant conference materials. These were:

- To focus attention on legislation that has recently been or is currently being reauthorized pertaining to children with disabilities: IDEA, School-to-Work, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and GOALS 2000.
- To identify strategies for providing technical assistance and for disseminating information to families, professionals, and administrators regarding inclusion/LRE, transition/school completion, and a broad range of multicultural issues.
- To focus attention on the need for policy formulation to promote systems change in the areas of inclusion/LRE, transition/school completion, and multicultural issues.
- To improve communication among OSEP's technical assistance and dissemination projects, and between each project and its primary constituents.
- To promote the sharing of information on current and ongoing activities among the technical assistance and dissemination projects.

Goals 2000, The Reauthorization of ESEA, School-to-Work, and IDEA

Patricia J. Guard

Last year when I met with you, I spoke about the new administration and some of the general directions we could expect. Much has happened since that time. As you know, OSERS came under new leadership in June, 1993, when Judy Heumann became Assistant Secretary.

With this new leadership came a vision that all people with disabilities will have full access to their communities. Judy Heumann has begun to implement this vision, in part by clearly stating her belief that it is unacceptable to exclude individuals with disabilities from full participation in all aspects of society. Judy recently sent a memo to OSEP's staff in which she shared her vision for OSERS: OSERS will work aggressively and collaboratively to create a society in which all disabled people can obtain the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve the goals they set for themselves.

This is the vision that can lead us into the 21st century in a way that builds on our past accomplishments, embraces the spirit and intent of our authorizing statutes, drives our strategic planning process, and motivates the work we do each day. I believe it also moves toward the society President Clinton envisioned when he pledged to work for "inclusion not exclusion, independence not dependence, and empowerment not paternalism."

This vision is shared by OSEP's new Director, Tom Hehir. A former special needs resource teacher who has spent over 10 years as a manager within urban local education agencies in Boston and Chicago, Dr. Hehir is keenly aware of the challenges we face as we look to the future of special education.

I've been asked to share with you initiatives underway at the Federal level. I will be presenting an overview of President

"...it is unacceptable to exclude individuals with disabilities from full participation in all aspects of society..."

"...inclusion not exclusion, independence not dependence, and empowerment not paternalism..."

Clinton's and Secretary Riley's education reform proposals. I will also summarize the major changes that are being proposed for education in this nation, changes that reflect systemic reform. From a Federal perspective, it is critical for special education to be an integral part of this reform.

Special education has rich contributions to bring to education reform, and we need to make sure special educators are working in our schools and communities as active participants in the planning. The education reform and restructuring efforts currently underway reflect a view of a unified education system for all students. This kind of restructuring is going to require extensive technical assistance to States and local school districts. The challenge for the Department is to figure out how all these TA efforts fit together into one integrated whole.

GOALS 2000. "GOALS 2000: Educate America Act" is President Clinton's comprehensive national education reform proposal in landmark legislation that sets the framework for other Federal efforts to assist in improving our schools. The Administration's GOALS 2000 proposal charts the future of education for all students. The bill defines "all students" to include students with disabilities. The GOALS 2000 plan rests on three pillars of change:

- raising standards;
- improving schools; and
- getting every citizen involved in supporting students and teachers.

Our GOALS 2000 proposal provides for State improvement plans that would include strategies for the development of content standards, student assessments, and student performance standards. The intent is that high expectations should be established for all students, including students with disabilities. In addition to embracing new, world class learning standards, the bill focuses on:

- enriching course content so students can reach the challenging standards;
- improving training for quality teaching;
- promoting parental involvement;
- challenging all schools to show real results;
- encouraging reform from the bottom up, not the top down; and
- underscoring the link between education and employment.

As I mentioned earlier, GOALS 2000 sets the framework for other Federal efforts to assist in improving our schools, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) reauthorizations, as well as the School-to-Work Transition proposal. I want to give you an overview of each of these.

ESEA Reauthorization. The Administration's reauthorization proposal, the School Improvement Act, also contemplates the inclusion of students with disabilities. On September 13, 1993, the Administration transmitted its ESEA reauthorization bill to the Congress. Title I of this proposal, which is currently Chapter I, proposes a dramatic overhauling of the Federal government's major effort to help poor and disadvantaged children.

The proposal targets the neediest districts and provides flexibility to schools using Chapter I funds to promote schoolwide improvement. Title I of our ESEA proposal requires the States to adopt challenging content and performance standards and to use assessments aligned to the standards to determine the yearly performance of LEAs and schools. Typically, students with disabilities are excluded from assessments rather than provided with appropriate accommodations so they can participate. ESEA requires the inclusion of students with disabilities in assessments "except under the most extreme conditions."

The bill also requires each State to define what would constitute adequate yearly progress of LEAs and schools toward enabling all children to meet the State's performance standards. The bill contemplates that the States would provide for disaggregated results for educationally meaningful categories of children, but does not require results to be monitored for different categories. Of particular interest to this group is the administration's proposal to merge the Chapter I Handicapped program under ESEA with the IDEA.

IDEA Reauthorization. A major step in preparing for the future of students with disabilities is the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The IDEA is essentially a good law that we want to make better. We want to take what we have learned from the past eighteen years of implementation and improve on it to ensure access to full educational opportunity for students with disabilities.

The IDEA will be reauthorized within the framework of GOALS 2000 and education reform. We are committed to an open process that will provide for meaningful input from

consumers, educators, families, and the disability advocacy community. We want to get different points of view, and we want the process to be one of collaboration and of seeking common ground within the disability constituencies and with the general education community. Our plan is to have a bill to the Congress in June.

In December we held eight outreach meetings. We invited representatives from disability and general education organizations to share their views about the issues that should be addressed in reauthorization. We are considering those issues now to determine which we believe are the most important to address and also to consider possible options for addressing the issues. We expect to have another round of outreach meetings when we are ready to talk about the issues and possible options, probably in March. We also expect to publish a notice in the Federal Register to provide the public with an opportunity to comment.

School-to-Work Transition. Special educators have focused on school-to-work transition for students with disabilities for over a decade, and some of the cutting-edge work in transition has been done in the disability field. The School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1993 was introduced in the House and Senate on August 5, 1993. The House has passed the bill; the Senate is expected to pass it in the near future. Our school-to-work transition bill, prepared jointly by the Department of Labor and the Department of Education, will support States in their efforts to build an education and training system that integrates successfully into the workforce those students who do not graduate from college.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act, jointly administered by the Departments of Education and Labor, will bring together partnerships of employers, educators, and others to build a high quality school-to-work system that prepares young people for careers in high-skill, high-wage jobs. The legislation will:

- establish required components and goals of every school-to-work program in the nation;
- provide development grants for all States to plan and create comprehensive, statewide school-to-work systems;
- provide five-year, implementation grants to States that have completed the development process and are ready to begin operation of school-to-work systems;
- provide waivers of certain program requirements to allow other Federal funds to be coordinated with comprehensive school-to-work programs;
- provide direct implementation grants to localities that are ready to implement school-to-work systems, but are in States that have not yet received implementation grants; and
- provide direct grants to high poverty areas to address the unique challenges of implementing school-to-work systems in impoverished areas.

Basic program components must include:

- work-based learning that provides a planned program of job training, paid work experience, workplace mentoring, and instruction in general workplace competencies.
- school-based learning that provides career exploration and counseling, a program of study that is based on high academic and skill standards as proposed in the Administration's GOALS 2000: Educate America Act.
- connecting activities that coordinate involvement of employers, schools, and students; match students with work-based learning opportunities; and train teachers, mentors, and counselors.

Building on what we have already done in special education and the scope of this new transition initiative, we have a real opportunity to integrate the needs and abilities of people with disabilities into this new framework.

Education Reform and Inclusion. As stated earlier, it is critical for special education to be an integral part of this reform. The education reform and restructuring efforts reflect a unified educational system for all students in our schools and communities. The term "inclusion" has come to refer to not only the provision of services to children with disabilities in regular classrooms, but to the broader concept of providing services to all children — regardless of their special needs — within a single education system responsible for serving all children. This does not mean that there is not a need for special education or for the continuum of placement options. It does mean that special education must be viewed not as a place, but as a set of instructional and curriculum

"...reform and restructuring efforts reflect a unified educational system for all students in our schools and communities..."

"...special education must be viewed not as a place, but as a set of instructional and curriculum supports which are intended to allow students with disabilities to access and benefit from education..."

supports which are intended to allow students with disabilities to access and benefit from education.

Judy Heumann and Tom Fitch both believe that the continuum of alternative placements is an integral part of the IDEA regulations, and they fully support the important role of placements other than the regular classroom for some students. They also believe that, consistent with IDEA, the regular classroom should be the first placement option considered for students with disabilities. Yet our Fifteenth Annual Report to Congress on the implementation of the IDEA tells us that less than one third of disabled students attend school in regular classrooms, a figure which has changed little since the passage of P.L. 94-142.

One of our major priorities will be to provide the training and support administrators and teachers need to make the regular classroom in the neighborhood school the appropriate placement for students with disabilities. This is an important role many of you are currently playing as you work with local school districts to transition students back to their home schools and to integrate students into regular schools for parts of the school day, as appropriate.

National Agenda. This goal of a unified education system that values all students and in which all students achieve better outcomes was the impetus for the Office of Special Education Programs to facilitate a National Agenda for achieving better results for students with disabilities in the context of education reform. This process began with a National Agenda Forum meeting held in Charlottesville, Virginia, in January, 1993. Forty-two individuals met to begin the development of a "National Agenda for Achieving Better Results for Students with Disabilities." Participants in this Forum represented the perspective of general and special education classroom teachers and related service providers, school principals, LEA and SEA administrators, parents, members of boards of education, and national leaders from a variety of organizations. Over the four days, their task was to identify issues affecting results for students with disabilities. The long-term intent is to produce an agenda that can be used by a variety of organizations and individuals to help focus efforts and resources at all levels.

The participants identified issues related to broad-based planned change, State and Federal legislation and policy, program development (including research, technology, and knowledge use and dissemination), and personnel development. The next step occurred in March, 1993, when teams met to develop strategies to address the issues identified by the Forum participants. In September, 1993, the Forum participants met again to develop a final draft of the National Agenda. The Assistant Secretary of OSERS, Judy Heumann, and the Assistant Secretary of OESE, Tom Payzant, provided opening and closing remarks to the participants.

The final draft includes a vision statement, barriers to achieving the vision (these were the issues identified by the Forum participants), and strategies for overcoming the barriers. OSERS staff are in the process of editing the draft and including language that ties the National Agenda to GOALS 2000 and the Americans with Disabilities Act. We expect to disseminate the document in the near future. OSEP is planning a conference for this summer to build support for the Agenda and to showcase best practices in the areas identified as barriers to achieving better results. Participants will be asked to think about activities that are appropriate for their organizations to undertake to move the Agenda forward.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to share the activities at the Federal level with you. As you continue your work on behalf of children with disabilities and their families, please know that we at OSERS appreciate and value the work you do.

Inclusion/LRE - Changing Systems to Include Students with Disabilities

Luanna Meyer, Ph.D.

Dr. Dawn Hunter, Chief of OSEP's Severe Disabilities Branch, introduced Dr. Luanna Meyer, Chair of the Department of Special Education at Syracuse University and a pioneer in the inclusion movement. Dr. Hunter indicated her pleasure that Dr. Meyer, who is also the Co-Director of the New York Partnership for State-wide Systems Change, would be discussing her work regarding strategies and systems change efforts in this arena.

Dr. Meyer's presentation began with a challenge to professionals to look beyond successful inclusion programs to those not providing inclusive education for students with significant disabilities. Her insights on inclusion and systems change were largely based on her work with the Minnesota Consortium Institute in Minneapolis/St. Paul, and more recently with the New York Partnership Project for Statewide Systems Change, a five-year "systems change" grant currently in its fourth year of

operation. "Until we take on the responsibility for making sure inclusion happens, we're not going to get very far," she stressed.

Dr. Meyer emphasized the need to consider the roles that various constituency groups will play in the process of systems change — a lesson she learned through her experience with the New York Partnership Project. For example, she admitted that they had underestimated the influence of the teachers union in the beginning stages. As the project developed, other issues requiring close attention included the complexity and size of New York State; the vast range of service delivery models already in place; and New York's history with "institutionalized" and powerful constituencies.

Dr. Meyer described the Systems Change Project as a "multi-layered partnership" between the New York Education Department's Office of Special Education Services, Syracuse University, and other institutions and agencies in the State. Key

components of the program include:

- Awareness training to inform the public about inclusion;
- Information provided to participants describing the kinds of opportunities and supports offered by the Project and the State Department of Education;
- Up to two years of direct technical assistance to participating districts provided by key research personnel committed to systems change;
- Video productions broadcast by New York public television; and
- An annual conference, regional training institutes (with the regional cooperative network), topical in-service workshops, and leadership training institutes.

Dr. Meyer indicated that school districts chosen to participate in the Project are required to meet certain criteria. These include: agreeing to use a Task Force Model; committing to at least "one superintendent's day" for training; providing, at minimum, one half-hour per week for staff collaboration; and the willingness to make a "systems commitment," which simply means demonstrating a level of dedication necessary for the program to succeed. Rural, suburban, and urban school districts are considered by the Project.

The Project also promotes a "top-down support, bottom-up implementation" model, said Dr. Meyer. The first half encourages administrators to not merely tell staff what to do, but to provide them the means with which to do it. The other half — bottom-up implementation — allows teachers the freedom to decide how to meet their goals. It empowers teachers, with some constraints, to develop a model that works for them.

Dr. Meyer emphasized that the Project will not implement an inclusion program on behalf of one child or on the basis of the interest of just one teacher or parent. The local school district must be willing to make inclusion available to all students for whom it is appropriate. She also noted that mandatory inclusion is probably unrealistic, but strongly urged that inclusion programs be at least an option in every school district.

One of the most difficult obstacles to inclusion is educating children with severe emotional disturbances and challenging behaviors, according to Dr. Meyer. But, she added, unless educators seriously confront this issue they really are not doing their jobs. She also stressed the need to coordinate mental health services with the school systems in order to create a more effective learning environment for these children.

The real difficulty facing inclusion is very much self-imposed, Dr. Meyer maintained. While special educators have enjoyed much support over the past 15 years, most of the

technology and techniques developed to address special needs revolve around a segregated or self-contained learning environment. Teachers are going to have to decide as a profession if inclusion is what they want to work toward, she said. Fortunately, there is considerable support from regular education teachers who generally consider inclusion methods an opportunity to improve the quality of education for all children. The key is for all teachers to work together.

Dr. Meyer believes this is starting to happen. One consistent piece of feedback she gets from inclusion specialists, particularly in New York City, is that regular education teachers are starting to take responsibility for initiating ideas concerning kids with special needs and adapting their ideas to the curriculum. Although special education teachers still have primary implementation responsibility, getting regular education teachers more involved is critical, she says. Special educators need to integrate their expertise with the regular educators' budding interest and concern in order to work to benefit all children.

Another important issue addressed by Dr. Meyer was parental involvement — and not just for parents of children with disabilities. A model she particularly likes is the drop-out prevention, home-visitor program through which school districts hire people from the community to act as liaisons between the schools and families. These employees are not social workers or other professionals, but usually parents with some education who are trained and paid a respectable wage for their work and who, at the same time, participate in their child's education.

Teacher education must also be reexamined, according to Dr. Meyer. It is easy for

university and state education agency personnel to point the finger at public schools and health organizations for being ineffective, she said. But, ultimately, the responsibility for teaching aspiring teachers that they have an obligation to all children falls to education professors. Teachers in the field should never be heard to say, "I wasn't trained to have that kid in my room."

Finally, Dr. Meyer discussed the state of the research literature and her concerns that too much of it no longer speaks to real people or schools. An inordinate amount of emphasis is placed on the concepts of "define and practice," she said, and too little on ensuring that what is defined has real application to real schools. In a more participatory model, she said, a task force would identify and answer questions by meeting with constituent groups, including teachers and families, to determine what the issues really are and what affected parties would like to know.

In conclusion, Dr. Meyer stressed that models of system change must move from paper to practice and should be implemented in the schools that need them most — in rural communities and urban settings, rather than in perfect schools with perfect teachers.

"...most of the technology and techniques developed to address special needs revolve around a segregated or self-contained learning environment. Teachers are going to have to decide as a profession if inclusion is what they want to work toward..."

OSEP's Vision for TA & Dissemination in a Time of Reform and Restructuring

Thomas Hehir, Ph.D.

Dr. Nancy Safer introduced Dr. Thomas Hehir, Director of the Office of Special Education Programs. Dr. Hehir received his Doctor of Education and Administration Planning and Social Policy from Harvard University, and he has a Masters in Special Education from Syracuse University. Dr. Safer shared with the group Dr. Hehir's commitment to, and vision of, technical assistance and dissemination related to school restructuring and reform. Dr. Safer also remarked that Dr. Hehir has brought with him to the office an appreciation of research and data and its implication for improving services for students with disabilities. Finally, she noted his conviction that technical assistance and dissemination can, in fact, make a real difference in what happens to students with disabilities in the future.

"...in a relatively short time, through the good work of many people, the practice of excluding children and youth with disabilities in American education has been greatly diminished..."

"...it is also a major accomplishment ... to have practically eliminated institutionalization for children with mental retardation..."

Dr. Hehir began his discussion by stating three main themes he wanted to highlight: special education's evolution and history; the myriad challenges facing special educators (particularly considering the push toward more inclusive approaches); and finally, his vision for a better future for the field of special education, especially one that focuses more clearly on results than in the past.

Special education has grown from a relatively small component of American education to a large and significant component, related Dr. Hehir. The field of special education comprises 20 percent, or more, of school budgets, employs hundreds of thousands of people, and educates approximately five million children. He also pointed out that as the field has grown it has become subject to more scrutiny, which, he added, is probably a good thing since a significant amount of public resources are spent there. Dr. Hehir observed that the field has also encountered criticism. For example, special educators have been criticized for segregating too many kids, including too many kids, and for the amount of money spent being spent. Special educators engage in a certain amount of self-criticism as well, asking "Have we done the right thing for the past 20 years in trying to expand services for students with disabilities? Have we created a separate system that is not in the best interest of children?" He indicated that it's at these times that it is important to remind each other of the significant accomplishments that have been made. From a historical perspective, and from a social policy and communications perspective, significant advances in the field are clearly visible.

Dr. Hehir continued by acknowledging the leadership role of special education. When P.L. 94-142 was passed approximately 750,000 to 800,000 children with disabilities in this country were being denied a public education. But in a relatively short time, through the good work of many people, the practice of excluding children and youth with disabilities in American education has been greatly diminished. That's an enormous accomplishment. He further indicated that it is also a major accomplishment for this field to have practically eliminated institutionalization for children with mental retardation.

Dr. Hehir further observed that at the time of the implementation of the law, there was increasing recognition that students with learning disabilities needed individualized attention in order to succeed in school. Since the passage of P.L. 94-142, many of these children have been successful in the school systems. Referring to the National Longitudinal Transition Study for special education students recently completed, it shows clearly, Dr. Hehir noted, that students with learning disabilities who receive appropriate access to curriculum and support have a higher probability of good educational results. For those students who do not, or who are simply put into general education classes with no support, there is a very high probability that they will drop out of school.

Dr. Hehir also talked about the importance of research and his belief that much of what is done in special education should be guided by it, and by values. One study he particularly noted appeared in the Harvard Education Review in about 1987 by Judy Singer and John Butler on the implementation of P.L. 94-142. It is very thorough research that uses both quantitative and qualitative methodology, and he indicated it was particularly important neither Judy Singer nor John Butler came from the "special education research community." They came strictly as researchers, emphasizing that research conducted in this field is sometimes burdened by the fact that people in special education tend to be passionate people. Such deep passions can obscure

objectivity, he observed. Dr. Hehir said he liked Singer and Butler's research because it did not come from a particular view of special education, but, to the extent possible, was unbiased in its perspective. And although these researchers concluded that "special educators have a long way to go," nonetheless, in a short time, they have extended to all children with disabilities in this country a free and public education, if not entirely appropriate yet. Dr. Hehir mentioned that every child with disabilities in this country has an IEP, which is a lot to have accomplished in such a short time. Progress is due to many, including the commitment of people at all levels of government—Federal, state, and local—compassionate people who are responsible for implementing services for students with disabilities.

Dr. Hehir emphasized the importance of recognizing the enormous challenges facing special educators and stressed the need to address those challenges head-on, or risk losing some of the support enjoyed in the past. He credited the Arc (formerly the Association for Retarded Citizens) for being perhaps the single most important group in the initial pressure for the extension of education rights to children with disabilities. The Arc became active after World War II in pressing state legislatures, and eventually the Federal government and the courts, for education rights for students with disabilities. The Arc recently published a report stating that, after 17 years of implementing P.L. 94-142, pervasive segregation of students with disabilities, particularly those with mental retardation, continues. Dr. Hehir cautioned the audience to heed that finding and consider it a warning. When the law was written, it was explicit in its preference that children should be educated alongside their nondisabled peers unless their IEPs called for some other arrangement. Many of the individuals and groups who formed the voice that created the law in the first place are not pleased with its implementation and are asking the professionals in the field to do a much better job.

The National Council on Disability also issued a study on the education of students with disabilities, and it, too, criticized the extent to which students with disabilities are segregated, as well as the lack of educational results for these students, Dr. Hehir stated. Furthermore, it concluded that African-American students are tremendously over represented in some disability programs. The Council pointed out that, while only 16 percent of children in this country are African-American, they represent almost 40 percent of the students in what is called EMH (educable mentally handicapped) programs. The Council also pointed out that over 55 percent of adults with disabilities in this country are unemployed.

The National Longitudinal Transition Study shows a much higher dropout rate for students with disabilities. It reports higher employment levels than the National Council on Disability's report; however, the longitudinal study reports that about five years after kids have gotten out of special education programs, approximately 58 percent are employed, as contrasted with 69 percent of nondisabled kids. It's important to look at all the issues that surround the special education field and develop a strong focus on how to address them, Dr. Hehir said, adding that professionals must make sure that the educational services children receive are the ones that are going to produce the greatest possible results.

Dr. Hehir pointed to the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which he considers the culmination of a movement in this country on behalf of, and by, people with disabilities. He believes it has significant ramifications for special education. The ADA seeks the full participation of, and equal status for, people with disabilities. It recognizes that people with disabilities have rights; that they should not be the object of charity but should be afforded full participation in all aspects of American society. Dr. Hehir suggested that those in special education need to recognize that some groups' activities are inconsistent with that mission. A very significant part of the field's history comes from charitable methods on behalf of people with disabilities, and that type of mind set is not appropriate in the age of ADA, he said. This society has a fundamental responsibility to children with disabilities. Therefore, professionals need to focus on ensuring that the laws and programs are implemented with a vision that includes full participation for people with disabilities in all aspects of American society.

Dr. Hehir acknowledged the efforts of his predecessor Judy Schrag, who, he said, did a wonderful thing by establishing a group to look at a national agenda to improve the results for students with disabilities. The group met first in the fall of 1993. Represented in the group were parents, the disability community, educators, people from different disability areas with different perspectives—all of whom he said were important in establishing the agenda. There was an

"P.L. 94-142 ... is explicit in its preference that children should be educated alongside their nondisabled peers unless their IEPs call for some other arrangement..."

"...The ADA seeks the full participation of, and equal status for, people with disabilities. It recognizes that people with disabilities have rights; that they should not be the object of charity but should be afforded full participation in all aspects of American society..."

"...programs for those with learning disabilities have shown that students with very discrepant learning styles can be successful in school..."

"...Special education has been used all too often as a vehicle by which students in ... culturally diverse communities have been separated from ... educational opportunities..."

enormous amount of agreement among participants that the focus needed to be on the results of education for students with disabilities.

One of the things the group questioned seriously was whether or not the vision for better results for students with disabilities can be achieved within a special education system. Could the full participation of people with disabilities in all aspects of society be accomplished through a very separate educational system, he said they asked. The group indicated very strongly for the need for connecting much more closely with the school restructuring and reform movement. The Goals 2000 Educate America Act that was introduced by the Clinton administration and subsequently passed by the Congress departs significantly from previous educational reforms and, asserted Dr. Hehir, from the traditional notions of schooling. GOALS 2000 establishes high standards and high expectations for all children, said Dr. Hehir, which, he continued, is particularly important for children in special education because so many of them have not been in programs predicated on high expectations. Consequently, results have not been satisfactory. Furthermore, GOALS 2000 has strong inclusive language. It is important, therefore, that special education remain at the school restructuring table so that the full participation of students with disabilities is assured.

Dr. Hehir went on to add that Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary of OSERS, has insisted that the special education community be part of all efforts in school reform and restructuring. She is part of the management council that is overseeing implementation of the law and is committed to allocating a significant portion of her time to GOALS 2000, he said. Dr. Hehir continued by saying that oftentimes, when people look at the issue of inclusion of students with disabilities, they view it as a zero sum game—that standards will fall, and that education will be more difficult for everyone. But, he said, when inclusion is done correctly, often the overall classroom environment is improved. Inclusion of children with disabilities is no less than a fundamental restructuring of what goes on in classrooms.

Over the past 15 years of American education, those in special education have been the innovators, observed Dr. Hehir. When you look at the best programs, they incorporate many of the innovative methods so badly needed by the educational system as a whole, he said. He suggested that the field's school-to-work transition efforts, and subsequent school-to-work transition programs, have many lessons to teach the overall education system in terms of how to connect employment to education. To illustrate his point, Dr. Hehir related his experience in the Boston Public Schools where, he said, a student with a significant disability had a much higher probability of employment than a nondisabled youth because of the transition programs in that system.

Dr. Hehir also spoke about Part H programs which have shown that different government agencies can collaborate and cooperate to provide services to disabled infants and their families. He also noted successes in wrapping services around schools. Furthermore, he said, successful programs for those with learning disabilities have shown that students with very discrepant learning styles can be successful in school. Those lessons are extremely important for the overall education system, he said.

Dr. Hehir related an experience he had in Chicago to illustrate the appalling pervasiveness of segregation of students with disabilities. One of his first experiences there was with a parent who had fought for two years to get her son, who had cerebral palsy and was in a wheelchair, into a barrier-free building. He assumed her son had significant cognitive disabilities and that she was advocating to incorporate kids with significant cognitive disabilities into general education classrooms—something new. Dr. Hehir said he asked this mother how cognitively disabled her son was, and she responded that he was not cognitively disabled at all but, rather, had an IQ of 135. The system felt this child needed to be in a special school where he could get OT and PT, not in a school where he could get an education. Bringing services to the student instead of requiring the student to go outside was an option that had not been considered by the school. This mother challenged that through the Office for Civil Rights and, in effect, began the desegregation of Chicago Public Schools for children with disabilities.

Another issue Dr. Hehir discussed was the importance of providing much better services to students with significant emotional behavioral disorders. He quoted the longitudinal study as saying these students consistently exhibited mediocre academic results, indicating to him the need to focus efforts on serving those children more effectively. Efforts are needed at the Federal level to encourage people at the state and local level. The child and adolescent mental health unit of

Health and Human Services, just received a significant increase in its appropriation from Congress, bringing that agency's resources to approximately \$35M in discretionary money this year. Dr. Hehir indicated that OSEP would be working with HHS to spend it in a way that benefits kids most appropriately, thereby recognizing the interrelated nature of education and mental health goals.

Within the population of students with disabilities are minorities who have particular needs that must be recognized. For example, Dr. Hehir said, students who do not speak English as their first language require services that are linguistically and culturally appropriate. He also noted that the relationship between the African-American community and special education needed to be acknowledged. Special education has been used all too often as a vehicle by which students in those, and other culturally diverse communities, have been separated from, not provided with, educational opportunities. That issue needs to be addressed head on, he emphasized, adding that educators also have to recognize that within the population of students with disabilities are minority disability groups whose needs are probably very different from those of the larger population of students with disabilities. He spoke specifically about being able to accommodate the needs of the deaf for appropriate instruction in communication and the need to recognize that a very significant number of children who are blind in this country are not being taught braille. Research indicates that the economic potential is significantly decreased for blind people who do not know braille.

Dr. Hehir concluded his speech by saying that he considers TA providers extremely important in achieving the goals at OSEP. One of the first items on the agenda, he said, is to link the various aspects of the Federal special education effort more closely together. Monitoring, he said, is viewed too often as a discrete function, technical assistance as a discrete function, research or knowledge development as a discrete function, and personnel preparation as a discrete function. Yet they are not—and should not—be so. OSEP, he said, can help states produce better education systems for students with disabilities by connecting them to the research base of both knowledge and craft. One of the things OSEP wants to achieve in the next few years is to connect things much more tightly between technical assistance and research developers, and systems change initiatives at the state level. OSEP will be looking at revising the monitoring system gradually over the next three years to focus more on issues that are directly related to achieving better results for students with disabilities. When a state is monitored and discrepancies are found, OSEP wants to be able to say to that state "we have technical assistance available, we have done research on that issue, and we can help guide you in your system change efforts."

Dr. Hehir ended by saying OSEP is depending on those in the special education community to help create a system that is much more integrated among monitoring, research, technical assistance and personnel preparation. He acknowledged that OSEP does not have all the answers, but needs the support and input of others in developing the systems.

"...OSEP ... can help states produce better education systems for students with disabilities by connecting them to the research base of both knowledge and craft..."

Changing Systems to Promote School Completion and Transition to Successful Adult Outcomes

David Johnson, Ph.D.

David Johnson is currently the Associate Director of the Institute on Community Integration and Director of the National Transition Network, North Central Regional Information Exchange, and National Study on Individuals with Severe Disabilities Leaving School. He is also senior researcher in the Research and Training Center on Community Living for Persons with Mental Retardation and the Research and Training Center on the Social and Psychological Development of Infants, Children, and Youth with Disabilities. He also serves as Principal Investigator of several Federal and State projects in the areas of transition, supported employment, cost analysis, and interagency planning.

Current Context for Transition.

David Johnson began by describing the current context within which systems change for transition is occurring. To answer the question, "How well do former special education students fare in adult life?", Dr. Johnson related statistics from the National Longitudinal Transition Study and recounted testimony presented to Congress, both of which have led to significant federal legislation to improve outcomes for students with disabilities once they leave the school setting.

Dr. Johnson briefly examined the specifics of the transition requirements contained within the IDEA, including:

- the definition of "transition services;"
- the meaning and importance of the phrase "coordinated set of activities;"
- student/family participation in the process;
- age requirements (no later than age 16);
- the content of the IEP; and
- statements of interagency linkages.

The context for systems change in transition also includes the influences of the educational reform movement upon special education programs, Dr. Johnson said. This includes GOALS 2000: Educate America Act; the School-to-Work Opportunity Act of 1993; and the initiatives of national commissions and task forces.

State Systems Change Program.

Dr. Johnson then focused his remarks upon OSEP's State systems change program on transition. The goals of the systems change program are to:

- increase the availability of, access to, and quality of transition assistance through the development and improvement of policies, procedures, systems, and other mechanisms for youth with disabilities and their families.
- improve the ability of professionals, parents, and advocates to work with young people with disabilities as they transition from school to adult life;
- improve working relationships and collaboration among education, rehabilitation, labor, postsecondary schools, advocacy groups, and families to plan and implement needed improvements in transition services within States and localities; and
- develop effective strategies and procedures for implementing the new transition service requirements contained within IDEA.

The National Transition Network.

An important part of meeting these goals will be the National Transition Network. Dr. Johnson described the NTN's goals, purpose, and participants (collaborators). Goals and purposes of the NTN include providing States with technical assistance on transition issues, evaluating and disseminating results, and conducting related support activities.

Early Findings of State Systems Change Programs on Transition.

Dr. Johnson shared with participants the early findings of State-level systems change activities on transition. There are six major areas where the need for improvement is being recognized and addressed:

- Interagency collaboration for transition;
- Administrative support and professional education programs;

- Student and family involvement in the transition process;
- Student services planning for transition;
- Transition programs and services through local demonstration activities; and
- Post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities;.

Dr. Johnson described some of the action steps being taken in each of these areas to bring about improvement. These are listed below.

Improving Interagency Collaboration:

- Formulate interagency teams at the State, community/regional, and local levels;
- Develop cooperative interagency agreements;
- Establish follow-along and follow-up systems;
- Coordinate IEPs, IWRPs, IHPs, and other individuals plans, when possible;
- Share student assessment/evaluation results with adult agencies to avoid duplication of effort; and
- Transfer student records/files to adult service agencies at the time of transition.

Improving Administrative Support and Professional Educational Programs:

- Provide administrators with information and special reports on student's transition needs.
- Provide professionals with training on transition.
- Increase involvement in interagency and transition planning committees.
- Emphasize transition programming in pre-service and in-service training programs.
- Modify the roles of special education and vocational rehabilitation personnel to address transition.

Improving Post-school Outcomes for Youth with Disabilities:

- Anticipate students' needs for adult services and support prior to transition from school.
- Share information on anticipated post-school services with adult service agencies.
- Develop transition exit plan for all students.
- Conduct follow-up and follow-along studies on students one year after exit from school.

Improving IEP and Student Services Planning for Transitions:

- Increase student participation levels in transition planning.
- Develop students' self-advocacy and self-determination skills.
- Make available information to students, families, and professionals on school and community services.
- Improve relevance of current assessment practices.
- Provide for early transition planning, beginning at age 16 (or younger).

Improving Transition Programs and Services Through Local Demonstration Activities:

- Emphasize inclusion in all school and community programs and services.
- Increase school and community program options.
- Address all transition areas on students' IEPs.
- Develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness.
- Provide staff with training on transition.

Improving Student and Family Involvement in the Transition Process:

- Increase student and family participation levels.
- Increase parent and professional collaboration.
- Provide families with information on adult services/dissemination.
- Empower families.
- Encourage family networking during the transition years.

Changing Systems to Address the Needs of Diverse Students with Disabilities and Their Families

Debra Spotts Merchant, J.D.

Debra S. Merchant currently serves as a Technical Assistance Specialist at the Mid-South Regional Resource Center (MSRRC), based at the Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute at the University of Kentucky. She has been involved in the disability field for many years and received both her undergraduate and graduate degrees in Learning and Behavioral Disorders. Her law degree is from the University of Kentucky. Ms. Merchant specializes in information on the EHA, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and parent participation in decision-making as well as in cultural, linguistic, racial, and economic diversity.

The intent of Ms. Merchant's talk was to give an overview of multicultural issues from the perspective of someone who works with the States and is in touch with current concerns, trends, and events. Ms. Merchant posed many thought-provoking questions to the group, moving from the concrete issues being faced to the more philosophical and legal questions driving the responses.

Ms. Merchant began by referring to the cyclical nature of things. "In the '60s, race was not supposed to matter," she said. "It was character, not skin color, that was supposed to be the issue. Yet, here it is the '90s, and race still matters." She posed some frequently asked questions and responded to many as she spoke. "How do we talk about race, culture, ethnicity, and disadvantaged and disabled? Who do we talk to? Do we talk to members of the majority population about changing their practices, or do we talk to members of the non-majority population about how to relate? What do we change, if we could change things? How do we raise the issue of race and not create tensions? Is it politically correct for people of the majority culture to be upfront in dealing with the issue?"

When discussing cultural diversity, Ms. Merchant stated that we are not clear about definitions or parameters for defining culturally diverse or disabled populations. She asked, "When you discuss the disadvantaged, do you include all African-

American or Hispanic students who may be economically or socioeconomically disadvantaged, but who are achieving at appropriate levels?" She observed that this was not the only variable to affect or cloud the view of issues of diversity and disabilities. She asked the audience to consider the components of diversity that make up a particular population. She questioned if the definition should vary from State to State, district to district, and community to community.

Most important for educators, and apart from the considerations above, are the variables of subcultures, sex, and ethnicity impacting the approaches being used to teach. Ms. Merchant gave as an example the differences in the successful approaches a teacher would use to teach a White male with a disability and those he or she might use to teach an African-American female with a disability.

These remarks flowed naturally into issues of overrepresentation and misplacement of African-American and limited English speaking students (LEPs) in special education. Ms. Merchant stated that students have been placed into classes for the retarded or the emotionally disturbed simply because of their deficiency in speaking English. When this is done, she felt, they are deprived of their peers and they fall further behind, limiting their ability to transition from special education into regular education.

Questions were then raised related to the issue of what States can do to correct mistakes of placement or to provide services. There are issues of resources, strategies, and the State's role, effort, and commitment. Ms. Merchant also addressed the issue of overrepresentation and incorrect placement of minorities. "Is this the result of discrimination or of culturally-biased assessments?" "Why aren't we testing English deficient students in their primary language and seeing how they compare with their language-similar peers?" If the latter were done, it might be more clear that schools need to address language education and culture instead of special education.

Ms. Merchant discussed the issue of ownership. She

"...schools need to address language education and culture instead of special education...for English deficient students..."

reminded the audience that people move more quickly on an issue if they have ownership of it. As a nation, she said, we must realize that the issues of adequate resources, discrimination, and diversity are not the issues of public education only; they are our issues and we all have responsibility. They are national issues, and some are social issues of the non-majority and majority cultures. The State agency, as well as the educational agencies and teachers, need to define their roles in order to have an impact on the issue. The audience was reminded that the most important goal is that schools provide children with the opportunity to realize their potential.

Issues of urban education were also discussed. Ms. Merchant stated that funding inequities can be documented and seen in the physical resources more easily than the academic resources, but both are there as seen by testing results. She raised the question, "Will school performance be limited for poor urban and rural areas as long as other socioeconomic issues are not addressed?" There is a need to convince affluent suburbanites to care about the inner city and rural schools. While magnet schools have helped, the issue of non-magnet schools remains.

In this era of reform, Ms. Merchant stated that, to address diversity, a family and community focus is required, and both need to be supported. Access and opportunity are based on outcomes. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are not the sum of education today — there is work. Work is an essential element of student success. A summary of her list of effective strategies included:

- strong parent/family/community involvement;
- an outcomes-based perspective;
- addressing diversity as more than a single issue;
- defining populations and their roles; and
- constant retooling of service providers.

Ms. Merchant reminded the audience that if we could view all students with no cultural biases and formulate strategies on that basis, not penalizing students for their parents' status, we would without doubt create a more supportive delivery system. Schools and school hours would be different; they would be responsive to the needs of the communities. We would have workable strategies for achieving outcomes and for promoting the realization of all children's potential.

Panel Presentations:

Changing Systems to Address the Needs of Diverse Students with Disabilities and Their Families

Dr. Carol Valdivia, moderator

Panel members:

Verna Morrow, Teacher Supervisor, San Simian Elementary School, Sells, Arizona

Hugo Galindo, Director, Center for Special Education, Washington, DC

Reginald Jones, Chair, Department of Psychology, Hampton University, Hampton, Virginia

Diane Powell, Director, Project D.A.I.S.Y., DC Public Schools, Washington, DC

Verna N. Morrow

Verna N. Morrow is currently Teacher Supervisor at San Simian Elementary School in Sells, Arizona. She supervises 35 teachers and aides and is responsible for scheduling, evaluation, curriculum, discipline, and staff training. She has worked in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) system for 24 years, and has served as president of a parent committee for children with disabilities, on the BIA Parent Advisory Council for Special Education, and on the Parents Advisory Council for the State of Arizona. She has three children, one of whom has a disability. Ms. Morrow received her master's degree in Foundations of Education from the University of Arizona.

"A key factor to ... providing appropriate services to children with special needs is parental involvement..."

Ms. Morrow began her remarks by reflecting upon her first years in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (in 1970) and then upon a position she took six years later administering the services provided to children with disabilities. "At that time," she said, "I never thought I would be involved in special education. I

never thought I would be the parent of a child with special needs. Having a child with disabilities has made a difference in my interest in special education." She is pleased to see how far the system has come since its early days, but

is aware that there are many changes yet to come.

Ms. Morrow reflected upon the many differences that exist between states, communities, and cultures. Even within one culture, there are often differences, she noted and felt it is

important to be aware that these exist. A key factor to understanding these differences and providing appropriate services to children with special needs "is parental involvement," Ms. Morrow said. "You must get parents involved, especially if you live in an isolated area where the communities are separate and there are problems with transportation."

Starting in the late 1970s, she went on to relate, children in BIA schools were mainstreamed into regular classes. This was a positive experience, she felt, because "it created the occasion for teachers and special education, parents, and others to work together on an ongoing basis ... Through a combination of

training, using consultants, having classes in mainstreaming, and so on, the teachers felt more comfortable with inclusion and were better prepared to make the child with a disability more comfortable."

Thus, being aware of and sensitive to students' different cultures, training teachers in how to include children with disabilities in regular classrooms, and building a strong collaboration between the various participants in the process — regular education, special education, parents, and others — are key factors in making inclusion work.

Hugo Galindo, Ph.D.

Hugo C. Galindo is currently Director of one of four Centers for Special Education in the Washington, DC public school system. As such, he serves 40 schools and is charged with oversight of all facets of special education services, including evaluation and assessment of students referred, placement of students with disabilities into appropriate programs, development and evaluation of programs, and supervision of all personnel. He has also served as the Executive Assistant for the Division of Special Education, with responsibility for city-wide programs for over 7,000 non-English speaking students.

"...English language deficiency is not an issue you simply ... refer for special education..."

Dr. Galindo began by addressing the process used to refer students for special education screening. "It seems the

whole educational system promotes referrals," he said, describing how in six years he completed over 700 evaluations of children referred to special education. This number, he felt, is representative of the over-referral of children into the special education track. For example, 52% of DC students referred to special education were found to be eligible, while the other 48% of the referrals were found to be unnecessary. "Think of the costs to the educational system for the wasted time, money, and energy to evaluate the referrals," Dr. Galindo said.

Dr. Galindo was especially concerned about students who were limited English speaking. One teacher, he related, referred 14 students in one year — all of whom were language deficient in English. "This is not an issue you simply push onto someone else." He challenged participants to "look at your own staff: How many culturally diverse staff members are there?"

Reginald Jones, Ph.D.

*Reginald Jones is a Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Special Education, and Chair of the Department of Psychology at Hampton University. He is also Director of the Center for Minority Special Education, which provides technical assistance to historically black colleges and universities (HCBUs) and other institutions of higher education having 25 percent or greater minority enrollment. Dr. Jones is currently preparing for publication the three-volume *Advances in Black Psychology and The Handbook of Tests and Measurements for Black Populations*.*

Dr. Jones provided an overview of the activities of the Center for Minority Special Education (CMSE), which include providing outreach to historically Black colleges and universities (HCBUs) and other minority institutions to assist them in obtaining funding under Parts C, E, F, and G of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. CMSE's mission is two-fold:

- To increase the institutional capacity of participating institutions so that they may contribute to the professional knowledge base and enrich the field through research or technological developments; and
- To increase participating institutions' capacity to compete for funds, primarily from Federal funding agencies but also from the private sector.

"We must ask ourselves several questions," Dr. Jones said. "Why are these minority institutions having problems competing for funds? What are the impediments to grant making and grant seeding? Why are these institutions having difficulty in these areas?"

According to Dr. Jones, the Center looks critically at each institution to identify the answers to these questions. Some factors

that have been found to impede minority institutions from pursuing Federal and private funding are the constraints upon the professors, who are the chief proposal writers; constraints include:

- teaching loads of professors;
- committee obligations;
- professional isolation (i.e., some professors do not have the time or setting to interact with their colleagues);
- college resource administrators lack awareness of grant activities;
- lack of release time for adequately reading the Request for Proposal (RFP), assembling a dedicated writing team, researching and composing the text, and turning the proposal in before the deadline;
- limited budget for support services (e.g., basic supplies, photocopying and fax charges, telephone);
- lack of doctoral and masters students to research and write materials;

"...CMSE's mission is ... to increase the capacity of ... minority institutions so that they may contribute to ... and enrich the field ...and to increase participating institutions' ability to compete for funds..."

- institutional bureaucracy that requires certain signatures on proposals;
- general apathy toward the grant-writing process, which is well known as a stressful, intense, and lengthy process.

There also appears to be a need for additional communication between States and minority institutions, Dr. Jones indicated. States need to let institutions know of services (e.g., technical assistance on grants) available from OSEP. There are information workshops and proposal writing workshops that go unnoticed.

Dr. Jones pointed out, however, that "there is more to writing than just production skills. There needs to be a concept, an idea of what you want to do and how you would do it." Information workshops

help to "bring out a person's ideas." A by-product of the workshops, Dr. Jones said, is that they allow OSEP to identify potential grant reviewers. "Grant review experience is a wonderful thing to have, especially when preparing for your own turn at grant writing."

Diane E. Powell, Ph.D.

Diane E. Powell is the Director of Project D.A.I.S.Y. in the Early Childhood Programs Branch in the District of Columbia Public Schools. She is also responsible for the coordination of transition and integration programs for young children with disabilities who receive education programming within the least restrictive environment. Dr. Powell has served as the State Specialist in the area of Behavioral and Emotional Disorders, and is the former coordinator of Programs for the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed in the Montgomery County Public Schools. She holds a Doctoral Degree from American University in the area of Emotional Disturbances and Learning Disabilities.

Dr. Powell addressed how educational reforms might be furthered in our schools. She began by asking, "Who are our primary customers?" and by answering, "Children and families." To serve the needs of children and families, Dr. Powell stated that "we need to engage in intense efforts for teaching training, with a broad-based practical component. Everyone must see themselves as a stakeholder." Teachers that are not

willing to involve themselves in training, in educational reform, and in the discussions taking place around these issues need to leave teaching, she felt. Outcomes for children, the primary customers, have not been effectively measured in recent years, and the standards used to measure the outcomes have not reflected "the changing needs of the primary customer."

"...Everyone must see themselves as a stakeholder ... schools need to initiate capacity building and involve staff in ownership of the positive..."

School-based management is an important component of change. "Schools will have to have something to say about the essential curriculum to be delivered to children, as well as identify what reasonable accommodations are needed,"

Dr. Powell stated. To solve the difficulties children are having, and to address their individual differences, schools need to initiate capacity building and involve staff in "ownership of the positive." She suggested strategies to bring this about:

- Mandating training on reflective and effective practice, in order to provide "responsive education;"
- Promoting a "delight the customer" perspective;
- Measuring student outcome performance;
- Varying use of time, so that there is flexibility in how instructional time is used to address individual student differences;

- Moving this agenda to the building level in at least 25 schools (i.e., site-based responsibility/management);
- Having staff identify what they need to provide a fully inclusive education to children, and then supporting them in that endeavor; and
- Promoting "stakeholder" perspectives, so that everyone is involved who has an interest in the environment where children are educated.

Presentation of Technical Assistance and Dissemination of Questionnaire Results

Richard Horne, Ed.D.
Debra Price-Ellingstad

Richard Horne is currently the Deputy Director of the National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (NICHCY) and serves on several research and evaluation projects at the Academy for Educational Development.

Debra Price-Ellingstad is Assistant Director of the Federal Resource Center (FRC) and has served as Project Director on several disability-related projects.

The Office of Special Education Programs believes strongly in the importance of its TA and Dissemination projects. They are essential to promoting OSEP's priorities, especially in working with families and in increasing State capacity to work with local education agencies and communities to provide services and opportunities for children and youth with disabilities. OSEP would like to see these projects pursue greater coordination among themselves in terms of:

- activities
- publications and the selection of topics
- electronic communication and linkages
- information and materials sharing.

OSEP would also like to help facilitate the flow of information from these projects to the local level — to administrators, teachers, related service providers, parents, and consumers.

To assist OSEP in its efforts, two questionnaires were developed: (1) The OSEP Technical Assistance and Dissemination Questionnaire; and (2) the SEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination Systems Questionnaire. The TA & Dissemination Conference Planning Team assisted in the development of both instruments.

The purpose of the first questionnaire was to help the Federal Resource Center (FRC) develop a strategic plan from which future TA & Dissemination conferences would be developed. Information from this survey will ensure that future conferences directly address the needs of the entire OSEP TA and Dissemination Network. Questionnaires were mailed to 25 OSEP TA & D projects. Twenty-two (88%) of those projects responded. Richard Horne presented the results of this questionnaire to conference participants. Data tables from his presentation can be found in Appendix D.

The purpose of the second questionnaire was to help OSEP and the OSEP TA & D projects: •(1) understand how technical assistance and information are provided at the State and local levels; and •(2) identify the mechanisms that are currently in place that could be used to get information into the hands of local practitioners. These questionnaires were disseminated to each of the Regional Resource Centers and, through them, to the States. Forty-seven (94%) of the States responded to this questionnaire. Debra Price-Ellingstad presented the results of this questionnaire. Data tables from her presentation are included in Appendix E.

Systems Change from a Policy Perspective

Ray C. Rist, Ph.D.

Ray C. Rist is currently the Director of the Center for Policy Studies, School of Education and Human Development, at the George Washington University. He is also the Director of the Teaching Case Studies Program at the U.S. General Accounting Office in Washington, DC, and for the past five years has been the Director of the General Government Division at the same institution. Dr. Rist is currently editing a book series on Comparative Policy Analysis.

Dr. Rist discussed the nature and relationship of policy analysis and systemic change. He stated that "policy making is cyclical in nature and thus requires specific policy tools." One of those tools is information. While there is certainly a glut of information available, much of it is not being used, or it is being used at the wrong stage of the policy cycle. "If you don't understand information needs in juxtaposition to the policy cycle," Dr. Rist stated, "then it's very tough going. If you want quality results in a situation, then you must address the information's usefulness. What is needed by whom and when?" He suggested that TA

*"...What is the problem?
needs to be answered through analysis and definition, not ready-aim-fire..."*

"...the problem doesn't stand still when a policy response is defined ... if no one continues to monitor the problem ... it's one of the riskiest and surest ways to fail..."

providers need to know their customers and where they, as providers, are in the policy cycle.

Dr. Rist described the policy cycle as having three phases: formulation, implementation, and assessment of outcomes. "Each impacts upon the information being produced and on the strategies for dissemination."

Formulation. This is the phase where pressure builds on the system or political apparatus, and some need has to be met. During the formulation phase, the question of "What is the problem?" needs to be answered through problem analysis and definition, not through a "ready-aim-fire mentality." That mentality, Dr. Rist said, "is not likely to achieve steady outcomes for a long period of time." Rather, formulation needs to take into account the situation, the political process, and so on.

The manner in which causal linkages are defined often suggests an approach that may solve the problem. For example, if A causes B, then "you know how to respond to B and possibly take care of A. But if A causes C, and you have no idea what happens during B, then this creates a greater chance of mistakes." Thus, Dr. Rist stated, "we need to have a systematic understanding of the problem we face." It is also useful to learn from the approaches others have taken to solving similar problems. What were their causal linkages? How successful were their approaches to solving the problem? Learning from the experiences of others is important, because "we are all public stewards," Dr. Rist said, "using public monies, using information to maximize desired outcomes. Not using the best available information is a misuse of this stewardship."

The formulation phase needs, then, to work on policy positions and their consequences. Problems may be framed differently according to the causal models and definitions that are used, and this provides people with more than one choice.

Implementation. There is, Dr. Rist said, one very important area of overlap between formulation and implementation. He described how a problem can grow worse over time, leading to pressure on the political system until a point is reached where the system must respond. "What often happens then is a tremendous vulnerability as money flows to work on the problem. When we get money to do something about the problem, we no longer study it." This is dangerous, because "the problem doesn't stand still when a policy response is defined; the problem is still there." The question then becomes, "What is the problem now?"

Thus, it is important to track the problem. It may drop off, level off, increase at the same rate, or skyrocket. If no one continues to monitor the problem, Dr. Rist pointed out, "then what are you actually working on? You must be very careful about this, it's one of the riskiest and surest ways to fail in the long run."

The TA provider may presume to "know" what the problem is, but, in truth, the problem is always subject to further questions and scrutiny. "Stay close to the nature of the problem," Dr. Rist suggested. "Most issues now are occurring at an accelerated pace."

Assessment of Outcomes. A part of assessing outcomes is accountability. Dr. Rist suggested several questions that organizations can use to measure their performance, including: What has to be done? What are we doing? What are the measurements and criteria to effectively assess what we've done? At this point, what have we learned? Is the organization learning? And, of course, he said, "You still must focus and ask yourself, 'What is the problem?'" Sustained change is not guaranteed. "There are new things to be learned."

Dr. Rist then focused upon policy tools, because he felt that "we are very weak conceptually in our understanding of policy tools." Examples of policy tools include: regulatory tools, taxes, direct service, privatization, tax credits, and loan guarantees. He remarked that "there is a trend of using three tools repeatedly, rather than the other 15 or so that are out there." There is also a multitude of examples of people or organizations using what he called a "misplaced policy tool." "Choosing a convenient policy tool versus ones that are robust and effective is not usually in our best interest, especially if the easy ones have been shown to be ineffective." But how does one tell the differences? A tool should be examined for its costs in terms of time, effort, labor, and money.

"This is not simply a conceptual issue," Dr. Rist stated. "There are real choices that have to be made, and you must understand why you are making them, how they are to be implemented, and what outcomes are anticipated. High performance necessitates attention."

A bibliography of recommended readings is found in Appendix F.

Creating Linkages

Robert Michael Stonehill, Ph.D.

Robert Stonehill is currently the Director of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), the network of clearinghouses and support services that produces the world's largest education database. He has also served as the Acting Division Director in the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation (OPBE) at the U.S. Department of Education, where he was responsible for national evaluations of elementary and secondary education programs. While at OPBE, he established a national network of technical assistance centers.

Dr. Stonehill began by stating that "In order to create effective linkages, there must be real purposes for them." TA&D groups, he said, often work to retrofit their projects to an administration's theme at the time. Words can be hollow when there is no reason behind the words.

Focusing on the current favorites of collaboration and coordination, Dr. Stonehill pointed out that "you have to have a reason to collaborate and coordinate. For collaboration and coordination to work, there must be a commonality of purpose, mission, and goals." Then there is a range of strategies and goals that become viable and can benefit all partners in the collaboration. It is important, however, to look at organizational arrangements, which can either impede or support change, products, services, and future directions. The organization needs to have a foundation where "linkages and coordination are possible, and where linkages are understood."

To establish linkages, then, it is important to understand what implicit and explicit factors cause collaboration and communication among entities. Dr. Stonehill provided several examples where linkages are difficult, including the National Research Centers and the regional labs. The 25 National Research Centers, he said, are mandated to have unique, not overlapping, missions. How then can linkages and communication be fostered? The regional labs, in their turn, serve different regions, but have similar missions. Yet they are not really set up to be an organization, because each has a separate board of governors and are conditioned and attentive to the policy directions and needs of the SEAs with whom they work.

ERIC, he said, has a particular kind of organizational arrangement. The different organizations in the ERIC network are "partners" with their own clientele, purposes, and so on, but they maintain linkages that permit them to use the information products and materials of the partners and stay in touch. Orga-

nizations outside of ERIC can also collaborate with ERIC, through acquiring materials, preparing abstracts, and using ERIC to store and maintain their materials and make them accessible to users.

Dr. Stonehill suggested that organizations ask themselves, "What outside organization produce materials that would be most valuable to our own constituents?" The answer to this question indicates fertile ground for collaboration. It is also valuable for organizations to examine "what mechanisms can be brought to bear to keep clients and potential clients aware of who you are and what you do. How can you make it easy for them to approach you?"

Products and services that can foster linkages include: databases, bibliographic information, full text collections, lesson plans, legislation, and collections of readily accessible materials, such as summaries of recent research trends and exemplary programs.

ERIC is offering a new service of electronic connectivity. Dr. Stonehill told participants. It is called AskERIC and has a guaranteed 48-hour turnaround time. Thousands of questions in the last two years have led to new ERIC services, such as several thousand available lesson plans, prepackaged literature reviews,

and more. "If you build it," Dr. Stonehill said, "they will come."

Providing users with access to your information requires examining diversified mechanisms. "Mailing lists, newsletters, Internet, and 800 numbers" were examples Dr. Stonehill gave of how public access has skyrocketed. "The worst that can happen is that you get overwhelmed and drown in your own success."

Dr. Stonehill also projected into the future and related some of ERIC's plans for meeting customers' information needs. The availability of the ERIC database and selected materials on low-cost CD-ROMs is one example. Another is the idea of using new Internet tools such as Mosaic World-wide Web. Mosaic uses "hypertext as an organizing principle," which means that information on similar topics can be linked. About 400 universities are currently doing this, Dr. Stonehill said. "So, for example, if you wanted to find out about inclusion, there would be an organizational logic to finding your way from one source or element of information to another without having to change places or databases." Mosaic is free, can be downloaded from the Internet (TCP/IP connection required), and can help individuals and organizations gain access to information around the world.

Products and services that can foster linkages include: databases, bibliographic information, full text collections, lesson plans, legislation, and collections of readily accessible materials, such as summaries of recent research trends and exemplary programs.

Closing Statements

Dawn Hunter, Ph.D.

Dr. Hunter began by noting that the participants had taken a real hard look at systemic change and observed that "the roles of the TA providers are changing. We have additional high pressures from the political arena to produce results; but what is critical for us is the need to try to work smarter at technical assistance and information dissemination, not necessarily harder at it." Dr. Hunter stressed the need for finding effective methods to deliver both information and products. She highlighted one message from an earlier segment of the conference [see Ray C. Rist presentation] and said that "we need to get tougher in the planning and design of technical assistance. We have to reach an understanding of when we simply need to quit a conventional, yet ineffective approach. We have to learn that it is okay to try something new, something different in an attempt to arrive at the desired outcomes." Dr. Hunter felt that OSEP had a responsibility to support its technical assistance providers when the decision to depart from the conventional runs into a political wall.

Dr. Hunter reminded the audience that, with technical assistance and dissemination projects, there is a need to get past the comfort level and investigate new strategies for accomplishing tasks. Projects' efforts should address the larger issues, not

just chip away at the small ones. This should be done with the realization that seeing changes in the larger issues will take a long time. She further cautioned that "there needs to be a recognition at the Federal level that the demand is not for temporary instant impact. Rather, there should be a focus on the importance for providing long-term, sustainable changes that will be reflective of the evolving changes in education." OSEP needs to take the initiative in helping the TA users reframe the questions that States currently pose. Dr. Hunter explained that "TA and dissemination providers should be proactive in helping States to rethink and articulate questions, so that the information being provided in the end is actually worth something to the States." She suggested that, in time, the TA projects' roles should alter from being providers of solutions to the States to perhaps being facilitators of change.

Dr. Hunter concluded by thanking all the participants for their involvement in what she called "a very energizing conference" and thanked the staff of the Federal Resource Center for the time and effort they had expended in coordinating and arranging the fourth annual conference.

Appendix A

The Office of Special Education Programs Fourth Annual Technical Assistance and Dissemination Conference

AGENDA

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27

1:00 - 1:10	WELCOME Carol Valdivieso - FRC
1:10 - 1:20	OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE Nancy Safer - OSEP
1:20 - 1:50	CONTEXT FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION: GOALS 2000, THE REAUTHORIZATION OF ESEA, SCHOOL TO WORK, & IDEA Patricia Guard - OSEP
1:50 - 2:05	QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
2:05 - 3:10	INCLUSION/LRE - CHANGING SYSTEMS TO INCLUDE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Luanna Meyer
3:10 - 3:25	Break
3:25 - 4:25	SMALL GROUP BREAK-OUTS
4:25 - 5:00	SMALL GROUP REPORTS

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28

- 8:30 - 9:25 OSEP'S VISION FOR TA & DISSEMINATION IN A TIME OF REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING
Thomas Hehir - OSEP
- 9:25 - 10:35 CHANGING SYSTEMS TO PROMOTE SCHOOL COMPLETION AND TRANSITION TO SUCCESSFUL ADULT OUTCOMES
David Johnson
- 10:35 - 10:50 Break
- 10:50 - 11:50 SMALL GROUP BREAKOUTS
- 11:50 - 12:30 SMALL GROUP REPORTS
- 12:30 - 1:30 Lunch
- 1:30 - 2:15 OVERVIEW: CHANGING SYSTEMS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF DIVERSE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES
Debra Merchant
- 2:15 - 3:05 PANEL STRATEGIES: CHANGING SYSTEMS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF DIVERSE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES
Moderator: Carol Valdivieso - FRC
Panel Members: Hugo Galindo, Reginald Jones, Verna Morrow, Diane Powell
- 3:05 - 3:20 Break
- 3:20 - 4:30 PANEL STRATEGIES (continued)
- 4:30 - 5:00 POSTER SESSION SET UP
- 5:00 - 7:00 POSTER DISPLAYS AND SOCIAL

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29

- 8:30 - 9:00 PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
Debra Price-Ellingstad - FRC; Richard L. Horne - NICHY
- 9:00 - 10:00 SYSTEMS CHANGE FROM A POLICY PERSPECTIVE
Ray Rist
- 10:05 - 11:00 CREATING LINKAGES
Robert Stonehill
- 11:00 - 11:15 Break
- 11:15 - 12:00 SMALL GROUP BREAK-OUTS
- 12:00 - 12:40 SMALL GROUP REPORTS
- 12:40 - 1:00 WRAP UP
Dawn Hunter - OSEP

Appendix B

PARTICIPANT LIST

Eileen Ahearn, Ph.D.
Senior Policy Analyst
National Association of State Directors of Special Education -
Project Forum
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: (703) 519-3800
TDD: (703) 519-7008
Fax: (703) 519-3808
SpecialNet: NASDSE

George Ayers, Ed.D.
Executive Director
The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Tel: (703) 620-3660
Fax: (703) 264-9497

Mr. David Baratz
Research Associate
The Chesapeake Institute
2030 M Street N.W., Suite 810
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-9360
Fax: (202) 785-0664

Ms. Vickie Barr
Assistant Director
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 939-9320
TDD: (202) 939-9320
Fax: (202) 833-4760
Toll free: (800) 544-3284
Internet: Heath@ace.nche.edu

Edith E. Beatty, Ed.D.
Director
Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC)
Trinity College of Vermont
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
Tel: (802) 658-5036
TDD: (802) 860-1428
Fax: (802) 658-7435
Internet: NERRC@delphi.com
SpecialNet: NERRC

Ms. Pat Blake
Associate Director
Technical Assistance for Parent Programs (TAPP)
Federation for Children with Special Needs
95 Berkeley Street, Suite 104
Boston, MA 02116
Tel: (617) 482-2915
Fax: (617) 695-2939
Toll free: (800) 331-0688

Ms. Phyllis Blaunstein
Deputy Director
Assessing & Using the Professional Knowledge Base to
Educate Children with ADD
The Chesapeake Institute
2030 M Street N.W., Suite 810
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-9360
Fax: (202) 785-0664

Marsha L. Brauen, Ph.D.
Project Director
Technical Assistance in Data Analysis, Evaluation, and
Report Preparation
Westat
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: (301) 251-1500
Fax: (301) 294-4475
Toll free: (800) 937-8281
Internet: Brauenm1%westat@Mcimail.com
SpecialNet: WESTAT

Ms. Sandra Brooks
 Technical Assistance Facilitator
 Technical Assistance for Parent Programs (TAPP)
 Northeast Regional Office
 P.O. Box 1422
 Concord, NH 03302
 Tel: (603) 224-7005
 Fax: (603) 224-4365
 Toll free: (800) 232-0986
 SpecialNet: NH.PIC

Mr. Bruce Bull
 Project Coordinator
 The National Information Clearinghouse on Children Who are
 Deaf-Blind (DB-LINK)
 345 N. Monmouth Avenue
 Monmouth, OR 97361
 Tel: (503) 838-8776
 TDD: (503) 838-8821
 Fax: (503) 838-8150
 Toll free: (800) 438-9376 (voice)
 Toll free: (800) 854-7013 (TDD)
 Internet: LeslieG@fsa.wosc.osshe.edu
 SpecialNet: TRD attn: DB-Link

Ms. Jane Burnette
 Publications Manager
 ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education -
 ERIC/OSEP Special Project (ERIC-CEC)
 1920 Association Drive
 Reston, VA 22091
 Tel: (703) 264-9470
 TDD: (703) 620-3660
 Fax: (703) 264-9494
 Toll free: (800) 328-0272
 Internet: ERICEC@inet.ed.gov
 SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Ms. Julia Burnham
 Information Coordinator
 Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC)
 Utah State University
 1780 North Research Parkway
 Suite 112
 Logan, UT 84321
 Tel: (801) 752-0238
 TDD: (801) 753-9750
 Fax: (801) 753-9750
 Internet: Handi@cc.usu.edu
 SpecialNet: MPRRC

Ms. Theresa Carr
 Project Coordinator
 Helen Keller National Center- Technical Assistance Center
 (HKNC-TAC)
 111 Middle Neck Road
 Sands Point, NY 11050
 Tel: (516) 944-8900, ext. 311
 TDD: (516) 944-8900
 Fax: (516) 944-7302

Ms. Delia Cerpa
 TA Coordinator
 South Atlantic Regional Resource Center (SARRC)
 1236 N. University Drive
 Plantation, FL 33322
 Tel: (305) 473-6106
 Fax: (305) 424-4309

Patricia Corley, Ed.D
 Associate Project Director
 National Center to Improve Practice (NCIP)
 Education Development Center
 55 Chapel Street
 Newton, MA 02158-1060
 Tel: (617) 969-4529
 TDD: (617) 969-4529
 Fax: (617) 969-3440
 Toll Free: (800) 225-4276
 Internet: Patricac@edc.org

Ms. Margie Crutchfield
 Information Specialist
 National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education
 The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
 1920 Association Drive
 Reston, VA 22091-1589
 Tel: (703) 264-9476
 TDD: (703) 264-9480
 Fax: (703) 264-9494
 SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Joan Danaher, Ph.D.
 Associate Director for the Information Unit
 National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
 (NEC*TAS)
 NationsBank Plaza
 137 E. Franklin Street, Suite 500
 Chapel Hill, NC 27514
 Tel: (919) 962-2001
 TDD: (919) 966-4041
 Fax: (919) 966-7463
 Internet: Danaher.nectas@mhs.unc.edu
 SpecialNet: FPGCENTER

Ms. Sheila K. Draper
Project Director
Networking System for Training Education Personnel
(NSTEP)
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: (703) 519-3800
TDD: (703) 519-7008
Fax: (703) 519-3808
SpecialNet: NASDSE

Lucy Ely-Pagan
Staff Associate
Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC)
Trinity College of Vermont
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
Tel: (802) 658-5036
TDD: (802) 860-1428
Fax: (802) 658-7435
Internet: NERRC@delphi.com
SpecialNet: NERRC

Dr. H. D. "Bud" Fredericks
Director
Teaching Research Access for Children and Youth with
Sensory Deficits
TRACES
Teaching Research Division
345 N. Monmouth Avenue
Monmouth, OR 97361
Tel: (503) 838-8401
Fax: (503) 838-8150
SpecialNet: TRD

Patricia Gonzalez, Ph.D.
Information Services Coordinator
Networking System for Training Education Personnel
(NSTEP)
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: (703) 519-3800
TDD: (703) 519-7008
Fax: (703) 519-3808
SpecialNet: NASDSE

Ms. Nancy Gray
CSPD Coordinator
Kansas Project Partnership
120 SE 10th
Topeka, KS 66612
Tel: (913) 296-2141
SpecialNet: KSCSPD or KANSASSE

Mr. Tom Grayson
Associate Director
Transition Research Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820
Tel: (217) 333-2325
Internet: Tgrayson@uiuc.edu

Ms. Rhona Hartman
Director
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 939-9320
TDD: (202) 939-9320
Fax: (202) 833-4760
Toll free: (800) 544-3284
Internet: Heath@ace.nche.edu

Richard L. Home, Ed.D.
Deputy Director
National Information Center for Children and Youth with
Disabilities (NICHCY)
P.O. Box 1492
Washington, DC 20013-1392
Tel: (202) 416-0300
TDD: (202) 416-0300
Fax: (202) 416-0312
Toll free: (800) 695-0285
Toll free: (800) 695-0285 (TDD)
SpecialNet: NICHCY

Joicy Hurth, Ph.D.
Associate Director for Technical Assistance
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
(NEC*TAS)
NationsBank Plaza
137 E. Franklin Street, Suite 500
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
Tel: (919) 962-2001
Fax: (919) 966-7463
Internet: Hurth.nectas@mhs.unc.edu

David R. Johnson, Ph.D.
Director
National Transition Network (NTN)
150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Room 6, Pattee Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Tel: (612) 624-1062
Fax: (612) 624-9344

Ms. Monique Jones
Information Specialist
Center for Minority Special Education (CMSE)
Hampton University
Hampton, VA 23666
Tel: (804) 727-5100
TDD: (804) 723-3980
Fax: (804) 727-5131
Toll free: (800) 241-1441
SpecialNet: VA.HAMPTON.UNIV

Reginald L. Jones, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Minority Special Education (CMSE)
Hampton University
Hampton, VA 23666
Tel: (804) 727-5100
TDD: (804) 723-3980
Fax: (804) 727-5131
Toll free: (800) 241-1441
SpecialNet: VA.HAMPTON.UNIV

Lynne Kahn, Ph.D.
Associate Director for Evaluation
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
(NEC*TAS)
NationsBank Plaza
137 E. Franklin Street, Suite 500
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
Tel: (919) 962-2001
TDD: (919) 966-4041
Fax: (919) 966-7463
SpecialNet: FPGCENTER

Ms. Anmarie Kallas
Dissemination Manager
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education -
ERIC/OSEP Special Project
ERIC-CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Tel: (703) 264-9470
TDD: (703) 620-3660
Fax: (703) 264-9494
Toll free: (800) 328-0272
Internet: ERICEC@inet.ed.gov
SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Edward J. Kameenui, Ph.D.
Associate Director
National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators (NCITE)
805 Lincoln
Eugene, OR 97401
Tel: (503) 683-7543
Fax: (503) 346-5818

Dr. Michael Kane
Project Director
Technology, Educational Media, and Materials Program
The Chesapeake Institute
2030 M Street N.W., Suite 810
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-9360
Fax: (202) 785-0664

Ms. Bernadette Knoblauch
Associate Director User Services/Publications
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education -
ERIC/OSEP Special Project
ERIC-CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Tel: (703) 264-9470
TDD: (703) 620-3660
Fax: (703) 264-9494
Toll free: (800) 328-0272
Internet: ERICEC@inet.ed.gov
SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Glenn Latham, Ed.D.
Director
Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC)
Utah State University
1780 North Research Parkway, Suite 112
Logan, UT 84321
Tel: (801) 752-0238
TDD: (801) 753-9750
Fax: (801) 753-9750
Internet: Handl@cc.usu.edu
SpecialNet: MPRRC

Dr. Larry Magliocca
Director
Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center (GLARRC)
The Ohio State University
700 Ackerman Road, Suite 440
Columbus, OH 43202
Tel: (614) 447-0844
Fax: (614) 447-9043
Internet: Magliocca.l@osu.edu

Ms. Carol Massanari
Technical Assistance Specialist
MidSouth Regional Resource Center (MSRRC)
University of Kentucky
Mineral Industries Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0051
Tel: (606) 257-4921
Fax: (606) 323-1901

Ms. Kathleen McLane
Associate Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education -
ERIC/OSEP Special Project
ERIC-CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Tel: (703) 264-9470
TDD: (703) 620-3660
Fax: (703) 264-9494
Toll free: (800) 328-0272
Internet: ERICEC@inet.ed.gov
SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Ms. Nancy Meidenbauer
Information Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1589
Tel: (703) 264-9476
TDD: (703) 264-9480
Fax: (703) 264-9494
SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

Ms. Debra Merchant
Technical Assistance Specialist
Midsouth Regional Resource Center (MSRRC)
University of Kentucky
Mineral Industries Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0051
Tel: (606) 257-4921
Fax: (606) 323-1901

Ms. Karen Mikkelsen
Staff Associate
Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC)
Trinity College of Vermont
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
Tel: (802) 658-5036
TDD: (802) 860-1428
Fax: (802) 658-7435
Internet: NERRC@delphi.com
SpecialNet: NERRC

Mr. Kelvin D. Mims
Program Assistant
The Federal Resource Center for Special Education (FRC)
1233 20th Street N.W., Suite 504
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 416-0309
TDD: (202) 416-0300
Fax: (202) 416-0312
Internet: Cforsped@capcon.net
SpecialNet: DC.AFED

Ms. Caroline Moore
Assistant Director
Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC)
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1268
Tel: (503) 346-5641
TDD: (503) 346-5641
Fax: (503) 346-5639
Internet: Caroline_Moore@ccmail.uoregon.edu
SpecialNet: WRRC

Mr. Karl E. Murray
Project Director
National Institute on Comprehensive System of Personnel
Development (CSPD) Collaboration
The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Tel: (703) 264-9488
TDD: (703) 620-3660
Fax: (703) 264-9494

Ms. Joan Nelson
Project Coordinator
National Information Action Center
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: (703) 519-3800
TDD: (703) 519-7008
Fax: (703) 519-3808
SpecialNet: NASDSE

Ms. Fran O'Reilly
Area Manager
Technical Assistance in Data Analysis, Evaluation, and
Report Preparation
Westat
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: (301) 251-1500
Fax: (301) 294-4475
Toll free: (800) 937-8281
SpecialNet: WESTAT

Mr. Mario Payne
Resource Associate
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 544-9320
TDD: (202) 939-9320
Fax: (202) 833-4760
Toll free: (800) 544-3284
Internet: Heath@ace.nche.edu

Ms. Debra J. Price-Ellingstad
 Assistant Director
 The Federal Resource Center for Special Education (FRC)
 1233 20th Street N.W., Suite 504
 Washington, DC 20036
 Tel: (202) 416-0309
 TDD: (202) 416-0300
 Fax: (202) 416-0312
 Internet: Cforsped@capcon.net
 SpecialNet: DC.AFED

Bruce A. Ramirez, Ed.D.
 Acting Director
 ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education-
 ERIC/OSEP Special Project
 ERIC-CEC
 1920 Association Drive
 Reston, VA 22091
 Tel: (703) 264-9470
 TDD: (703) 620-3660
 Fax: (703) 264-4494
 Toll free: (800) 328-0272
 Internet: ERICEC@Inet.ed.gov
 SpecialNet: CEC.RESTON

John W. Reiman, Ph.D.
 Director
 The National Information Clearinghouse on Children Who are
 Deaf-Blind (DB-LINK)
 345 N. Monmouth Avenue
 Monmouth, OR 97361
 Tel: (503) 838-8776
 TDD: (503) 838-8821
 Fax: (503) 838-8150
 Toll free: (800) 438-9376 (voice)
 Toll free: (800) 854-7013 (TDD)
 Internet: LeslieG@fsa.wosc.oashe.edu
 SpecialNet: TRD attn: DB-Link

Ms. Suzanne P. Ripley
 Director
 National Information Center for Children and Youth with
 Disabilities (NICHCY)
 P.O. Box 1492
 Washington, DC 20013-1492
 Tel: (202) 416-0300
 TDD: (202) 416-0300
 Fax: (202) 416-0312
 Toll free: (800) 695-0285
 Toll free: (800) 695-0285 (TDD)
 SpecialNet: NICHCY

Ms. Laura Samberg
 Resource Associate
 HEATH Resource Center
 One Dupont Circle N.W., Suite 800
 Washington, DC 20036
 Tel: (202) 939-9320
 TDD: (202) 939-9320
 Fax: (202) 833-4760
 Toll free: (800) 544-3284
 Internet: Heath@ce.nche.edu

Karen Sanders, Ph.D.
 Assistant Director
 Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center (GLARRC)
 65 S. Ford, Room 309
 Columbus, OH 43266
 Tel: (614) 466-0224

Dr. Judy Smith-Davis
 Director
 East Desk
 Knowledge Production and Networking Alliance 2000
 Project- University of New Mexico
 10860 Hampton Road
 Fairfax Station, VA 22039
 Tel: (703) 239-1557
 Toll free: (800) 831-6134
 Fax: (703) 503-8627
 SpecialNet: SMITHDAVIS

Dr. Judy Smith-Davis
 Director
 Knowledge Production and Networking Alliance 2000
 Project- University of New Mexico
 College of Education
 University of New Mexico
 Albuquerque, NM 87131
 SpecialNet: UNM

Ms. Kerry Traylor
 Research Analyst
 The Chesapeake Institute
 2030 M Street N.W., Suite 810
 Washington, DC 20036
 Tel: (202) 785-9360
 Fax: (202) 785-0664

Pat Trohanis, Ph.D.
 Director and Principal Investigator
 National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
 (NEC-TAS)
 NationsBank Plaza
 137 E. Franklin Street, Suite 500
 Chapel Hill, NC 27514
 Tel: (919) 962-2001
 TDD: (919) 966-4041
 Fax: (919) 966-7463
 Internet: Trohanis.nectas@mhs.unc.edu
 SpecialNet: FPOCENTER

Carol H. Valdivieso, Ph.D.
 Director and Principal Investigator
 The Federal Resource Center for Special Education (FRC)
 1233 20th Street N.W., Suite 504
 Washington, DC 20036
 Tel: (202) 416-0309
 TDD: (202) 416-0300
 Fax: (202) 416-0312
 Internet: Cforsped@capcon.net
 SpecialNet: DC.AFED

John F. Walsh, Ph.D.
 Associate Director
 Academic Affairs Kansas Board of Regents
 Kansas Project Partnership
 120 SE 10th
 Topeka, KS 66612
 Tel: (913) 296-2141
 SpecialNet: KSCSPD or KANSASSE

Ms. Jean Wolman
 Research Scientist and Manager
 Center for Special Education Finance
 American Institutes for Research (AIR)
 P.O. Box 1113
 Palo Alto, CA 94302
 Tel: (415) 493-3550
 Fax: (415) 858-0958
 Internet: xt.led@forsythe.stanford.edu

Richard Zeller, Ph.D.
 Director
 Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC)
 1268 University of Oregon
 Eugene, OR 97403-1268
 Tel: (503) 346-5641
 TDD: (503) 346-5641
 Fax: (503) 346-5639
 Internet: Richard_Zeller@ccmail.uoregon.edu
 SpecialNet: WRRRC

Ms. Martha Ziegler
 Executive Director
 Technical Assistance for Parent Programs (TAPP)
 Federation for Children with Special Needs
 95 Berkeley Street, Suite 104
 Boston, MA 02116
 Tel: (617) 472-2915
 Fax: (617) 695-2939
 Toll free: (800) 331-0688

Federal Participant List

RoseAnn Ashby
 US Department of Education
 Rehabilitation Services Administration
 330 C Street S.W.
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202

Betty Baker
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3513
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-9264

Dor Blodgett
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3518
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8749

Sara Conlon
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 4628
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8157
 TDD: (202) 260-0410

Judith Gregorian
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3619
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-9092

Patricia Guard
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3090
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-5507

Tom V. Hanley
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3526
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8110
 Fax: (202) 205-9070
 Internet: T_Hanley@ed.gov

Jane Hauser
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3521
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8126

Thomas Hehir
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3086
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-5507
 TDD: (202) 205-9754

Norm Howe
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3072
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-9068

Dawn Hunter
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 4620
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-5809

Joan Pine
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3613
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-9375

JoLeta Reynolds
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3082
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-5507

Marie Roane
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 4623
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8451

Debra Sturdivant
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 3622
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8038

Mike Ward
 US Department of Education
 Office of Special Education Programs
 330 C Street S.W., Rm 4624
 Switzer Building
 Washington, DC 20202
 Tel: (202) 205-8163

Appendix C

RESULTS OF SMALL GROUP ACTIVITIES

Systems Change - Inclusion

Components of successful systems change:

GROUP ONE

- Client directed, i.e. local system & teacher driven.
- Needs to be a whole system effort.
- Emphasis on services rather than placement.
- Includes training.
- Support from top; buy in at bottom.
- Tied to whole - i.e. total reform effort.
- Need to address unions, i.e.; obstacles.
- New roles for parents.
- Promote real-life - challenge is to get into the tough situations.
- Research for/from practice.
- Reflects demographic diversity.
- Full commitment - top support.
- Take beginners - the real challenges.
- Choice of what to commit to - flexibility.
- Incentives & sanctions.
- Allowance for time; change is a process over time.
- Client involvement in design of model.
- On-site TA support available.
- Commitment to finding/making time for cooperative planning.
- State ownership; development of various levels of partnership.
- Changing practice at IHE level.
- Changing roles of SEAs, regional & local levels.
- As roles change, need to work out the details resulting, (e.g. tenure).
- Need to leave our baggage behind- recondition how we think /talk.
- Change means change for everyone.
- Willingness to self-evaluate; acknowledge what is not working; recognize and acknowledge mistakes.
- Build on success.
- Very Sensitive to community characteristics and dynamics.
- Change occurs when peers influence peers.
- Involve all elements/stakeholders-individuals who might be involved.
- Biggest challenge is behavior - aggressive behavior.

Implications for TA & Dissemination:

- Need to reach other audiences in education.
- Link to other TA networks.
- Need to link with audiences outside education.
- Need to begin to talk about system-wide changes/ case studies.
- Need to define the audiences - targeted information dissemination.
- Need to expand the ways we share information in order to assure we are reaching families, business and other audiences - be creative - use nontraditional mechanisms/ways.
- Need to spend time to translate the question to assure we are getting to the real issue that needs to be addressed.
- Need to get more client involvement in deciding/ defining need & delivery mechanisms.
- Incorporate the components of system change - - what we know about the change process - into the way we approach day to day efforts to solve problems with our clients - incorporate into our dialogue & problem solving.
- Keep everything grounded toward impact on children, families, community and schools - accountability to individual needs.
- Need new methodologies in service delivery, in research, in measuring effectiveness.
- Change in curriculum and instruction at university level.
- Change in certification.
- Collect vignettes about children and families and frame impact in terms of vignettes.
- Move away from using labels and substitute more descriptions of individuals and their characteristics.
- Re-think how we distribute and award funds (e.g. proposal review, state awards).
- Use peer review as opposed to competitive models.
- The TA & D system needs to stay abreast more effectively/ efficiently/quickly.

GROUP TWO

- Joint ownership of "system problem" by all (parents, teachers, administrators).

- Adjusting to new circumstances by "other systems" (e.g., IHEs).
- Top down support...bottom up implementation.
- Willingness to challenge sacred wisdom.
- Having a vision and having a commitment.
- Increased flexibility in general education to try other structural arrangements, collaborative models of planning, cooperative learning, grouping approaches, etc.
- Looking at research through a practical lens.
- Variety of opportunities and strategies for retraining (tailored to individual needs).
- Insistence on commitment of time for the "task group" working on change.
- Task groups, release time, etc. - identified conditions necessary to make systems change work.
- Sharing (vision, structural arrangements, time, resources) across subsystems.
- Understanding that not all stakeholders are at the same point in readiness to change; understanding attitudes.
- Project/support personnel with real experience in the settings.
- Established criteria and willingness to break off when they aren't met.
- Sufficient time to prepare (a year) with planning team, teachers/building, parents of special education and general education kids.
- Materials, user friendly, geared to particular audiences.
- Site visit opportunities - to show that it can be done - within reasonable distances.
- Diverse population districts as models - "picking some harder places to work".
- Willingness to work on problems.
- "Systems change" directed, in the end, to benefitting all children.
- Empowerment - only way to make "bottom up implementation" work is to empower teachers.
- "All really does mean all"—change sites really got to this understanding.
- "Project with TA/consultant support in the SEA working with districts" - this may be a nascent "State system of TA".
- Need something in place "after the project is gone" (buddy systems, TA systems, new functions for SEA/BOCES staff, etc.).

Implications for TA & Dissemination:

- Get together list of model projects/sites that people can visit—to see inclusion "practices" in place.
- Need is probably greater at the middle school and high school level.

- Need to help people understand how to evaluate programs; to help local districts figure out "when will we know when we are making progress?"
- These "20 or so components" may suggest a template for setting, creating, guiding, documenting standards (at least in individual case).
- New roles for TA providers - facilitating more collaboration by a broader range of stakeholders:
- Involvement in some specific topics, issues—eg. assessment and new "world class" standards.
- Need to be able to capture what's working in the scores of projects working on pieces of systems change.
- "New customers" - out of just special education and into general education, consumer, etc.
- "Tailor products to specific audiences" (eg. public, principals, business leaders, etc.).
- Figure out how to not overwhelm people with information (eg. NICHCY & Extension Services).
- Longer-range perspective on change than we are used to operating in.
- Figure out how to make it easier, cleaner for people to ask their questions - safe environment/ support.
- Create readiness for change by probing, helping to clarify/guide questions.
- Figure out with States what it would mean to have a State TA/D system that support systems change in LEAs (links to other SEA functions).
- Role of teacher training institutions - figure out how to involve them both to help and to influence perservice systems.
- Inservice training - credit for certification, competency focused, (require that "all staff read the CSPD plan").
- TA/D projects role in teacher prep:
 1. CSPD planning/change.
 2. Link with IHES (building bridges to IHEs as "new customers").
- Materials development.

Summary: TA/D Providers must change too, e.g.:

- Information needs to be clear, easily accessible, and understandable to a broader range of "customers".
- Get together information on what works.
- Increased facilitation with variety of collaborators (general education, IHEs).
- Define "leadership" for systems of TA/D (federal, state, etc., levels).

GROUP THREE

- Strong Commitment - bottom and top.
- Grassroots has say.
- Ownership.
- Empowerment.
- Shared vision.
- Planning time.
- Emphasis on logistics.
- Total support of all students.
- Creativity in new roles.
- New perspective on parent involvement.
- Community involvement.
- Early involvement through part H.

Implications for TA & Dissemination:

- Provide leadership and support.
- Strategic planning assistance.
- Less restrictive—more strategic coordination.
- Provide information on:
 1. "How tos".
 2. Subsidies.
 3. Models- linking models.
 4. Personnel and family.
 5. Trainings.
- Provide information on community resources.
- Help with processes to get information on finances.
- Address diverse schools/systems, not just easy ones.
- Connecting with state resources (i.e. State maps- state specific information).
- Should we be training personnel? Possible options:
 1. Make videotapes of trainings for dissemination.
 2. Train local level (grass roots) on how to do strategic planning for their area.
- Ask stakeholders what they need.
- Identify impact at all levels, down to students.
- Facilitate a process to develop a vision for each specific group.
- Strong training of personnel.
- Resources? What about finance.
- Priority- School commitment determines allocation.
- Inclusive Resources - Should be part of school improvement and involve all aspects.
- Administration should present inclusion as an option.
- Allow for time to implement.
- TA should match a group's vision.

Systems Change - Transition

GROUP ONE

Points from David's presentation:

- Follow-along/follow-up—outcome data to determine success.
- Need for collaborative teams to effect systems change—need for commitment to change systems.
- Need (SEA/LEA/others (communities) to effect change—collaborative meshing.
- Must maintain a sense of humor.
- Networking for common causes.
- Transmission of information and data to adult service providers.
- Shift happens—interagency cooperative agreements (formal papers) need to be implemented and can work.
- Collaboration—difficulty of pulling agencies together—to accomplish goals.
- Optimistic that cooperation will occur.
- Case management—systems in place to get individuals to a point—but transition to adult life isn't accomplished.
- Collaboration part—different agencies/efforts not connected.
- Moving forward despite complications.
- Transition may be a concept that is difficult for parents to grasp.
- No way of sustaining/maintaining efforts we've started.
- Connections to/with other regular education TA providers—to look beyond special education—eg. Chapter 1, compensatory education, bilingual.
- How do we tie systems change efforts together to avoid duplication.
- How do we get the huge amount of information out to the folks who need it.
- No way of sustaining/maintaining efforts we've started.

*Implications for TA & Dissemination
what we can do differently:*

- Practical linkages between projects—concrete/absolute/practical—"actions that are do-able" — direction which is reality-based not concept based.
- Promoting transition—include other TA providers work into our efforts.
- How do we set the stage for families—early on (Part H)—so they expect/know about eventual transition of child in future.

- Research and evaluation—outcomes are predetermined—we need to know how to reach outcomes—which is process—we must change our evaluation methodology.
- Our audiences will be much more inclusive.
- We must give up—our trust that “things will work out”.
- We must acquire new skills.
- Connections to/with other regular education TA providers—to look beyond special education—eg.
- Emphasis on linking information with TA to provide a more comprehensive set of services.
- Shift in power between different parties involved in order to truly collaborate.
- Shared/joint decision making between multiple agencies—from competitive to collaborative.
- Funding may shift philosophy.
- More pronounced leadership from OSEP.
- More leadership from the field.

Reflections:

- Overwhelming—what do we do as service providers with individual in field who don't have high levels of expertise in this area.
- Changing attitudes—how to do this is quite perplexing, we approach day to day efforts to solve
- Reaching out to other groups which we haven't done in past—labor-intensive efforts, how can we collectively work together on similar tasks?
- Complexity and multiple systems and audiences—also economic and demographic variables.
- How do we not miss important opportunities?
- What is the impact of our work on this generation of students?
- Issues of uncertainty—direction(s) will take.
- Need for flexibility as we change—step beyond boundaries toward collaboration/cooperation.

Priority focus for next steps:

- Link to School to Work Transition—GOALS 2000—special education and regular education must work together—regulations will be written soon.
- Link with existing efforts on transition.
- Coordinated definitions of transition across RSA, NIDER, OSEP/DOE that drives TA & dissemination, research, evaluation, practice—once accomplished, this could drive the direction of RFPs released by the Federal Government.

GROUP TWO

- Use of follow-up data to track long-term efficacy of projects.
- Getting clients involved in their own transition planning.
- Linking things in school to student's goals/vision.
- Don't base a transition program on an individual.
- Create strategies for schools to connect with adult services providers in community—individualized to specific community.
- Collaboration has to be articulated from state level.
- Maintain ongoing communication among all entities at all levels.
- Support over time—TA, fiscal.
- Early and careful planning (12-14 years) including student, student's family and friends (life planning).
- Best inservice training is to advocate for another individual.
- Follow the spirit of the law vs. the letter of the law.
- Recognize urgency of issue vis a vis data we now have—also, appreciate what has been accomplished.
- Need to integrate all reform/innovation efforts.
- Training—broad, dealing with reform, for everyone.
- Create participatory processes to value parent input (tends to be ad hoc where it's being done).
- Have young people with disabilities, who have successes to share, provide training.
- Need to streamline process to make it easier.
- Find ways to include families that are traditionally under-represented—use of natural groupings.
- Letter of law is important, too—working for a mandate that requires certain behaviors.
- Look at models outside of U.S. (eg., Germany and Japan).

Implications for TA & Dissemination: what do we do differently?

- TA providers actively engage with providers in other disciplines—Rehab, etc. (maybe conduct joint meetings, have forums, develop models).
- Bring stakeholders in to participate in TA—require it as a condition of TA—including evaluation.
- As we identify things that need to be done, make them conditions of services. And be willing to back out if not met.
- Signing on for long-term TA, like interagency collaboration, when we know that's what it will take.

- Find ways to better collect data and follow what happens to these kids.
- Include Independent Living Centers in TA.
- Educate each other and beyond (broaden the audience).
- Proactively package information on funding streams, what Rehab providers, etc.
- Use/package/synthesize model demonstration projects.
- Promote use of MAPs or similar life planning process (P.F.P., etc.).

GROUP THREE

- Making specific agreements.
- Need for collaboration.
- Need to track results, document results, continually measure results/outcomes.
- Interagency collaboration in linking to share records, IEPs, etc.
- Need to understand context of systems change.

Implications for TA & Dissemination:

- Individualize on state by state basis.
- Understand how to create change outside school system.
- Need to work in different ways with outside—agencies, businesses.
- Responsibility to provide families with information and help to manage their child's "case" and self-management for students.
- Look at all transitions (school to school-level to level, etc.).
- Teach families to negotiate.
- Projects should work in teams.
- Promote communication among professional groups/projects within states and nationwide.
- Collaborate on activities.
- Share finances, control.
- Study feasibility of various kinds of collaboration (Why do we need to collaborate?).
- Study how to use families effectively in TA delivery.
- Make information available outside our "Traditional" audiences—"how to" information.
- Connect with other state and local groups to assist with information dissemination.
- Enlist families to carry information "banner".
- Work with families in non-adversarial manner.
- Establish collaborative relationships.

Appendix D

OSEP TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE Preliminary Results

Development and Dissemination of Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire was to provide a general overview of OSEP's TA and Dissemination projects. Items on the questionnaire were initially generated by a workgroup consisting of members from each of OSEP's Divisions in addition to staff from the Federal Resource Center and NICHCY. The final questionnaire went through several cycles of edits and refinement.

The questionnaire was mailed to 25 technical assistance and dissemination projects, all funded through OSEP. Projects were given approximately 30 days to respond. Projects were instructed to select from among their staff those persons most knowledgeable in each area of the questionnaire (i.e., Project Information, Project Organizational Structure, Information Management, etc.) in order to provide responses for specific items. Projects were informed that the aggregate information resulting from the questionnaire would be presented at OSEP's Fourth Annual TA & Dissemination Conference being held on January 27-29, 1994, in Arlington, Virginia.

Questionnaire Response

Follow-up was conducted by mail and telephone during the first week in January. Final follow-up phone calls were placed to all projects that had not returned their questionnaires by Friday, January 14th. Friday, January 21st was the cut-off date for questionnaires to be included in the preliminary analysis. Twenty-two of the twenty five projects (or 88%) responded to the questionnaire before the cut-off date. All responses were used in the data analysis.

Data Analysis

A number of items were selected from the questionnaire to develop a general profile and description of the TA and Dissemination projects. In addition, these items were selected for analysis in order to determine whether or not further information should be gathered for an in-depth analysis of the OSEP TA and Dissemination Network. Items selected were coded and entered into SPSS-PC for descriptive data analysis.

Limitations

- These results do not include all of OSEP's TA and Dissemination Projects.
- The questionnaire was not pilot-tested to determine the validity and reliability of individual items.
- It needs to be emphasized that these are preliminary results and intended for descriptive purposes only. Items were chosen to provide a general profile and description of the TA and Dissemination Network. The data should not be used for comparative or causal purposes.

RESULTS**Project Information**

Question: Area you serve?

Area	Percent	Number
• National	73.0	16
• Regional	27.0	6
• State	0	0
• Local	0	0

Question: Primary focus?

Primary Focus	Percent	Number
• Technical Assistance	46.0	10
• Dissemination	18.0	4
• Technical Assistance and Dissemination	32.0	7
• Other	5.0	1

Question: Classification?

Classification	Percent	Number
• Grant	14.0	3
• Contract	14.0	3
• Cooperative Agreement	73.0	16

Population Served

Question: Target audience(s)? Identify primary and secondary (Check all that apply).

Target Audience	Percent
Primary	
• SEA Administrators	70.0 (14)
• Special Ed Teachers	42.0 (8)
• Related Service Professionals	37.0 (7)
• Parents	35.0 (7)
• Policy Makers	33.0 (7)
• Persons with Disabilities	32.0 (6)
• Teacher Trainers	32.0 (6)
• Researchers	28.0 (5)
• Advocacy Organizations	26.0 (5)
• General Public	24.0 (4)
• Regular Ed Teachers	16.0 (3)
Secondary	
• SEA Administrators	74.0 (14)
• Regular Ed Teachers	68.0 (13)
• Related Service Professionals	58.0 (11)
• Persons with Disabilities	58.0 (11)
• Policy Makers	57.0 (12)
• Teacher Trainers	53.0 (10)
• Advocacy Organizations	53.0 (10)
• Special Ed Teachers	53.0 (10)
• Researchers	50.0 (9)
• Parents	50.0 (9)
• General Public	47.0 (8)
• SEA Administrators	40.0 (6)

Types of Services Available

Question: Which of the following TA and Dissemination Services are provided by your project?
(Check all that apply.)

TA & Dissemination Services	Percent	Number
• Product Development (fact sheets, brief papers, curricula)	91.0	20
• Meetings/Conferences	86.0	19
• Telephone Consultation	82.0	18
• Referral	77.0	17
• Individually-prepared packets in response to specific requests	77.0	17
• Prepared information packages	77.0	17
• Literature Searches	68.0	15
• Needs Assessment	68.0	15
• On-site Consultation	64.0	14
• Teleconferencing	64.0	14
• Database searches	64.0	14
• Program evaluation	55.0	12
• Targeted mailings	55.0	12
• Training	55.0	12
• Strategic Planning	50.0	11
• Information on alternative formats	50.0	11
• Database development	50.0	11
• E-mail	50.0	11
• Subscriptions (project newsletters, bulletins, etc.)	41.0	9
• Electronic bulletin boards	41.0	9
• Mailing lists	36.0	8
• Consultant Registry	36.0	8
• Technology	36.0	8
• Product ordering and fulfillment	27.0	6
• Media outreach	23.0	5
• TA/Dissemination materials in other languages	18.0	4

Question: In the past 12 months, how many information requests has your project received?
(Number)

Number of Requests	Number of Projects
• Less than 1000	13
• 1000 to 9,999	3
• 10,000 +	2
Total Requests = 96,598	18

- 96,595 total requests from 18/22 projects
- 10,000+ are dissemination projects (NICHY & HEATH)

Question: How do you decide what type(s) of TA and Dissemination services to provide?
(Check all that apply.)

Method	Percent	Number
• Priority setting through contact with primary users	77.0	17
• Federal/state mandate or priority	73.0	16
• User survey data	64.0	14
• User follow-up data	50.0	11
• Advisory board activities & data	49.0	11
• Unsolicited user feedback	50.0	11
• Special task force/workgroup activities and data	50.0	11
• Analysis of user demographics	41.0	9
• Other	27.0	6

Question: How do your audiences access your services?
(Check all that apply.)

System	Percent	Number
• Telephone	100.0	22
• Mail	100.0	22
• Fax	95.0	21
• Electronic Network	77.0	17
• Telephone (TDD/TT)	64.0	14
• Telephone (Toll free)	27.0	6
• Walk-in	27.0	6

Project Organizational Structure

Question: How many staff does your project employ?
(Please write the number of positions for each category.
Include subcontract staff, if appropriate.)

Position	Full Time	Part Time	Volunteer	Graduate Assistant
• Administrative Staff (PD, Asst. PD, Coordinator)	28	31	0	0
• Information Specialist	22	8	1	5
• Technical Assistance Specialist	39	15	0	9
• Research Associate/ Assistant/ Content Specialist	8	14	0	10
• Librarian	3	0	0	0
• Computer/Systems Analyst	3	4	0	0
• Database Coordinator	2	1	0	1
• Support Staff (secretary, editor, administrative assistant, logistics planner, data entry)	51	32	0	5

- This is an overall look at the TA & Dissemination Network

Question: How are overall project activities evaluated?
(Check all that apply.)

Method	Percent	Number
• Evaluation forms after presentations with groups	86.0	19
• Telephones	64.0	14
• Surveys	59.0	13
• Mailed questionnaires	50.0	11
• Other	41.0	8
• Quality review panel		
• Field evaluation experts		
• Informal input		
• Reports to OSEP		
• Focus Groups		
• Consultant review/External evaluators		
• Extensive evaluation plan		
• Structured interviews		

Question: How is the overall project evaluated?
(Check all that apply.)

Method	Percent	Number
• Internal Review	77.0	17
• Independent External consultants	55.0	12
• Use different methods	36.0	8
• Surveys		
• Staff evaluation		
• Client satisfaction		
• OSEP external review		
• Focus groups		
• Long & short-term outcome evaluation		
• Consortium review		
• Data collected from requests		

Information Management

Question: How are information results stored/maintained?
(Check all that apply.)

Information System	Percent	Number
• Microcomputer database	86.0	19
• Library/resource collection	82.0	18
• Rolodex/card catalog	18.0	4
• Microfilm	9.0	2
• Mainframe database	5.0	1
• CD-ROM	5.0	1

Question: Do you use a computerized system for information management?

Usage	Percent	Number
• Currently use	91.0	20
• Planning to use	9.0	2
• Not planning to use	0	0

Question: Databases maintained?
(Check all that apply.)

Database	Percent	Number
• Mailing list	86.0	19
• Bibliographic	77.0	17
• Request processing & reporting	46.0	10
• Referral to organizations	41.0	9
• Consultant	41.0	9
• Conference	27.0	6
• Other	27.0	6

Question: Networks accessed?
(Check all that apply.)

Network	Percent	Number
• LocalNet	86.0	19
• Internet/Alnet	77.0	17
• CompuServe	18.0	4
• Other	18.0	4

Product Development

Question: Type of print products developed by your project?
(Check all that apply.)

Print Products	Percent	Number
• Issue Papers	82.0	18
• Brochures	59.0	13
• Proceedings Documents	59.0	13
• Bibliographies	59.0	13
• Fact Sheets	55.0	12
• Newsletters	55.0	12
• Directories	55.0	12
• Training Manuals	46.0	10
• Curricula	14.0	3

Question: Do you produce products in alternative formats?
(Check all that apply.)

Format	Percent	Number
• Braille	42.0	8
• Diskette	42.0	8
• Large print	32.0	6
• Audio tape	26.0	5
• Video tape	21.0	4
• Video tape - Captioned	17.0	3
• Video tape - Descriptions	11.0	2
• CD-ROM	11.0	2
• Other	5.0	1

Question: Are these produced in other languages?

Alternative Formats	Percent
Other languages	5.0 (n=1)

Question: Rate the significance of the following to developing and maintaining the
OSEP TA/Dissemination network? (Circle the appropriate response.)

Item	Mean (N=22)
• Electronic networking capabilities	1.2
• Sharing information resources/products	1.4
• Sharing TA/Dissemination needs and accomplishments	1.5
• Shared outreach ideas	1.5
• Funding	1.6
• Increased staff expertise in provision of TA/dissemination	1.6
• Collaborative product development	1.9
• Shared policies among federal agencies promoting collaboration	1.9
• Standardized processes for managing information resources	2.1
• Standardized procedures for maintaining databases	2.2
• Federal/state legislation requiring collaboration	2.4
• Compatible software across projects	3.0
• Compatible computer hardware across projects	3.1

Scale:

- 1 = Highly Significant
- 2 = Significant
- 3 = Somewhat Significant
- 4 = Not Significant

Appendix E

SEA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/DISSEMINATION SYSTEMS QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS

Development and Dissemination of Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire was to provide information on the technical assistance and dissemination systems in place at the State level, and how those systems operate to provide information to the LEAs. Initial suggestions for items on the questionnaire were made by a workgroup consisting of members from each of OSEP's Division in addition to staff from the Federal Resource Center and NICHCY. The final questionnaire went through several revision cycles.

The questionnaire was provided to the six Regional Resource Centers for dissemination to the SEAs within their region (for the purposes of this study, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is considered as a separate SEA). SEAs were given approximately two weeks to submit their responses to the RRCs, who in turn, forwarded them to the FRC.

Questionnaire Response

Forty-five out of fifty-one (88%) SEAs returned their questionnaire in time to be included in the preliminary analysis that was presented at the TA & Dissemination Conference on January 29, 1994. Another two SEAs submitted their questionnaire after the deadline, bringing the final response rate to 92%. All 47 SEA responses are included in the data tables reported below.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire items were coded and entered into SPSS-PC for descriptive data analysis. Only aggregate data are reported from this analysis. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for each of the response choices. One question was dropped from the analysis due to ambiguity in the responses.

Limitations

- The questionnaire did not collect information on U.S. Territories due to the fact that they closely resemble LEAs in the way they provide TA.
- The questionnaire was not pilot-tested to determine the validity and reliability of individual items.
- It needs to be emphasized that these results are intended for descriptive purposes only. Items were chosen to provide a general profile and description of State-level TA & Dissemination systems. The data should not be used for comparative or causal purposes.

RESULTS

Question : How does the SEA decide what kinds of technical assistance, information, training or other assistance to provide to LEAs?

N=47

Method	Frequency	Percent
Findings of SEA Monitoring	47	100
SEA Advisory Council	40	85
CSPD	40	85
Federal/State Mandate	38	81
Complaints/Due Process Hearings	37	79
Priority Setting Through Long Range Planning Process	36	77
Issues Raised Through Telephone Inquiries	35	74
Analysis of LEA Reporting Data	33	70
State Plan	32	68
Incentive or Special Project Grant Application Process	28	60
Formal Assessment of Target Groups	28	60
Focus Groups	24	51
Public Hearings/Forums	21	45
Emerging Needs Identified by Demographic Studies	19	40
Other	6	13
Issues raised by LEAs		
Other State Advisory Councils		
Upon request of districts & developmental preschools		
Project's annual workscope plans		

- To help determine what technical assistance, information, training or other assistance to provide to LEAs, 28 of the 47 SEAs responding to the questionnaire conduct formal assessments of the following target groups:

n=28

Target Group	Frequency	Percent
LEA Directors	25	89
Special Education Teachers	21	75
Regular Education Teachers	21	75
Related Services Providers	20	71
Parents	19	68
Advocates	15	54
Other	14	50
CSPD Plans (3)		
IHEs (2)		
SEA Staff (2)		
By Projects		
Paraprofessionals		
Professional Organizations		
Regular Ed Administrators		
State Advisory Council		
Transition Systems Change Project		
Informal Information Gathering		

Question: Does the SEA support project(s) or center(s) for the purpose of providing technical assistance and/or information dissemination?

- Eighty-five percent (40) of the 47 SEAs responding to the questionnaire reported supporting project(s) or center(s) for the purpose of providing technical assistance and/or information dissemination.
- These project(s)/center(s) and networks include: n=40

Type of Project(s)/Center(s)	Frequency	Percent
Single, Topic Specific Project/Center	29+	73
• Assistive Technology (7)		
• Inclusion (6)		
• Behavior Intervention (5)		
• Secondary Transition (5)		
• Early Childhood (2)		
• Autism (2)		
• Assisted/Augmented Communication (2)		
• Access		
• ADD		
• Administration of Special Education		
• Assessment		
• CSPD		
• Deaf/Blind		
• Disability		
• Early Childhood Sensory Impairments		
• Early Childhood Transition		
• Evaluation of Student Achievement		
• Facilitated Communication		
• Instruction/Support		
• Moderate-Severe Disabilities		
• Outcomes		
• Parent Education		
• Preschool		
• Proportional Representation		
• Sensory Impairments		
• Special Education Partnerships		
• Systems Change		
General TA & Dissemination Project/Center	27	68
General TA & Dissemination Network	27	68
Topic Specific Network	19+	48
• Assistive Technology (9)		
• Inclusion (4)		
• Behavior Disorders		
• Best Practices		
• Bureau of Indian Services		
• Communication		
• Early Childhood		
• Early Childhood Sensory Impairments		
• Education Direction		
• Deaf/Blind		
• Emotional/Behavior Disorders		
• IEP/LRE Training		
• Instructional Support		
• Leadership Training		
• Outcomes		
• Secondary Transition		
• Sensory Impairments		
• Traumatic Brain Injury		

+ Some respondents reported supporting multiple centers or networks

Question: Which of the following technical assistance services does the SEA provide?

n=46

Type of Service	Frequency	Percent
Inservice Training	46	100
Telephone Consultation	45	98
Conferences/Workshops	45	98
On-Site Consultation	44	96
Information Product Development	39	85
Support for Outside Consultant Services	36	78
Database Access	22	48

- The 46 SEAs providing inservice training reported providing it at the following levels:

n=46

Level	Frequency	Percent
Statewide	45	98
Regional	45	98
District	39	85
Local	34	74

Question: How are best practices, promising practices and research finding identified for incorporation into TA and information delivery to LEAs?

n=46

Method Used	Frequency	Percent
Expert Consultants	38	83
Literature Review	37	80
Advisory Panel	28	61
Database Searches	24	52
Other	24+	52
•RRCs (8)		
•Conferences (4)		
•CSPD Council/Sub-committee (2)		
•Field-based Data/Observations (2)		
•Other State Agencies (2)		
•Statewide Projects (2)		
•TA & Dissemination Projects (Other than RRCs) (2)		
•National Diffusion Network Project (2)		
•Counterpoint		
•DOE Statewide Weekly Television Production		
•LEA Group		
•NASDSE		
•On-site training & TA		
•Other States		
•Professional Groups		
•SEA Consultants		
•SpecialNet		
•Staff		
•State Application & Review Process		

- + Some respondents provided multiple "other" responses

Question: If follow-up is conducted on technical assistance activities, what are the methods used?

n=44

Method of Follow-Up	Frequency	Percent
•Evaluation Forms	32	73
•Site Visits	25	57
•Interviews	20	45
•Questionnaires	15	34
•External Evaluators	14	32
•Other	5	11
•Documentation from LEA		
•Documentation by Provider		
•Annual FY Questionnaire		
•Informal Reaction		
•Peer Evaluation Model		

Question: What dissemination vehicles does the SEA use to get information to LEAs?

n=46

Dissemination Vehicles	Frequency	Percent
•SEA Policy Memo, Bulletin	46	100
•Newsletter	13	28
•Counterpoint	28	61
•Teleconferences	27	59
•Electronic Bulletin Boards	25	54
•E-Mail	21	46
•Other	29	63
•Conferences/Meetings (8)		
•Formal Publications /Products (5)		
•Formal Publications /Products (5)		
•Administrator's Advisory Meetings (3)		
•Inservice/Workshops (3)		
•Brochures (2)		
•Interactive Video Broadcasts (2)		
•Regional Networks (2)		
•SpecialNet (2)		
•TA Papers (2)		
•Data Base		
•Direct Mailings		
•Leadership Institutes		
•Pamphlets		
•Phone Contact		
•Telebroadcasts		

+ Some respondents provided multiple "other" responses

Question: What dissemination vehicles does the SEA use to get information to parents and advocates?

n=46

Dissemination Vehicles	Frequency	Percent
•SEA Policy Memos, Bulletins	34	74
•Newsletters	34	74
•Teleconferences	13	28
•Counterpoint	11	24
•Electronic Bulletin Boards	10	22
•E-Mail	8	17
Other	34+	74
•Conferences/ Meetings (10)		
•Parent Centers /Advocacy Groups (10)		
•Formal Publications/Products (4)		
•Advisory Boards/Panels (3)		
•Direct Mail (2)		
•Inservice/Workshops (2)		
•Brochures		
•ICC		
•Interactive Video Broadcasts		
•Pamphlets		
•SpecialNet		
•Telebroadcasts		

+ Some respondents provided multiple "other" responses

Question: Are information requests from LEAs recorded/tracked by the SEA?

- Fifty-seven percent (27) of the 47 SEAs responding to the questionnaire reported tracking information requests made by LEAs. The methods that they reported using include:

n=27

Method of Recording/Tracking	Frequency	Percent
•Hard Copy	18	67
•Database	11	41
Other	7+	25
•Data base for complaints only (2)		
•By individual consultants (3)		
•Programs/units track their areas (2)		
•Informal logs & materials request lists		
•Review district reports		

+ Some respondents provided multiple "other" responses

Question: Does the SEA have grants, contracts and/or formal interagency agreements with other organizations/agencies to provide TA and information to LEAs?

N=47

Method	Frequency	Percent
•Grants and Contracts	40	85
•Formal Interagency Agreements	26	55

Appendix F**SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY of RAY RIST**

- Dobyns, L., & Crawford-Mason, C. (1991). *Quality or else : The revolution in world business*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hall, G., Rosenthal, J., & Wade, J. (1993, November/December). *How to make reengineering really work*. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 119-131.
- Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Nakanura, R.T., & Smallwood, F. (1980). *The politics of policy implementation*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pressman, J.L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation* (3rd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stata, R. (1989, Spring). *Organizational learning : The key to management innovation*. *Sloan Management Review*, 30, 63-74.
- Yin, R. (1985). *Studying the implementation of public programs*. In W. Williams (Ed.), *Studying implementation*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.