National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN FACILITATING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAMS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

by

Aileen Lew

B.Sc., University of British Columbia, 1970

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS
in the Faculty
of
Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

March, 1992

APPROVAL

Name: Eileen Lew

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: The Role of the Principal in Facilitating Educational Change Through the Development of School Support Teams For the Integration of Students with Special Educational Needs

Examining Committee:

Chair: Mike Manley-Casimir

Leone M. Prock
Senior Supervisor

Peter Coleman
Professor

Candace Soler
Deputy Superintendent of Schools(Burnaby)
External Examiner

Date Approved April 2, 1992

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN FACILITATING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAMS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Author:

(signature)

Aileen Lew

(name)

92.04.02

(date)

ABSTRACT

The role of the principal in facilitating the changes necessary for successfully meeting the educational needs of all students in the neighbourhood school is discussed in the context of a literature review of recent work in educational change and school restructuring, mainstreaming and special education, school support teams and collaborative problem-solving, and the changing role of the principal in the schools of today and the schools of the future.

Themes and factors of educational change theory are supported by the work of leaders in the field of educational reform. An investigation of the phases of the change initiative, mainstreaming, and the role of the principal in facilitating the effective implementation of the change initiative is the focus of this discussion. Mainstreaming, a concept defined by law-makers and special educators over fifteen years ago, is still in its infancy. The question is asked, "Why?"

Recent studies in school improvement indicate that collaborative school cultures and reflective practices are key elements in educational change. Building on the model of collaborative problem solving, school support teams are presented as an effective means to assist in solving the problems inherent in attempting to meet the needs of all students in the neighbourhood school. School support teams serve as a forum for special education teachers and classroom teachers to collaboratively plan, monitor and evaluate strategies

for the integration of children with special educational needs into the regular classroom and, simultaneously, involve teachers and administrators in talking about beliefs and values, instructional strategies and rationales.

Recent work on educational change, on restructuring and on transformational leadership forms the basis for an examination of the role of the principal in facilitating change through the development and maintenance of school support teams. The principal is seen as a key to developing a collaborative culture, shared beliefs and values, as well as resource support and commitment, resulting in a school in which everyone is continually learning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

> ... transformational school leaders are in more or less continuous pursuit of three fundamental goals: 1) helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; 2) fostering teacher development; and 3) helping them solve problems together more effectively (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9).

Background

In the past decade, the call for change in education has progressed from a quiet cry heard by few to a powerful message affecting everyone involved in the process of education. Educators have called to question deeply embedded beliefs and traditional practices. Change in education, as envisioned by Michael Fullan (1991), Roland Barth (1990, 1991), Carl Glickman (1990), Karen Louis and Matthew Miles (1990) and Seymour Sarason (1990), is not a superficial refining of school as it exists today but a major structural re-alignment. "Such a redesign must begin, I believe, with a fundamental reconceptualization of the purpose and vision that will provide the framework out of which restructured schools might emerge to meet the needs of the twenty-first century" (Schlechty, 1990, p. 34).

"Special education" epitomizes the need for change in education. The term, "special education", implies a need for educational segregation of students according to differences from some norm, a concept clearly at odds with a vision of a society comprised of a diversity of people, each

with different strengths, all functioning as equals. An educated citizen, according to B.C. Ministry of Education Year 2000: A Framework for Learning is one who is "... cooperative, principled and respectful of others regardless of differences; aware of the rights and prepared to exercise the responsibilities of an individual within the family, the community, Canada and the world" (Province of British Columbia, 1989b, p.3). To reach this goal, policy makers have focussed initiatives on the need to educate all students in the least restrictive environment, generally considered to be the neighbourhood school (Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd & Bryan, 1988, Jones & Southgate, 1989, LeBaron, 1990, McBride, 1989, Poirier, Goguen & Perry, 1988, Sarason & Doris, 1979, Wiederholt & Lee, 1989).

Mainstreaming, the integration of students with special educational needs into the regular classroom, is supported by legislative changes occurring over the last few years (MacKay, 1987a, 1987b, Sussel, 1988, Sussel & Manley-Casimir, 1987). The result is a growing need for collaborative planning, group decision-making, school-based problem-solving, improvement in instructional strategies for all students and informed leadership (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990, Booth & Swan, 1987, Brain, 1987, Chalfont, VanDusen Pysh & Moultrie, 1979, Graden, 1989, Haydek, 1987, Will, 1986).

Administrators can play a crucial role in facilitating change in education (Barth, 1990, Fullan & Newton, 1988, Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987, Leithwood, Rutherford & van der Vegt, 1987, Wilson,

1989). Leaders must be able to involve all staff in developing and articulating a vision, and in planning and implementing the changes necessary for the successful attainment of the goals inherent in the vision (Conley & Bacharach, 1990, David, 1989, Deal, 1986, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, Glickman, 1990, Louis & Miles, 1990). Research addressing the role of the administrator in facilitating change is applicable to the specific role of the principal in facilitating change in how students with special educational needs are educated and how teachers are supported during the fundamental shift of long-held beliefs and structures relating to special education (Phillips & McCullough, 1990, Schlechty, 1990, Wangberg, 1987).

Mainstreaming is a focal point of change in the 1990's (Sarason, 1990). Fullan's cautionary reminder that change takes time finds credence in the issue of change in the educational environment of students with special educational needs (Fullan, 1991). Fifteen years have passed since the first American legislation called for education of all students in the least restrictive environment, yet movement towards a full-scale integration of students with special educational needs has generally been slow (Sarason, 1990, Wiederholt, 1989).

Schools throughout B.C. use school support teams consisting of administrators, classroom teachers, special education teachers, district personnel and, occasionally, parents to work together to develop an appropriate program for students with special educational needs (Brain, 1987, McBride, 1989). The development of school support teams is one

strategy for assisting in the program and placement decisions attendant to the integration of students with special educational needs in the regular classroom (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990, Brain, 1987, Graden, 1989, Haydek, 1987, Chalfont, VanDusen Pysh & Moultrie, 1979, Will, 1986). As administrators, classroom teachers and special education teachers became increasingly aware of the need for resource people to assist teachers as well students, the role of special educators and the expectations from school support teams changed considerably (Cosden, 1990).

The role of the administrator in facilitating educational change through the implementation and support of school support teams to plan, monitor and evaluate strategies for the integration of children with special educational needs in the 'mainstream' forms the basis for this study. Specifically, a review of the literature and an investigation of the relationship between educational change and school restructuring, mainstreaming and special education, school support teams and collaborative problem-solving, and the changing role of the principal in the schools of today and the schools of the future should provide the starting point for future research and recommendations for implementation. Factors affecting the implementation of educational change are discussed in Chapter 2 and applied to the specific issue of mainstreaming in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the role of the administrator in facilitating change is examined and in Chapter 5, reflections on a change process are shared and recommendations for future research are made.

Statement of the problem

The purpose of the thesis is to investigate the role of the principal in facilitating educational change through the development of a school support team designed to provide a collaborative structure for solving problems involved in the integration of students with special educational needs into the regular classroom as well as to act as a forum for reflection on teaching practices. The results of the study will enable the formulation of recommendations for effective implementation and future research.

Importance of the question

The climate surrounding education in the 1990's is a complex web of issues (Sarason, 1990), initiatives (Ainscow, 1989) and pressures for educational reform (Barth, 1990, Conley, 1989, Cuban, 1988, Deal, 1986, Glickman, 1990, Perelman, 1988, Sarason, 1990, Schlechty, 1990, Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989). Fullan's work on educational change provides an analytical framework for discussion of the role of the principal in facilitating educational change through the development of collaborative problem-solving teams (Fullan, 1991). The change initiative specifically addressed in this discussion is the inclusion of students with special educational needs in the regular classroom; the collaborative team is the school support team.

Legislation mandating change is frequently ineffective in actualizing significant long-term change. As McLaughlin (1990) noted in her re-analysis of the 'Rand Change Agent' study of the late seventies:

> A general finding of the Change Agent study that has become almost a truism is that it is exceedingly difficult for policy to change practice, especially across levels of government. Contrary to the one-to-one relationship assumed to exist between policy and practice, the Change Agent study demonstrated that the nature, amount, and pace of change at the local level was a product of local factors that were largely beyond the control of higher-level policymakers (McLaughlin, 1990, p. 12).

Students with special educational needs are at the center of educational debate (Walker & Sylvester, 1991). Legislation to mandate the inclusion of students with special educational needs in their neighbourhood school has had limited effect on practice (Raynes, Snell, & Sailor, 1991). Teacher unions are focussing on class size and students with special needs as a negotiating item in the definition of workloads (Schlechty, 1990).

Stainback and Stainback (1990) suggest that the question is not whether the student *should* be educated in the neighbourhood school but what needs to be done to *ensure* that all students can successfully be educated in a natural, integrated community setting. Hopkins (1991), in his work on school improvement, identifies two goals for successful educational change: enhanced student outcomes and a strengthened capacity for the school to manage change.

School improvement literature highlights the importance of collaborative problem-solving and reflective practice strategies (Ainscow, 1991, Hopkins, 1992, Sparks-Langer, & Colton, 1991).

> Consequently the first strategy in seeking to make schools more responsive to the needs of all children is to find ways of gearing them to problem-solving. In other words I want schools to be organizations within which everybody is engaged cooperatively in the tasks of learning, both pupils and teachers (Ainscow, 1991, p. 299).

Louis and Miles (1990) studied characteristics of successful change leaders and effective change managers in their study of school improvement efforts and outcomes in urban high schools. They concluded that administrators must articulate a vision, get shared ownership, use evolutionary planning and think constantly of assistance, training, and support as a master resource that will help other staff. The results of their study emphasized, as well, the need for the prinicipal to have highly developed skills for coping with complexity and ambiguity, skills which are clearly relevant to the highly complex change initiative, mainstreaming (Louis & Miles, 1990).

An analysis of the role of the principal in facilitating educational change through the development of school support teams to support the integration of students with special educational needs in the regular classroom draws on five important issues facing educators in the 1990's: educational change, school restructuring, collaborative problem-solving, reflective practices, and effective leadership principles.

Key issues of effective leadership and the role of the principal in facilitating change are examined in a literature review. Recommendations are developed in the context of the work of modern educational research specialists.

Specific questions guiding the discussion follow:

1. What is the meaning of educational change?
2. What are the historical foundations of the present pressure for change in special education structures?
3. What fundamental changes in beliefs and organizational structures have to occur for successful institutionalization of the mainstreaming initiative?
4. Is there a relationship between the call for change in special education and the call for reform in regular education?
5. What is the role of the principal in facilitating change?
6. In which educational change theories do we find support for the development of a school support problem-solving team?
7. What role does the administrator play in ensuring that the implementation of the school support team affects change in the delivery of education to all students in the school?
8. What recommendations can be made for strategies for implementation and for future research?

Definition of key terms

A *school support team*, in this paper, is a school-based problem-solving team comprised of administrators, teachers, specialists and, sometimes, parents, who are responsible for recommending programs and strategies for students with special educational needs in regular education in the neighbourhood school.

Students with special educational needs are defined as students whose unique pattern of learning would have previously resulted in categorization and, frequently, special class placement.

Mainstreaming is defined as the inclusion of students with special educational needs in the general educational process for any part of the school day (Lewis & Doorlag, 1987); and as the process of educational decision-making and planning for 'included' students with special educational needs (Stephens, Blackhurst & Reynolds, 1988). An *inclusive school* is one in which all students are educated in the mainstream, with appropriate program and support to meet their individual needs (Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

The *least restrictive environment*, legislated as a legal right for handicapped students in U.S. Public Law (P.L.) 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, is generally accepted to mean that, as much as is possible, students with special educational needs should be

educated in regular classrooms (Sussel & Manley-Casimir, 1987, Wiederholt, 1989).

Limitations

The study is limited to an exploration, in the context of modern educational change theories, of the role of the principal in facilitating the changes inherent in providing education for students with special educational needs in the regular classroom through the development of a school support team.

Major bibliographic sources derive from the United States, as comparable documentation originating in Canada was not available. In my view, the cited references are applicable to the Canadian experience.

.

The discussion is designed to produce recommendations for administrative leadership in facilitating change through the effective implementation and support of school support teams and to define areas for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

Educational change

> If a healthy respect for and mastery of the change process does not become a priority, even well-intentioned change initiatives will continue to create havoc among those who are on the firing line. Careful attention to a small number of key details during the change process can result in the experience of success, new commitments, and the excitement and self-satisfaction of accomplishing something that is important. More fundamentally, reducing the number of failures and realizing new successes can lead to the revitalization of teaching and learning that is so desperately needed in the lives of educators and students today (Fullan, 1991, p. xiv).

The Meaning of Educational Change

Educators often lament that they wish that 'things would just stay the same for a while'. In the last decade, educators have faced constant pressure for change, the essence of which is a call for meaningful education focused on the needs of all students (Barth, 1990, Fitzpatrick, 1991, Fullan, 1985, Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989, Louis & Miles, 1990, Schlechty, 1990). For change to occur, a balance must exist between pressure for change and support for change. Fullan's work on educational change provides a framework for the following discussion of the elements evident in the pressure for change and the elements necessary to support change, as identified by current educational research in school effectiveness, school improvement and school reform (Ainscow, 1991, Barth, 1990, Fullan, 1991, Schlechty, 1990).

An understanding of the theory of educational change and the integration of specific details of the particular innovations, mainstreaming and school support teams, informs the role of the principal in facilitating the change process, the purpose of this study.

Why reform movements fail

"So much school reform has taken place over the last century yet schooling appears pretty much the same as it's always been" (Cuban, 1988, p. 342). Is the classroom of today much different from the classroom that current teachers knew as children, ten, twenty, thirty or forty years ago? The answer, it would seem, is a resounding "No!" (Barth, 1991, Glickman, 1990, Sarason, 1990).

Sarason (1990), in his book, The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform, notes that not enough attention has been afforded to altering the existing power relationships in schools and to understanding the complex interdependencies existing in school systems.

A leading educational researcher involved in the study of educational change, Michael G. Fullan, also points to the frequent failure of educational reform movements to co-relate proposals for change with the complexity of the school system (Fullan, 1985, 1990). He suggests that the field of 'effective schools research' and the resulting process-oriented recommendations are examples of change innovations which

over-simplified the complex nature of schools and failed to "consider explicitly the relationship between the nature of proposed innovations and the purposes of schools" (Fullan, 1991, p.22).

Fullan and Hargreaves comment that "reform has failed because the focus has not been on the total school and the total teacher as these relate to the learning of students" (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, p. xiii). Six reasons they give for the failure of most reform movements are:

- the problems are complex and not easily solved
- timelines are usually too short
- fads and quick-fix solutions are rampant
- the underlying issues of teacher development and change in instructional strategies are frequently overlooked
- follow-up support is usually not included in the plans
- by ignoring the teacher as the locus of change, many initiatives actually succeed in entrenching teachers further in refusal to participate in reform

Silberman's analysis of the failures of educational reform two decades ago still rings true in more recent analyses of failed innovations. Too often the central questions are not asked. "What is education for? What kind of society do we want to produce? What methods of instruction and classroom organization, as well as subject matter, do we need to produce these results? What knowledge is of most worth?" (Silberman, 1970, p.182). Are we planning for excellence? Are we truly

attempting to see each and every child reach the peak of his or her potential? (Fitzpatrick, 1991, Hilliard, 1991).

The broader goals of planned-for changes in the educational system, to enable students to become life-long learners who are successful in learning and who want to learn, remain goals, not achievements (Perelman, 1988, Shanker, 1988). Sarason points out that the changes that have occurred are not fundamental, that "the failure of educational reform derives from a most superficial conception of how complicated settings are organized: their structure, their dynamics, their power relationships, and their underlying values and axioms" (Sarason, 1990, p. 4).

Recent reform initiators seek to respond to the deficiencies identified in studies of previous attempts to institute educational reform. In one such proposal, Hopkins (1992) identifies assumptions upon which Ainscow and he built their Improving the Quality of Schooling Project. The beliefs that guided their project were that the school is the center of change, that change is managed process requiring years, and that change in education usually involves change in the school organization.

Pressure for change

The pressure for change is evident in a quick perusal of a day's newspapers and journals. Global and national economies are in a state of upheaval.

> ... to thrive in the face of intensifying international competition, accelerating technological change, oppressive public and private debt, and changes in the population and work force, the learning enterprise must become far more productive. When an economy is knowledge-based, learning becomes a strategically critical industry (Perelman, 1988, p. 20).

Schlechty, in stressing the need to define the purpose of schools within the context of current and future, social and economic, realities, states that, "Today schools are expected to *develop* aptitudes, as opposed to simply identifying them. Such expectations surely require schools that will look very different from those Americans are used to" (Schlechty, 1990, p. xviii).

Educators are not alone in their struggle to come to grips with the frantic pace of change. Peter Vaill (1989) describes the situation leader-managers face today as "the world of permanent white water" in his metaphorical Managing as a Performing Art: New Ideas for a World of Chaotic Change. How can one understand and respond to the unplanned changes abundant in our world and use that knowledge to develop and successfully implement planned change?

Pressures for change in education vary from a rash of uncomplimentary comparisons of the outcomes of our educational system with the outcomes of education systems in other countries (Barth, 1990), to changes in adult and student access to technology (Dwyer, Ringstaff, & Sandholtz, 1991), to a perceived inequity in service to some

students (Hilliard, 1991), to the increasing expectation that schools should be prepared to meet an increasingly broad spectrum of student needs (Schlechty, 1990, Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Which change initiatives are promoted by people involved in education?

The critical questions Fullan insists that we ask before plunging ahead with a change initiative are: "Who benefits from the change (the values question) and how sound or feasible are the idea and approach (the capacity for implementation question)" (Fullan, 1991, p. 18). Change facilitators must be cognizant of the potential influence of special interest groups whose reason for pressuring for educational change does not always have educational merit (Sarason, 1990).

If the answer to Fullan's question asking who benefits from the innovation is not, "all students", then a critical look must be taken at the proposed change. Specific to the initiative, mainstreaming, have enough questions been asked? Who benefits? By placing all students in the regular classroom, do the students with special educational needs benefit and, if so, in what ways? Do the rest of the students in the class benefit? If so, in what ways? Does the classroom teacher benefit? The special education teacher? Will access to education be equitable? Will the results be accountable to the public? Is there a cost benefit in mainstreaming? If so, who benefits?

And, if the answer to the values question is that mainstreaming benefits all students, then the capacity for implementation question must

be asked. Is mainstreaming feasible? Are all schools ready? Does the approach chosen give the best possible chance for success? Do the schools have the resources necessary to be successful?

Mel Ainscow (1991) applied Fullan's work on educational change to the specific issue of integration of students with special educational needs . He is critical of a simplistic approach to mainstreaming, an approach which focuses on training all teachers in special techniques.

> The approach does not take account of wider social, political and organizational factors that influence and constrain the work of teachers. As a result there tends to be a passive acceptance of curriculum and assessment policies which may themselves contribute to the creation of educational difficulties for some pupils (Ainscow, 1991, p. 298).

Ainscow proposes a shift in focus away from policy-making and towards restructuring of schools, with a focus on the issue of improvement in instruction for all students.

Reiterating the shift in attention toward the school as the center of change and the teacher as the locus of change, Glickman (1990) claims that the key to restructuring education lies in empowerment, giving teachers control of curriculum and instructional decisions. Success or failure, he suggests, rests on how well the goals of equitable access to knowledge for all students and accountability to the public are met, once that power has been relinquished.

Significant change transcends cosmetic refurbishing of the trappings of formal education, the materials, and the strategies, and attacks the core of educational institutions, the beliefs and values that guide what happens in the classroom (Dwyer, Ringstaff & Sandholtz, 1991). Changes in values, beliefs and behaviour are difficult to achieve (Fullan, 1985). "The challenge of the 1990's will be to deal with more second-order changes - changes that affect the culture of schools, restructuring roles and reorganizing responsibilities, including those of students and parents" (Fullan, 1991, p. 29).

The inconsistent results of previous change efforts emphasize the necessity to assess the nature of the change (does it make sense?) and the scope of the change (does it affect the innermost foundations of schools?) (Cuban, 1988, Fullan, 1991, Glickman, 1991, Sarason, 1990). The conditions that facilitate successful change include adequate time and insightful leadership and, most importantly, a purposeful altering of the power structures in the system based on an understanding of the culture of schools and school systems (Deal, 1985, Sarason, 1990). Superficial, short-lived change occurs when the complexity of making meaningful change in education is under-estimated (Fullan, 1991).

"The worth of particular policies or innovations cannot be taken for granted, because we cannot be sure about the purposes, possibilities of implementation, or actual outcomes of proposed changes" (Fullan, 1991, p.28). An analysis in Chapter 3 of the policies and processes involved in

the innovation of mainstreaming and school support teams provides further insight into the complex nature of these factors.

Educational change: a process

The oft-quoted "Change is a process not an event" serves to remind educators that change takes time (Fullan & Park, 1981, quoted in Fullan, 1991, p. 49). According to Fullan, institutionalization of significant educational change can be expected to require at least three years and, quite reasonably, up to ten years. The process of change is a complex process evolving over time.

> One of the most persistent tendencies of those who do not appreciate the complexities of change is to equate change with handing over a new program, which is an event. This, in fact, was the false tenet on which school improvement was based in the past. We now know that change is a process occurring over time, usually a period of several years (Hord, Rutherford, Huling, Austin & Hall, 1987, p.5).

Fullan describes the first phase, *initiation*, as the process which results in a decision to proceed. The second phase, *implementation*, is the process of attempting to put the change into effect and spans approximately 2 to 3 years. The third and last phase is *continuation*, or *institutionalization*, the process by which the change becomes an integral part of the system (Fullan, 1991).

Educational change is complex and occurring on several fronts at once. Fullan's model of educational change as three phases provides a

framework for analysis of the change process as it evolves over time and which, in fact, does not follow a linear path (Fullan, 1991). Complicating the issue further is the premise that change must occur in each individual involved in the change and that each individual approaches change and the specific innovation in a unique way (Ainscow, 1991, Fullan, 1985, 1991, Hord, Rutherford, Huling, Austin & Hall, 1987).

Initiation phase

The initiation phase marks the beginning of a change process. The process may be mandated by others or it may be decided upon by those who are responsible for implementing the plan. Fullan cautions the change facilitator not to assume that all decisions or even most decisions to proceed with an innovation are a result of a carefully analysed response to an educational need (Fullan, 1991). Eight factors he identified as associated with initiation decisions are:

- the existence and quality of innovations,
- access to innovations,
- advocacy by central administration,
- teacher advocacy
- external change agents,
- community pressure or support or apathy,
- new policy and funding,
- a problem-solving orientation (Fullan, 1991, p. 50).

Three factors identified by Fullan which may impede or facilitate the initiation of proposed innovations, depending on the degree to which each need is represented in the proposed change are *relevance, readiness* and *resources*.

Relevance describes the characteristics of the change initiative as it relates to the needs of the school. Are the changes involved in the initiative clear? Is it important enough to warrant the expenditure of time and energy? *Readiness* refers to the capacity of the school and of the individuals in the school to initiate and develop a change. Is there a shared ownership of the change to be implemented? Is there a real and a perceived need for the change? Is it a reasonable change? Are the necessary *resources* in place to lead to successful implementation? What changes need to occur in facilities, equipment, materials and support? Is there sufficient time and expertise to be successful?

Returning to Fullan's critical questions regarding the value and feasibility of a proposed change, change facilitators are advised to identify, before introducing a proposal for change, whether there is a perceived and/or real need for the change (and by whom), whether all parties who will be involved in the change are adequately prepared for the change and whether the resources needed for the change (materials, time and people) are available (Fullan, 1991).

Implementation phase

Changes, once initiated, proceed or do not proceed, to forms of implementation and continuation which, in turn, result in outcomes, intended or not intended. Fullan asks what factors and themes influence whether a change in practice will actually occur as a result of an initiated change (Fullan, 1985, 1991).

Implementation is a word heard frequently by educators. Provincial Ministries of Education, School District Boards of Education and individual schools seek to implement one initiative after another. The Royal Commission on Education (1987), and the subsequent Year 2000: A Framework for Learning (1990), marked the initiation of a change process designed to forever change the education system in British Columbia. Teachers and administrators throughout B.C. have been inundated with brochures and binders, conferences and workshops, all geared toward implementation of Year 2000 initiatives by set timelines and deadlines. Having opened the path for empowerment of teachers in deciding curricular directions, tomes filled with educational philosophy and resource guidelines have been developed to support the implementation of the Primary Program and the Intermediate Program (Province of British Columbia, 1990).

A recent change in government from Social Credit to New Democratic raises questions regarding the proposed implementation. The questions being asked are the questions Fullan identified as being

crucial to the success of the implementation. Is the change *relevant*; are the education system and society *ready* for the change; and what and where are the *resources*? The answers may well lead to a re-thinking of the approach to the implementation of the proposal. Year 2000 initiatives provide one context for the specific innovation central to the current discussion, mainstreaming of students with special educational needs and the implementation of school teams to support the change.

Fullan identified a system of factors and themes which interact to determine the success or failure of an implementation to reach the phase of routine use in schools (Fullan, 1991). Key factors are identified as the *characteristics of the change* (the need, clarity, complexity and quality or practicality of the particular change), the *local characteristics* of the change (specific details about the district, community, school, principal and teacher involved in the change) and *external factors* (including governments and other agencies). Key change themes investigated by Fullan (1991) are *vision-building, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, staff development and resource assistance, monitoring and problem-coping*, and *restructuring.*

The factors affecting implementation carry over from the initiation phase. Is there a perceived or real need for the change? In the early phases of an implementation, people involved must see a need being met, at least to some degree (Huberman & Miles, 1984). Are the goals and process clear? What specific changes in practice must occur for the proposed change to occur? Is there a false clarity, an oversimplification

of the change process? (Ruddock, 1991). How complex is the proposed change? Is the change simple enough to be easily carried out and yet not so simple as to yield little difference? Is the complexity of the change beyond the means of the school to carry it out? (Louis & Miles, 1990). Is the proposed change practical? What is the quality of the proposed change? (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

Fullan proposes that "district administrators affect the quality of implementation to the extent that they show specific forms of support and active knowledge and understanding of the realities of attempting to put a change into practice" (Fullan, 1991, p. 75). The principal is seen to be, potentially, a deciding factor for successful implementation of change. Considerable research indicates, however, that frequently the principal does not, in fact, play an active role in implementation (Fullan, 1991, Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986).

Interaction between teachers and between teachers and administrators is increasingly seen as the local factor most likely to ensure the success of an innovation (Ainscow, 1991, Fullan, 1985, 1991, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, Little, 1982, Rosenholtz, 1989). In Chapter 3, the development of school teams to support mainstreaming will be analysed in light of the premise that

> School improvement is most surely and thoroughly achieved when:

> Teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice ... By such talk, teachers build a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtue from another.
>
> Teachers and administrators frequently observe each other teaching, and provide each other with useful (if potentially frightening) evaluations of their teaching ...
>
> Teachers and administrators plan, design, research, evaluate and prepare teaching materials together.
>
> Teachers and administrators teach each other the practice of teaching (Little, 1981, quoted in Fullan, 1991, p. 78).

Themes are the embodiment of successful change processes (Fullan, 1991, Louis & Miles, 1990). *Vision-building* is seen as a dynamic, interactive process involving clarification of the goal, a shared vision of what the school should look like after the implementation, and a shared conception of the change process itself (Rosenholtz, 1989). Louis and Miles' (1990) research into school improvement in urban high schools revealed that *evolutionary planning* was a theme inherent in successful innovations. Plans grew and developed and changed to adapt to the changing context and preliminary outcomes. *Empowerment* or shared decision-making, emerged as a theme in the work of Barth (1990), Cohen (1988), Louis & Miles (1990), and Rosenholtz (1989) and as a subtheme in Glickman's (1990) work on restructuring. Investigation of the importance of support mechanisms of *staff development and resource assistance* emphasize the degree to which each must be provided over time (Huberman & Miles, 1984, Joyce & Showers, 1988, Louis & Miles, 1990). *Monitoring* of implementation processes is difficult, but critical to the theme of evolutionary planning. *Problem-solving*

resulting from carefully planned monitoring of the implementaion process can strengthen the chances of success of the change proposal (Louis & Miles, 1990). And, perhaps most critical of all, *restructuring* schools, changing the basic organization of schools and how they are run, is seen to be essential in meaningful educational change (Fullan, 1991, Schlechty, 1990). .

Schlechty, in his book, Schools for the 21st Century, leadership imperatives for educational reform, develops a proposal for how schools should be changed to meet the needs of the students of today (Schlechty, 1990).

> First, some mechanism must be created for articulating and disseminating a vision of schools that is compelling within the local context. Second, a strategy must be created for developing and marketing the vision in a way that meets local needs. Finally, decisions must be made about which structural elements must be changed to pursue the vision, and a strategy must be devised for ensuring that these changes are made and institutionalized (Schlechty, 1990, p. 45).

Fullan's factors and themes interact to form a dynamic system of variables. The degree to which the factors and themes work in concert with the particular innovation and within the specific context of the change process will determine the relative success or imminent failure of the proposed change. The factors define the specifics of the innovation and the context of the change while the themes define the symbolic underpinnings and values and beliefs inherent in the particular change.

Continuation phase

> While change in society has become commonplace, the schools remain much as they always were ... despite huge efforts, the educational system at all levels has shown a remarkable inability to implement and maintain more effective ways of teaching or to create school settings that are productive and exciting learning environments for students (Wideen, 1987, p.1).

The note of frustration evident in the words of Wideen, and others referred to previously, (Fullan, 1985, 1991, Glickman, 1990, Sarason, 1990) results from the failure to institutionalize most innovations. Many projects are initiated, several are implemented but very few innovations become lasting routines in the educational system. "Thus, false clarity occurs when people *think* that they have changed but have only assimilated the superficial trappings of the new practice" (Fullan 1991, p. 35, his emphasis).

Throughout the literature, one theme emerges to explain why even potentially good ideas stop short of becoming long-term success stories, that is, the need for meaningful collegial interaction in all phases of the change process (Ainscow, 1989, 1991, Barth, 1990, Fullan, 1985, 1991, 1992, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, Lieberman, 1990, Loucks-Horsley & Hergert, 1985, Rudduck, 1991).

Commenting on the absence of any mention of collaboration in the literature pertaining to 'effective schools research', Scott and Smith maintain that "evidence is accumulating that the nature of the

relationships among adults who live and work in schools has a tremendous influence upon the school's quality and character and on the accomplishment of its pupils" (Scott & Smith, 1990, p. v).

Sergiovanni (1992), in his work on transformational leadership, refers to the work of Susan Moore Johnson who considers teachers to be true colleagues when they are "working together, debating about goals, and purposes, coordinating lessons, observing and critiquing each other's work, sharing successes and offering solace, with the triumphs of their collective efforts far exceeding the summed accomplishments of their solitary struggles" (Johnson, quoted in Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 43).

Those who would encourage the development of a collaborative culture and support for reflective practices have learned that it is not easy for teachers to trust each other and to open their minds to suggestions for improvement from their colleagues (Barth, 1990, Blau, 1988, Cuskey, 1986, Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989, Goodlad, 1984, Little, 1982, Rosenholtz, 1989).

> It requires intensive action sustained over several years to make it possible both physically and attitudinally for teachers to work naturally together in joint planning, observation of each other's practice, and seeking, testing and revising teaching strategies on a continuous basis (Fullan, 1991, p. xiii).

Problem-solving collaboratively, sharing a vision and beliefs, talking about teaching, clarifying goals and expectations, analyzing successes and failures, making important decisions as a group, reflecting

on the effectiveness of the decisions, seeking to refine teaching strategies and defining learning outcomes, educators working together towards common goals will pave the way to meaningful educational change (Ruddock, 1991, Rosenfield, 1987, Stainback & Stainback, 1990). "The interface between individual and collective meaning and action in everyday situations is where change stands or fails" (Fullan, 1991, p. 17).

Conclusion

> Most attempts at educational reform fail...
>
> However noble, sophisticated, or enlightened proposals for change and improvement might be, they come to nothing if teachers don't adopt them in their own classrooms and if they don't translate them into effective classroom practice (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, p. 13).

The Ministry of Education of B.C. inferred the need for radical and swift change by entitling its monumental document for change, Year 2000: A Framework for Learning (1987). Within the educational system, many change movements are occurring simultaneously, the movement supporting inclusive schooling (Stainback & Stainback, 1990), the movement supporting site-based management (Caldwell & Spinks, 1988, Conley & Bacharach, 1990), the movement supporting collective bargaining (Shanker, 1988), the movement to keep students in school (Hilliard, 1991), the movement to involve other agencies (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1991), the movement proclaiming the need for restructuring (Glickman, 1990, Schlechty, 1990) to name a few. Fullan's work

provides an understanding of the dynamic multi-faceted nature of change and the factors and themes which are present to a greater or lesser degree in any proposed change (Fullan, 1985, 1991, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991).

Fullan reflects on the strategic point at which we find ourselves. Educational change does not and cannot exist in an isolated microcosm consisting of schools and school districts but only as an extension of communities and society as a whole. The daily paper and the six o'clock news portray dramatically the tension in the world today. New reform movements aimed at keeping students in school are an indication of an emerging awareness of the potential costs to the students themselves and to others around them of wayward youth and poorly educated young adults (Burke, 1991, Walker & Sylvester, 1991). Economic realities place limits on resources available to schools yet, at the same time, force increased attention on the need for skilled, competent, and confident school graduates (Schlechty, 1990).

Fullan suggests that the answer to the question, 'how can we institute meaningful change?' lies first in identifying what we are trying to accomplish: "institutional renewal with new forms of leadership, collegiality, commitment to, and mechanisms for continuous improvement" and then coming to grips with the concept that "individuals must begin immediately to create a new ethos of innovation - one that has the ability to permit and stimulate individual responsibility, and to

engage collectively in continuous initiative, thereby preempting the imposition of change from outside" (Fullan, 1991, p. 353).

Chapter 3 will analyze mainstreaming as a change initiative. Chapter 4 will address the issue raised time and again by Fullan (1985, 1991) and others (Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989, Goodlad, 1984, Little, 1982, Rosenholtz, 1989, Stainback & Stainback, 1990) that there is an overwhelming need for involvement of teachers in educational reform and that the kind of involvement necessary for improvement in schools is interactive professionalism, working together to plan, implement and refine change initiatives (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). "For teachers to remain vital, engaged, and committed to teaching, they must have time for dialogue and reflection away from the daily demands of the classroom" (Yatvin, 1992, p. 54).

CHAPTER 3

Mainstreaming

> Mainstreaming is one of the more complex changes on the current educational scene, and as such it highlights the dimensions of change and the magnitude of the task in bringing about major educational reform - valuing new beliefs; cognitively understanding the interrelationship between the philosophical principles and concrete diagnosis and treatment; changing the roles and role relationships between regular classroom teachers and special education teachers, and between school personnel and community members and professionals outside the school (Fullan 1991, p. 42).

Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming is defined as the inclusion of students with special educational needs in the general educational process for any part of the school day (Lewis & Doorlag, 1987). The process of educational decision-making and planning for students with special educational needs so that they may remain in the least restrictive environment is an integral part of the working definition of mainstreaming (Stephens, Blackhurst & Reynolds, 1988). Many other definitions exist for mainstreaming but the overall concept remains intact, that all students will be educated in a non-segregated environment as much as is possible.

Students with special educational needs

Funding is provided to B.C. school districts by the Ministry of Education for students in the following categories: mildly mentally handicapped, moderately mentally handicapped, severely and profoundly mentally handicapped, physically handicapped, visually impaired, hearing impaired, autistic, severely learning disabled, severely behaviourally disordered, rehabilitation, English as a second language/dialect, Indian education, gifted education, hospital and homebound (Province of British Columbia, 1985).

A universal policy which could adequately meet the needs of all the exceptionalities is difficult to imagine. The Ministry Special Education Handbook specifies identification, program, funding, etc. for each one (Province of British Columbia, 1985). This handbook is currently under revision.

The cascade model of student placement adopted by the Special Education branch of the B.C. Ministry of Education in 1985 envisioned fewer and fewer children being placed as the degree of restriction increased from regular classroom with no support through regular classroom with additional instructional support to part-time Special Class to Full-time Special Class and on down to the most restrictive environments of Homebound and Institutional care (Province of British Columbia, 1985, p.4.2). As increasing emphasis is placed on programming for the individual within the context of a regular classroom,

proportionally fewer children will be served in the more restrictive environments.

Pressure for change in special education

The philosophical and legal foundations of special education have undergone significant change in the past two decades throughout Canada, the United States and Great Britain. As a result, students with special educational needs are increasingly being placed in a 'least restrictive environment', an environment which most frequently translates as a regular classroom in the student's neighbourhood school, with varying degrees of support (Ainscow, 1989, Bowers, 1987, Lewis & Doorlag, 1987, Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler & Goetz, 1989, Sarason & Doris, 1979, Stephens, Blackhurst & Magliocca, 1988, Wang, Reynolds & Walberg, 1986). What pressures for change led to the mandate for mainstreaming of students with special educational needs?

There have been some important transitional stages in the progression towards the legal recognition of the rights of students with special educational needs. Prior to the 1960's, children who were considered "exceptional" were, most frequently, institutionalized and, thus, segregated from the community. During the 1960's, human rights movements brought a new awareness of the rights and the plight of the those members of our society who had been denied basic human rights a a result of their unique needs. Fairness and equality became

measures for the appropriateness of actions (McBride, 1989, Wiederholt, 1989).

An increased understanding of the potential of many handicapped children supported a greater focus on the assessment of academic and behavioural functioning in relation to the demands of the individual's environment (Ainscow, 1989, Shapiro & Kratochwill, 1988). De-institutionalization of children with special educational needs led to parental expectations that the community school should be providing education for these children as it does for their siblings and neighbours. In the past two decades, advocacy groups sprouted and became increasingly organized and vocal, asking probing questions about who should be served in regular education and how this service should be provided (MacKay, 1987b). The answer to Fullan's question regarding *relevance*, 'is there a perceived and/or real need for change in special education?', would appear to be 'yes'.

In the 1970's, in the United States of America, the justice system became instrumental in accelerating the initiation of change in how and where children with special educational needs would be educated. A notable legislative document of this period was the Education of all Handicapped Children's Act (U.S. federal legislation PL 94-192) which legislated free and appropriate education to all students (McBride, 1989, Wiederholt, 1989). Reference to individualized planning and placement in a least restrictive environment was included in the act which formalized the rights of parents to be involved in educational decisions

affecting their children (Sarason, 1990). By tying the package to state funding, the power of the act increased tremendously (Sussel, 1990).

In the 1980's, the Canadian Charter of Rights and the individual provincial School Acts addressed the issues of education and the rights of students with special educational needs (Bezeau, 1989, MacKay, 1987a, Poirier, Goguen & Perry, 1988, Sussel, 1988, Sussel & Manley-Casimir, 1987). Section 7 of the Charter states that

> Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice (Sussel, 1990, p.5).

Included in Section 15 of the Charter is the provision that

> Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and in particular, without discrimination based on ... mental or physical disability (Sussel, 1990, p.5).

The pressure for rapid change in special education indicates a lack of understanding that "real change involves changes in conceptions and role behaviour, which is why it is so difficult to achieve" (Fullan, 1991, p.38). Mainstreaming is a multi-dimensional change initiative, involving change in materials, teaching strategies, roles and beliefs. As Sarason and Doris found in their studies on mainstreaming,

> The speed with which mainstreaming as a concept, value and public policy has emerged in our society is little short of amazing. Indeed, the change has come about so fast and with such apparent general approbation as to raise a question about what people understand about

> *mainstreaming and its implications for schools. ... Because we may think mainstreaming is desirable is no excuse for assuming that institutional realities will accommodate our hopes* (Sarason and Doris, 1979, p. 355, quoted in Fullan, 1991).

Pressures opposing change in special education

Fullan (1991) reminds the change facilitator of the need for the school or the school district to be ready for a change initiative. Educators have had to reconceptualize the educational needs of the children which will be served in the regular classroom (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Both special and regular education teachers often find themselves ill-prepared to manage the diversity and complexity of demands placed on them as a result of the change in classroom composition (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990, Cosden, 1990, Raynes, Snell & Sailor, 1991).

The classroom teacher attempting to provide for the diverse educational needs of all students in the regular classroom also requires additional *resources* of time, materials, and support (Graden, 1989, Jones & Southgate, 1989, Rosenfield, 1987, Stainback & Stainback, 1990, Stephens, Blackhurst & Magliocca, 1988). To define, understand, accept and begin to change the roles of the classroom teacher and the special education teacher, the necessary teacher and administrator in-service and subsequent follow-up sessions, could place overwhelming demands for time and money on a limited resource system (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990).

The change in the role of educators has not been entirely smooth and has, at times, led to legal confrontations (Mackay, 1987b, Sussel, 1990). Sussel reported on a landmark case, *Antonsen et al v. School District No. 39, July, 1989,* involving a litigation initiated by parents asking that the court order the Vancouver School Board to provide a lower teacher-student ratio and a segregated setting for learning disabled students. In finding for the school district,

> Mr. Justice Trainor remarked that school officials are not obligated to ensure that every child entering the system achieves his or her potential... According to the new 1989 School Act, students are entitled to educational programs designed to develop students' individual potential. Parents and students are required to recognize, however, that in designing programs school boards are constrained by very real financial, resource and educational concerns (Sussel, 1990, p. 4).

No court cases in Canada have, to this point in time, tested the rights of the teacher and the other students to freedom from extreme disturbances wrought when particular students with special educational needs are placed in regular class programs (Kauffman, 1987, Yell, 1989). Bezeau (1989) contends that mainstreaming has created problems for classroom teachers and suggests that

> Emotionally disturbed children with behavioural problems integrate with difficulty both inside and outside of classes. In serious cases the integration decision must be based on the welfare of the rest of the class (Bezeau, 1989, p. 319).

The question is also being asked by teacher unions and has become a negotiating item in some school districts. The collective agreement (July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992) for the Langley School district includes provision for reduction in class size when a student with special educational needs is included in the class and further limits placement to three special needs students in any one classroom, only one of whom may have a severe behavioural disorder.

The issue of limited resources acts as a restraining force on the implementation of full inclusion mainstreaming, yet the issues of the high cost to society of drop-outs and the lack of evidence supporting the effectiveness of segregated classes tend to support the change initiative. Complicating matters further is the apparently ever increasing numbers of children who could be designated "special needs" due to societal factors such as the effects of poverty, disease, drugs and multi-culturalism (Lipp, M., presentation, 1990, O'Neill, 1991).

> The first wave of children born to crack-addicted mothers will be entering school this fall, causing a panic among parents, educators and federal and state officials who are trying to decide how to deal with their behavioural problems and learning disabilities (Anderson, 1991, p. A2).

What basic tenets of change process, as identified by Fullan (1991) apply to the innovation of mainstreaming? Are the factors and themes present to sufficient degree to predict success? Or, are there inherent flaws in the change approach adopted for mainstreaming to lead inevitably to failure?

Initiation phase

Was the decision to proceed with mainstreaming the result of a carefully analyzed response to an identified educational need? Referring to Fullan's work (1991), eight factors can be analyzed in the initiation phase: external change agents, community pressure or support or apathy, new policy and funding, advocacy from central administration, teacher advocacy, the quality of the innovation, access to information, as well as problem-solving or bureaucratic orientations (Fullan, 1991).

Mainstreaming appears to have been initiated in response to external change agents, the parents of students with special educational needs and to policy changes enacted by the federal and provincial governments and local School Boards (McBride, 1989, Sarason & Doris, 1979, Wiederholt, 1989). Factors which may serve to delay successful implementation of mainstreaming include limited funding, unclear expectations, lack of information at the classroom teacher level and increasingly confrontational approaches to problem-solving (Barth, 1990, Schlechty, 1990).

Readiness, relevance and resources

As Fullan noted, the response of educators to any proposed innovation is directly affected by the perceived *relevance* of the innovation, the level of *readiness* of the educators and of the community

and the availability of the *resources* necessary for successful implementation (Fullan, 1991).

An analysis of the *relevance* of mainstreaming points to several unique frames of reference. Within the context of the predominant philosophical theories shaping education in the latter years of the twentieth century, segregation and isolation are clearly not accepted modes for meeting the needs of any segment of the student population. However, taking into consideration the newly gained power of teacher unions and the increased emphasis on working conditions, mainstreaming is also perceived to result in increasing teacher workloads for both the classroom teacher and the special education teacher (Ainscow, 1991, Barth, 1990, Schlechty, 1991).

> Unfortunately, things between teachers and principals these days have become increasingly strained with growing emphasis on teacher empowerment, pupil minimum competency, collective bargaining, declines in student population, reduction in teacher force, increased litigation, and above all "accountability" (Barth, 1990, p. 19).

At the same time that most special educators are pushing for the acceptance of students with special educational needs in the mainstream, their colleagues are closing their classroom doors, stating that, even with support systems, students with special educational needs put too much stress on the classroom teacher (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990). Chapter Four will address the need for the principal to understand the restraining forces at play in the educational change initiative, mainstreaming of students with special educational needs.

Readiness is a concept understood, if not always responded to, by most educators. The Primary Program is founded on the premise that all students will be taught at their level of readiness. The student as a unique individual is a key issue being addressed in most recent proposals for change (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). Applying the question of readiness for mainstreaming to regular classroom teachers and special education teachers, yields a not-surprising array of readiness levels (Bowers, 1987). Classroom teachers need a founding in inclusive teaching strategies while special education teachers now require a comfort level in the consultative role (Adamson, Matthews, & Schuller, 1990, Brain, 1987, Cosden, 1990, Graden, 1989). The principal, in planning for inclusive schooling, must be cognizant of the unique readiness profile of his or her school.

Resources include tangible resources such as materials, books, and facilities but, equally as critical to success of the initiative of mainstreaming, are the less concrete but just as expensive resources of time and support (Fullan, 1991). Again, the principal must have a clear understanding of what resources are needed and how they can be provided if the innovation of mainstreaming is to succeed.

Mainstreaming was pushed along as an innovation with little apparent attention paid to the answers to Fullan's critical questions regarding relevance, readiness and resources. Carver asks whether deaf students are best served in the hearing classroom (Carver, 1984).

Ainscow states that "what we are witnessing is the inability of a teacher or group of teachers to provide classroom experiences that are meaningful and relevant given the interests, experiences and existing skills and knowledge of particular children" (Ainscow, 1991, p. 295).

The initiation phase of the educational change called mainstreaming is supported by the apparently powerful pressure for mainstreaming emerging from Ministry of Education initiatives, policies and laws and philosophical stances held by many educators and parents and restrained by the less obvious but also powerful forces in seeming opposition to mainstreaming, the teacher unions, some special educators, some parents, lack of resources and less than adequate preparation and follow-up support (Fullan, 1991, Sarason & Doris, 1979).

No difficult questions regarding the value and feasibility of mainstreaming appear to have been asked before the initiative was mandated (Wiederholt, 1989). Clearly all parties involved in the change, school administrators, teachers, parents, and students were not adequately prepared for the change and are struggling to make sense of the change (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990, Bezeau, 1989, MacKay, 1987a). The resources needed for successful implementation of mainstreaming, specifically the element of time necessary to change instructional strategies for all students, were not in place before the mandated change (Bowers, 1987).

The rights of students with special educational needs

In British Columbia, the legal rights of students with special educational needs are defined in the Human Rights Code, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and the British Columbia School Act (1989).

Human Rights Codes

Human Rights Codes prohibit discrimination by reason of physical handicaps, (and mental handicaps in some provinces not including B.C.) or through denial of accommodation, services or facilities available to the public. Although Quebec and Saskatchewan are the only provinces which specifically state that the code applies to schools, there is a possibility that the terms "accommodation", "services" and "facilities" could be successfully applied to schools (Poirier, Goguen & Leslie,1988).

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - Constitution Act (1982)

Integration of students with special educational needs into the regular classrooms could be supported by application of Section 7 (liberty) and Section 15 (equality) of the Charter of Rights. Yet to be tested is the application of the Charter to the balance of rights between the non-handicapped students and the handicapped students. "Such rights would appear to center on receiving an education free from unreasonable disturbance" (Nicholls 1989, p. 91).

B.C. School Act 1989

Sections of the B.C. School Act (1989) which specifically apply to the rights of students with special educational needs and their parents are:

Part 1 Section 1 Interpretation

Part 2

Section 2	Access
Section 11	Appeals
Section 18	Teacher's Assistant
Section 94	Provision of Educational Program
Section 103	Power and capacity
Section 104	Agreements
Section 106	Support services for schools

Ministerial Order 12/89 Support services

Ministerial Order 13/89 Special Needs Student Order

(Province of British Columbia, 1989a).

While some sections of the B.C. School Act support the right to an education, other sections support the right to conditions without which the right to education remains theoretical (Sussel & Manley-Casimir, 1987).

Part 1 Section 1 of the B.C. School Act (1989) emphasizes the definition of an educational program as a set of learning activities which are designed to enable the learner to develop his or her individual potential. Also present is the expectation that the program will be designed to enable the learner to be a productive member of a healthy society. This section has a direct bearing on the Individualized Educational Program expectations and the goals of the I.E.P. (McBride,

1989, Province of British Columbia, 1989a). Part 2 Section 2 defines the student population and does not exclude students with special educational needs.

Part 2 Section 11 gives the parents and/or the student the right and the process to appeal a decision affecting the education, health or safety of the student. Accountability for decisions made by teachers, administrators and school support teams is supported by this section. (McBride, 1989, Province of British Columbia, 1989a).

Part 2 Section 18 gives School Boards the right to hire paraprofessionals who will be expected to work under the supervision of a teacher or administrative officer. The specifics of what constitutes adequate supervision could affect local contracts as, for example, legal disputes may result in negligence charges if supervision of the paraprofessional is not apparent at the time of an incident (McBride, 1989, Province of British Columbia, 1989a).

Part 2 Section 94 gives the board discretionary rights to assign students to schools within and outside the particular district, according to the needs of the student. Also of importance to the special needs population is the inclusion of the right for a school board to permit a person who is older than school age to attend an educational school program as specified by the board (McBride, 1989, Province of British Columbia, 1989a).

The B.C. School Act, Part 2 Section 103, would appear to give the board the right to order an educational assessment (Province of British Columbia, 1989a). Since there is no mention of parental consent and since parents have the right to educate their child at home, it would seem that the board could suggest to the parent that an assessment would be required in order to develop an educational program. Parents who opposed assessment could choose to educate their child at home. This section may prove to be useful in situations where teachers and administrators and boards have felt their hands tied by parents who refuse to sign for assessments and thus who are rendering the development of an appropriate program more difficult if not impossible (McBride, 1989).

Part 2 Section 104 of the B.C. School Act allows the board to enter agreements for services including "educational services that will be under the general supervision of an employee of the board who is a member of the teachers college" (Province of British Columbia, 1989a). Control of and accountability for the quality of the service would rest with the board. Collective agreements may oppose 'contracting out' positions to employees not included in the bargaining unit.

Part 2 Section 106 introduces into legislation Ministerial Order 12/89 Support Services for Schools Order. The order is currently under scrutiny by several facets of the legal and educational community (McBride, 1989). The order indicates, in part, that the "minister shall loan to the board auditory training equipment for each student, who has been

assessed under subsection (1) as needing the equipment" but does not refer to the need for professional expertise to use the equipment with students. Another concern is the use of "shall" in the order. All districts are expected to supply services, some of which are in short supply. The omission of recognition of the need for resource specialists to work with the classroom teachers is an area of contention. Training of professionals and paraprofessionals to carry out medical procedures and the possible contravention of contract items in some districts need to be addressed (McBride, 1989).

Clearly the onus is being placed on the board and its employees for referral of students for assessment, although the identification of the specific medical treatment and intervention is not the responsibility of the board (McBride, 1989).

Ministerial Order 13/89 Special Needs Student Order ensures that a meeting is expected to be offered to the parent by the administrator in which placement of a handicapped student will be discussed. This order provides the impetus for 'least restrictive environment' decisions, such that, unless it can be shown that the student should have the program provided for in another situation, the handicapped student will be integrated in the regular classroom. The power of Order 13/89 will be a significant factor in the continuation phase of the implementation of mainstreaming.

Year 2000

Year 2000: A Framework for Learning provides the framework for the total integration of students with special educational needs in the regular classroom by the year 2000. The encouragement of multi-graded classrooms supports the entry into the classroom of students of varying ability (Province of British Columbia, 1989b).

All supporting curriculum documents are being written in this context. The mandate of the program and the goals of the sub-sections all support inclusive education As outlined in Language Arts English Primary - Graduation Position Statements (1990)

> Education is moving toward a model of integration of children with special needs into the optimum school environment ... In many cases this optimum environment will be the regular classroom. In the Language Arts English area, the goal for special needs students is expressed by the central aim statement for the entire curriculum: to enable each student to experience literature and to use language with satisfaction and confidence, striving for fluency, precision, clarity, and independence (Province of British Columbia, 1990, p. 14).

The stage was set, then, for mainstreaming by policy makers intent on forcing educators to include students with special educational needs in the regular classroom. The decision was made at government levels and reinforced to varying degrees by local School Boards. Did fundamental changes occur at the classroom level? Were there changes in materials, teaching strategies and beliefs?

Litigation affecting implementation

Three legal cases which are important to educators faced with program and placement decisions regarding students with special educational needs are the Bales case, the Elwood case and the previously mentioned Antonsen case.

The case of Bales vs. S.D. 23 (Central Okanagan) (1984) is significant in that it was expected to provide a precedent for future Charter cases. The case involved the removal of an eight year old mentally handicapped student from a special class in his community school to a special school for the handicapped some distance away. Charter section 15 was not in effect at the time. The parents sued the board for wrongful placement. The judgment upheld the placement stating that placement in the special school could not be discriminatory in a negative sense. Although the judgment upheld the placement, the judge, in his statement, indicated that he would have preferred to have found a legal reason for sending the child back into the community school (Nicholls & Wuester, 1989).

A landmark case is the case of Elwood vs. Halifax County (1987). Luke Elwood, a mentally handicapped nine year old who had been attending his community school, was ordered by the school district to attend a special segregated class at a school eighteen kilometers from his home. His parents sought and received a court injunction which allowed Luke to continue at his home school for Grade 3. Just before the

case was to come before the courts an agreement was reached. The agreement between the board and the Elwoods stated that regular class placement was most appropriate for Luke. Specifics were included regarding placement in elementary and junior secondary and the assistance of an educational support team which included the parents. Provision was made that disputes over the agreement would be handled by arbitration rather than through the courts. Although this case did not come before the courts, it is a persuasive case in that it was a court ordered agreement upholding the rights of handicapped children to a least restrictive educational environment (MacKay, 1987b, Sussel, 1989).

In Antonsen vs. S.D. 39 (Vancouver) (1989), the parents of a nine year old girl with learning difficulties sought to have the board provide specific accommodation and free tuition for their daughter. The courts failed to find in favour of the Antonsens. What is significant about the case is that the parents were seeking a more restrictive environment, that they were opposed to mainstreaming and felt that their daughter had the right to special class placement (Sussel, 1989, 1990).

Much of the evidence presented in the Antonsen case was of an educational nature, provided by educational experts, a fact which underlines the need for accountability of educational assessments and subsequent program decisions. The findings were sensitive to the issues of students with special educational needs and to the expertise shown by classroom teachers. One aspect of the case which serves to support the thesis of the current discussion is the credence afforded the policies and

practices of the school support team (Sussel, 1989). Also the court found that the board had a responsibility to provide an appropriate educational program, not necessarily the best educational program. Does equity of educational access mean equity of expected educational outcomes?

Of interest recently is the potential for legal cases involving behaviourally disordered students in the regular classroom (Fraser, 1987). Some cases regarding the protection of the rights of the behaviourally disturbed child have involved disputes regarding discipline. At this point, the ministry is drafting a guideline regarding discipline of students with special educational needs. The draft guideline indicates that when the problem behaviour is directly related to, or stemming from, an identified handicap or disability, standard disciplinary procedures may be inappropriate. In these instances, school districts will have to balance their responsibility to students with special needs with their duty to maintain order and discipline.

An analysis of the implementation process for mainstreaming and the establishment of school support teams in light of the theory of educational change as presented in Chapter 2 should lead to specific recommendations for the role of principals in facilitating the change so as to increase the possibility of long-term success of the implementation, the continuation or routine use of school support teams and the acceptance of mainstreaming as the norm (see Chapter 4).

Implementation phase

> A most critical and controversial issue facing the field of special education is the General Education Initiative (GEI) or, as it is sometimes called, the Regular Education Initiative (REI). ... Advocates of the initiative assert that these students should be educated entirely in the regular classroom, and charge that pull-out programs have largely failed. If the initiative is enacted, this indeed would be a fundamental change in the way most students with learning disabilities receive educational support (Wiederholt, 1989, p. 181).

Fullan defines the implementation phase as the "process of putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities and structures new to the people attempting or expected to change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 65).

> The reconceptualization of special education that is gradually becoming accepted is based upon a very different analysis of the nature of educational difficulty. Rather than assuming that problems arise solely as a result of the limitations or disabilities of children, it recognizes that they occur because of the interaction of a range of different factors. In other words, educational difficulties are seen as being context bound, arising out of the interaction of individual children with a particular educational programme at a certain moment in time (Ainscow, 1989, p.3).

Fullan identified a system of factors and themes which interact to determine the success or failure of an implementation to reach the phase of routine use in schools (Fullan, 1991). Not surprisingly, factors and themes similar to those that he identified are often referred to in the literature on mainstreaming and school support teams (Ainscow, 1989, Sarason & Doris, 1979).

Factors affecting implementation of mainstreaming

Fullan organized the critical factors which interact to affect the degree of success of the implementation into three sub-sets: the *characteristics of change* (need, clarity, complexity and quality and practicality), *local characteristics* (district, community, principal, teacher) and *external factors* (government and other agencies). The six themes he identified as affecting school improvement are *vision-building, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, staff development and resource assistance, monitoring and problem-coping,* and *restructuring* (Fullan, 1991). An analysis of the literature on mainstreaming and on the implementation of school support teams leads to some interesting correlations with Fullan's findings. What characteristics of change affect the implementation of mainstreaming and school support teams?

The *need* for change in education for students with special educational needs seems clear from legal and philosophical standpoints, as outlined previously. However, the need to educate all students in the regular classroom may not be quite so clear to the classroom teacher who often sees mainstreaming as adding one more problem to an already overloaded day (Pugach & Johnson, in Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

In fact, despite legislation which would enforce mainstreaming, "a tremendous growth of special education over the past decade has occurred as a result of increased *exclusionary* practices on the part of the

regular education system" (Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler & Goetz, 1989, p.242). Everyone involved in an innovation needs to feel that specific needs are being addressed and that the needs being addressed are significant. Kauffmann, in his work on students with severely deviant behaviour patterns cautions that

> Evidence does not suggest that general education classrooms are a safe haven for students whose behaviour is deviant; nor can one conclude that classrooms are made safer places and better learning environments for nonidentified students by the presence of those whose behaviour is disordered. ... we would do well to remember that youth violence is a serious problem in our society, including our schools (Kauffmann, 1987).

Clarity of the issue is complicated by the traditional categorization of students with special educational needs for the purposes of funding and by the long-held beliefs that students with special educational needs require special programming. A shift in the belief system to understand that, as Gardner stated in 1977,

> there are indeed no instructional methods that are unique to special education, ... the basic processes of developing instructional objectives using curriculum-based (formative) assessment procedures, instruction in the least restrictive environment, task analysis, reinforcement techniques, and some standards for measurement of performance prevail at all levels of education in general (Gardner, 1977, p. 17).

Understanding the *complexity of mainstreaming* as a change initiative involves an investigation of the difficulty of change required, the skills required, and the extent of change required in beliefs, teaching strategies, and use of materials (Fullan, 1991). Mainstreaming is a highly

complex change initiative involving change in belief systems, teaching strategies, teaching roles, and use of resources including materials, facilities, time and people (Wilson, 1989).

Examination of the *quality* of the mainstreaming initiative uncovers issues of insufficient time and funding to develop materials and strategies, and the need for long-term development of a supportive school culture. Teachers must perceive a change to be *practical.* Mainstreaming initiatives, although philosophically acceptable, are, frequently, lacking in practical structures for implementation and leave teachers feeling more 'needy' than before the implementation (Hopkins, 1991).

The *local characteristics* of the school district, local community, school principal and school profile affect the potential for successful implementation of mainstreaming. Are there strongly held and clearly articulated beliefs regarding learner-focused education? What support systems exist at the school district level to assist schools in implementing inclusive models? Is the school district decentralized in its decision-making? Does the school have a process for group problem-solving? Does the community have a large or small proportion of students with special educational needs? Are community services available to augment school programs? What kind of training and expectations do the teachers have? What is their union telling them? What are the beliefs and strengths of the principal? What kind of administrative support and nurturing are being offered?

What *external factors* affect the successful implementation of mainstreaming? A concept unique to the latter part of the twentieth century is the inter-agency model for providing services to children with special needs and their families. Davie, in his introduction to Evans (1989), criticized the "difficulty of achieving effective cooperation and collaboration between education, health and social services" (Davies in Evans, 1989, p. 6). Does the community have a level of social services sufficient to meet the needs of the students and families served by the school? Are the services in any way aligned to schools? Is there access to free and low-cost counselling for families in need? Thoughtful planning is needed for long-term collaboration of community and school to provide for students at risk (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1991).

Themes affecting implementation

Vision-building is accepted by many to be crucial to the success of any innovation. The people who will be involved in the change need to forge a vision of the future and to articulate that vision and continually refer back to that vision (Barth, 1990). If the vision is that the school will be able to educate all children in its catchment area, regardless of any categorical criteria, then each new situation should be held up to that vision (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). When a child who is in the low incidence level of functioning and is prone to hitting and kicking registers at a school, a staff which has not developed a clear vision of what mainstreaming will be for them in their school, could say, "no" too quickly.

A staff which has thought through their vision in advance will be able to actively seek the necessary resources to keep the child in the school (Booth & Swann, 1987, Fullan, 1991, Stainback & Stainback, 1988a).

Evolutionary planning could be the key to maintaining the student with special educational needs in the neighbourhood school. A plan and program is developed in consultation with the classroom teacher, administration, the parents and the resource and support people from school and district and then is implemented by the classroom teacher (Thousand & Villa, 1990). Without appropriate time and energy allotted to follow-up and refining the plan, the inclusion of that child in the regular classroom may be doomed. A program which will meet the needs of the child, the teacher, the class and the school can only evolve over time into a successful solution. "The underlying theme of the adaptive model is the need for constant learning and evolution to improve the basic functioning of the school" (Louis & Miles, 1990, p. 26).

Empowerment, according to Fullan, occurs when administrators are successful in "getting and supporting people who are acting and interacting in purposeful directions" (Fullan, 1991, p. 83). The original initiative to mainstream begins, most frequently, as a mandate or edict from policy-makers. To result in the successful implementation of mainstreaming, staffs and individuals must feel empowered to take on the initiative to provide appropriate education for all children (Caldwell & Spinks, 1988, Glickman, 1991).

Decisions must be made about expectations, about degree of integration, about modifications, about resources and in-service. A school support team is one method of providing a forum for discussion, evolutionary planning, group decision-making, problem-coping and strategy monitoring regarding the successful inclusion of all children in the neighbourhood school. Transformational leadership skills which enhance empowerment of staff and also include involvement of parents and students are complex and difficult (Barth, 1990, Leithwood, 1992).

One theme consistent with all educational change and yet frequently underestimated is the need for *staff development and resource assistance*. The key issue is the development over time of new skills and strategies and linking resources to the specific innovation (Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). The Ministry of Education (1985) Special Education manual recommends pre-integration in-service. Effective in-service includes pre-implementation training, assistance during training and extensive opportunity for reflection and follow-up (Fullan, 1985, Joyce, Showers & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987). "Research on implementation has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that these processes of sustained *interaction and staff development* are crucial regardless of what the change is concerned with" (Fullan, 1991, p. 86, his emphasis). Opportunities to learn from each other are one more reason to implement school support teams to support mainstreaming.

Fullan suggests that *monitoring* of the change outcomes and change process is frequently not done or is done ineffectively. A clear vision and a culture of trust and collaboration will allow a staff to evaluate progress objectively. "The success of an implementation is highly dependent on the establishment of effective ways of getting information on how well or poorly a change is going in the classroom or school" (Fullan, 1991, p. 87).

The theme of *restructuring* is intertwined in meaningful change initiatives (Barth, 1990, Schlechty, 1991). The organization of the school, the decision-making processes and access to resources including in-service, materials and time to meet, will undergo restructuring to support the change initiative of mainstreaming (Bowers, 1987). When will teachers meet to discuss strategies for integrating students with special educational needs? How will decisions be made as to what classroom support a particular student with special educational needs will require? When will the staff who work with a student meet to evaluate progress? How will monitoring of the implementation occur? Who is responsible for what? (Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

Continuation phase

The Human Rights Codes, the Charter of Rights and the provincial School Acts all work together to support and protect the rights of students with special educational needs to an education. The onus is placed on the School Boards to initiate assessment of handicaps and to provide educational programs for all students in the least restrictive environments (Bezeau, 1989, Province of British Columbia, 1989a, Sussel, 1988). Will mainstreaming become the accepted norm? Will mainstreaming reach Fullan's continuation phase, "the long-term capacity for continuous improvement"? (Fullan, 1991, p. 90).

Fullan charges that the factors which influence implementation, also influence continuation. The balance between pressure and support is critical when funding is cut and teachers and administrators move to different schools. The pressure for mainstreaming, as described previously, rests primarily in legislation and parent advocacy groups. Financial support is limited. Without the on-going support of the principal and the school support team, the teacher may well begin to question the feasibility of full inclusion schooling.

The student with special educational needs in the regular classroom is still a student with special educational needs and, as such, will require special consideration, legally as well as educationally (Cosden, 1990, Yell, 1989). Draft Special Education guidelines recommend that "Boards ensure that classroom teachers who assume the primary responsibility for educating students with severe behaviour disorders have appropriate pre-service and/or in-service training." This

important consideration carries little weight, as it is merely a recommendation. Kauffman presents the view that behaviourally disordered students are seriously under-identified and under-served. "If we fail to identify behaviour problems for which special education can provide solutions within the mainstream, we will inevitably be contributing to the personal and social distress of students and teachers" (Kauffman, 1987, p. 56).

The dynamic nature of change is nowhere more evident than in the stage of institutionalization. An innovation takes on many forms throughout the lengthy implementation stage. Successful institutionalization of mainstreaming is evident in a school which, not only successfully includes students with special educational needs, but also has developed a "generic capacity for improvement" (Fullan, 1991, p. 90).

Collaborative problem-solving

> The hierarchy of authority in the educational community has shifted from one in which classroom teachers who were once seen as obstacles to change, deficient members of the academic community, defective in professional knowledge, consumers of the expertise of specialists, are now seen as (or potentially as) expert practitioners, writers, agents of change, teacher-consultants, classroom-based researchers, contributors to the pool of current professional knowledge, trainers of administrators, curriculum specialists and publishing authors (Blau, 1988, p. 35).

Collaboration and consultation are seen as essential supports for the integration of students with special educational needs into the mainstream of education (Adamson, Matthews, & Schuller, 1990, Brain, 1987, Chalfont, Pysh & Moultrie, 1979, Graden, 1989, Phillips & McCullough, 1990). The characteristics most frequently cited when describing successful collegial consultative models are collaborative professional relationships, a mandate for co-ownership of the process and the problem, a problem-solving orientation and a two-fold goal: to resolve the immediate problem and to increase the capacity of the consultee to solve similar problems in the future (Phillips & McCullough, 1990, Pugach & Johnson, 1989).

Key elements of the collaborative ethic include a shared responsibility for problems, a shared recognition and accountability for problem resolution, a multi-disciplinary team approach, a shared belief that teacher or student problem solving warrants resource allocation of time, energy, materials, and a shared belief in the value of using the collaborative process (Phillips & McCullough, 1990). "Although it is difficult to assess, the personal relationship of respect and trust between them is a critical factor in the implementation process" (Adamson, Matthews & Schuller, 1990, p. 75).

One method for structuring collaborative problem-solving for mainstreamed students and their teachers is the teacher-support system known as the school support team or teacher assistance team. The function of the school support team is to help teachers to work effectively

with children who are experiencing learning and/or behavioural difficulties in the classroom (Chalfont, Pysch & Moultrie, 1979). In commenting on collaborative cultures in which teachers talk together and observe each other, Leithwood stated that "Norms of collective responsibility and continuous improvement encourage them to teach one another how to teach better" (Leithwood, 1992, p. 10).

Not surprisingly, there is evidence that the collaborative team is more effective than the expert/advice giving team (Graden, 1989). How can a school move from an expert/advice model to a collaborative model? One premise is the assumption that all students in the school belong to all staff and that everyone working together will provide the learning environment for the student.

> With teacher collaboration, however, ownership of children's problems is not transferred from one discipline to another. Rather, students remain a *school* responsibility, with teachers from regular and special education working together toward common goals (Cosden, 1990, p. 6, his emphasis).

Unfortunately, the climate and professional ethic needed to establish and sustain collaborative consultation is notable by its absence in many schools (Phillips & McCullough, 1990). Graden concurs that "many current efforts to implement prereferral intervention are not based on teacher collaboration; they do not maintain the locus of power and responsibility with classroom teachers" (Graden, 1989, p. 229).

Yet, "for effective mainstreaming, regular classroom teachers must have the strong and coordinated backing of special education teachers and support personnel" (Ryor, 1976, quoted in Sarason & Doris, 1979, p. 372). The role of the principal is as a facilitator and role model in the creation of the necessary ethos to support collaboration (Barth, 1990, Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, Little, 1988).

The capacity for continuous improvement

Considering that the goal of educational change is not simply the implementation of a multitude of innovations but is to effect a significant change in the capacity of a school and an individual to continuously change, what will schools which have successfully institutionalized mainstreaming look like?

Fullan cautions that change in behaviour frequently precedes change in beliefs and values (Fullan, 1985). Schools in which the staff has made the changes in instruction and materials necessary for successfully meeting the needs of the students with special educational needs in the classroom will have undergone significant and complex changes. When values held by the staff reflect the practice, then the staff will be in a position to continually strive to improve the closeness of the match of instructional program to each individual learner (Fullan, 1991).

CHAPTER FOUR

The role of the principal

> Be open to different views and perspectives, maintain a core of well-regarded and capable people to keep synthesizing and articulating the evolving view of the system, as much as possible allow for direct experiences with elements of the change (don't let people become passive observers), broaden the number of people aware of and committed to the change through communicating about it, build credibility through the use of symbols and public dialogue, legitimate emerging viewpoints in support of a new vision, be aware of shifts in the change process having an effect on the organization, implement partial solutions when necessary to act as building blocks for the larger effort, broaden political support and finally, find ways to dampen the opposition (Anderson & Cox, 1987, p. 8, 9 in Fullan, 1991, p. 82).

The role of the principal

The role of the principal has "become dramatically more complex, overloaded and unclear over the past decade" (Fullan, 1991, p. 144). Recent research in school leadership focuses on the complex expectations and issues faced by principals in the past decade (Barth, 1990, Fullan, 1988, 1990, 1991, Hall & Hord,1987, Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986, Louis & Miles, 1990). Sarason (1990) found that most principals, faced with an overload of responsibilities and tasks, respond by investing much of their time maintaining order and completing office duties.

Barth summarizes the results of studies which analyze the importance of the principal within the school when he states that "with strong leadership by the principal, a school is likely to be effective; without capable leadership, it is not" (Barth, 1990, p. 64). Fullan identifies the principal as the major change agent in the school (Fullan, 1991) and directs attention to the role of the principal in leading changes to the structural organization of the school, a role which transcends the role played by the principal in the implementation of specific innovations.

Louis and Miles (1990) differentiate leadership actions from management actions. "Three forms of action seem to be especially important in motivating a school's staff to engage in significant change: articulating a vision, getting the staff to believe that the vision reflects their own interests and the use of evolutionary planning strategies" (Louis & Miles, 1990, p. 30). Further study of the management of change revealed

> another set of actions that seemed to promote change: continuous monitoring of the school's environment, with a particular eye toward finding additional resources, and repeated efforts to cope with potential and actual problems facing the school to protect innovative efforts (Louis & Miles, 1990, p. 32).

What is the role of the principal, as a leader and as a manager, in facilitating mainstreaming and in implementing the school support team as a means to solve problems collaboratively?

Initiation process

> The school principal must sincerely *believe* that all children can learn and that equity and excellence are moral imperatives that can and must be accomplished (Andrews & Morefield, 1991, p. 276).

Ever mindful of the limited resources of time and funds, the effective administrator "helps to protect the school from ill-conceived or unwanted change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 152). As noted earlier, Sarason and Doris (1979) caution that not all proposed innovations have identified educational outcomes. Some calls for reform directed at the education system are more appropriately placed at the feet of other systems co-existing in our society (Carnoy & Levin, 1976). An apt metaphor for the role of the principal as the protector of the school is the image of the principal as the gatekeeper of change (Fullan, 1991).

Deal (1985, 1986) studied the symbolism of effective schools. He believes that an understanding of the culture and symbols of a school must precede attempts to improve the school. He identifies external forces which have driven some schools and school systems into despair: the weakening of social myths which previously had equated school with success, the reform movements which chased more traditional teachers behind closed classroom doors, public accountability and pressures such as evaluation and unionization.

The effectiveness of the school administrator in building a coherent ethos with shared values, beliefs and goals may well depend

on his understanding of the symbolism of schools (Deal, 1985). "The 'stuff' of culture includes a school's customs and traditions, historical accounts; stated and unstated understandings; habits, norms, and expectations; common meanings and shared assumptions" (Sergiovanni, 1984, p. 9).

Mainstreaming resulted from external pressures for change (McBride, 1989). Some schools have rallied to the challenge of mainstreaming by opening their doors and welcoming all students (Stainback & Stainback, 1990) while some schools have expended all their energy in attempting to close their doors to students with special educational needs (Ainscow, 1991).

The role the principal plays in supporting the change process, mainstreaming, can be analyzed, using the characteristics of strong leaders and effective managers as identified by Louis and Miles in their study of improving urban high schools (Louis & Miles, 1990). Effective change leaders and effective change managers articulate a *vision* and get *shared ownership* of the vision. They use *evolutionary planning* and *negotiate* the school's relationship with its environment, *coping* with difficulties along the way with persistence and tenacity (Louis & Miles, 1990).

Vision-building

Fullan's most recent work emphasizes the necessity for the principal to foster

> vision-building; norms of collegiality that respect individuality; norms of continuous improvement; problem-coping and conflict resolution strategies; lifelong teacher development that involves inquiry; reflective practice, collaboration, and technical skills; and restructuring initiatives (Fullan, 1992, p. 19).

A vision of the inclusive school as formulated by front-runners in the movement supporting mainstreaming follows:

> Integrated schools and classrooms should provide all students with opportunities to receive supports when and if they need them. In such schools and classrooms not only will the student who has been previously segregated in a self-contained classroom be given support, all students in the regular classroom will be supported within the course of a typical school day (Strully & Strully in Stainback & Stainback, 1990, p. ix).

An inclusive school is visualized as a community or mini-society, its members pulling together to provide for each other within the classroom and within the school as a whole. Providing support with respect demonstrates how our society should work, according to Strully and Strully in their introduction. A circle of friends is a need of all individuals, "a network of concerned people is brought together for the express purpose of being a protection not only for the person who is obviously vulnerable, but for each other" (Strully & Strully in Stainback & Stainback, 1990, p. x).

Initiative-taking and empowerment

To achieve "full inclusion of all students in a mainstream that is challenging to each student but also adaptive and sensitive to each student's needs" the supports that are suggested by Stainback and Stainback (1990) focus on network building. Suggestions include teacher and student assistance teams, cooperative learning, collaborative consultation and team teaching. Too often, teachers are faced with attempting to meet the diverse needs of previously segregated students without being provided with the necessary time, assistance, resources or expertise to feel adequately prepared and to be ultimately successful (Ainscow, 1989).

The effective leader sees the school support team as one means to provide time and a forum for staff to work collaboratively to support the students and each other in the changes necessary for the vision to become a reality (Chalfont, Pysch & Moultrie, 1979, Haydek, 1987, Vandercook & York in Stainback & Stainback, 1990). With the development of a strong support network, Stainback and Stainback (1990) conclude that goals of the inclusive school can be achieved. The network will provide human and material resources, expertise in a wide range of curricula, a wealth of teaching strategies and classroom management techniques, time to problem-solve and to assist and support each other and a place for information sharing and confidence building (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). "Those of us who claim to be

wizards ought to make sure that our primary role is to help people see the power that they themselves have to make things better" (Deal, 1984, p.136).

Reforms and changes within schools are vulnerable to the opposing forces of those who would seek to maintain the status quo (Marris, 1974). Staff members who have had little input into changes, who find that their comfort level is being attacked and who lack understanding of the changes involved in mainstreaming students with special educational needs will indeed close their doors and wait for the pressure for change to subside (Wangberg, 1987).

Fullan has frequently referred to the power and influence of a principal in initiating change. "Principals are very influential when they voice and demonstrate commitment to an adopted innovation and follow through by seeing that ongoing assistance, interaction, and so forth, occur within the school" (Fullan, 1985, p. 408). The complex role of the change facilitator includes maintaining an acceptable balance of the two components, support and pressure (Fullan & Newton, 1988).

The principal plays a major role in moving the school towards the vision of inclusiveness and in empowering the staff to make the changes necessary to include all students. Effective principals value each student and staff member as an unique individual (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Effective principals demonstrate support of collaborative problem-solving by providing time and incentives for collaborative actions by teachers

and administrators (Ainscow, 1991). The principal can be most effective when he or she uses the power inherent in the administrative position to empower the team members by providing the resource support identified by the school support team (Vandercook & York, in Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

Implementation process

> It would be repetitive to review all the things that effective principals were found to do, but two things stand out. They showed an active interest by spending time talking with teachers, planning, helping teachers get together, and being knowledgeable about what was happening. And they all figured out ways of reducing the amount of time spent on routine administrative matters; they made sure that change had an equal priority (Fullan 1991, p.168).

In reference to Fullan's analysis of the need for relevance, readiness and resources, the principal is responsible for developing a school culture which is conducive to change (Fullan, 1991). Articulation of the relevance of the mainstreaming initiative in the last decade of the Twentieth Century, ensurance that the staff is ready for the change in classroom make-up and attainment of adequate resources for implementation of mainstreaming will pave the way for the significant change in instructional strategies necessary for effectively meeting the diverse needs of all children in the classroom. "Transformational leadership provides the incentive for people to attempt improvements in their practices" (Leithwood, 1992, p.9).

Staff development/resource assistance

The principal is frequently referred to in the research as being instrumental in creating the environment which supports the continuous professional development of teachers and special education support staff (Fullan, 1991, Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989, Jones & Southgate, 1989). The role of the principal in staff development extends beyond the role of the administrator as instructional leader to the role of the administrator as a facilitator of change, a transformational leader. "It is the principal's role to help create the climate (collegiality, communication, trust) and mechanisms (time and opportunity, interaction, technical sharing and assistance, ongoing staff development) for supporting the implementation of innovations" (Fullan, 1985, p. 409).

Changes inherent in moving to an inclusive school range from changes in instructional techniques to changes in classroom set-up to changes in the role of the regular classroom and special education teachers. Staff development is an on-going process requiring the commitment of time and resources (Joyce, Showers & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987, Fullan, Bennett & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1989). As Fullan reminds us, "learning to be proficient at something new involves initial anxiety, a variety of assistance, small experiences of success, incremental skill development, and eventually conceptual clarity and ownership" (Fullan, 1985, p. 409). Staff development for the implementation of mainstreaming focuses on acquiring a common language, conceptual

framework, and technical skills (Jeffs in Bowers, 1987, Villa & Thousand in Stainback & Stainback, 1990.)

Wahlberg (1984) undertook to isolate the major factors influencing student learning. An in-depth analysis of over 2000 studies provided data to support the existence of three major influences on student learning: aptitude, instruction and environment. Crucial to the success of integration of students with special educational needs is a hard look at the quality and quantity of instruction provided to all students, within the context of the particular environment of the classroom and the school.

Instructional consultation focuses on support for improvement in instruction by the regular classroom teacher through on-going consultation with other professionals (Rosenfield, 1987).

> One leader who was particularly successful in implementing Public Law 94-142 was unusually adept at getting what he desired from the higher levels of the school system, and was able to bring this talent into the service of children with special needs (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 10).

Provision of resources in the form of time, materials, support and people and development of a collaborative school culture are seen as critical attributes of effective principals (Hall & Hord, 1984).

Communication

> Crucial to the first stage - planning and initiation - was the principal's agreement with the project, his input into the

project proposal, and the communication of his support and enthusiasm to others (Hall & Hord, 1984).

The communication of the vision and the plan extends beyond the school to the community, the school board and to senior management. The role of the principal has always been to share the mission statement, to spread the word, to communicate what it is that the school intends to accomplish; within the change issue of mainstreaming the role of the principal as key communicator is vitally necessary (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal communicates the vision of the school in words and in actions. Content and processes leading to the goal of mainstreaming are articulated in one-on-one meetings, small group interactions and large group meetings with teachers, parents, school board, community and students (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The role of the principal is to communicate the vision through modelling by valuing ideas, discussing theories, reading books and journals, actively and collaboratively seeking solutions to the problems facing today's schools, reflecting on practices and experiences and taking an analytical stance to defining the issue and an open-minded viewpoint when formulating the plan for change (Deal, 1986, Schlechty, 1990, Sergiovanni, 1991, 1992).

Another powerful strategy for gaining support for an inclusive school philosophy is to involve representatives of concerned school and community members in developing the school or school district's

philosophy and goals for supporting the inclusion of all students in regular education (Villa & Thousand in Stainback &Stainback, 1991).

Judith Warren Little investigated the notion that schools vary in the quantity and quality of interactions among staff members. She concluded that

> Continuous professional development appears to be most surely and thoroughly achieved when:
> Teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice ...
> Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful (if potentially frightening) critiques of their teaching ...
> Teachers plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together ...
> Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching (Little, 1982, p. 331).

By implementing and supporting a school support team built on the model of collaborative problem-solving, the principal puts in place a structure for the kind of staff development favoured by Little (1982), Guskey (1986), and Fullan (1985).

Restructuring

The principal cannot make the changes necessary for the implementation of mainstreaming single-handedly. The effective administrator works with other change facilitators on staff to implement program changes. "It is this team of facilitators, under the lead of the principal, that makes successful change happen in schools" (Hall, 1988, p.49, quoted in Fullan, 1991, p. 156). The effective school support team

is a team of change facilitators working together to support and assist the school staff as it moves along the continuum from the initiation of the concept of mainstreaming to the routine inclusion of students with special educational needs in the neighbourhood school (Haydek, 1987).

Two characteristics associated with innovation and restructuring are decentralization and horizontal communication (Brookfield 1987 in Osterman, 1990, p. 146). School support management represents a change in how the district operates - how authority and responsibility are shared between the district and the schools. Although school support management takes on many forms, the essence is school-level autonomy informed by participatory decision-making (Bacharach & Conley, 1986, Caldwell & Spinks, 1988, David, 1989).

In discussing the strategies which may be employed in order to meet the educational requirements of students with special educational needs in the regular classroom, Evans (1989) indicates that "such solutions may require the breaking down of accepted barriers: the subject, the classroom, even the school" (Evans in Jones & Southgate, 1989, p. 192). Reform, of the calibre proposed in the last decade, is not simply the implementation of single innovations. The very culture and innate structure of the school will be affected.

> It is becoming clear that the fate of the education reform movement in America depends upon the willingness of public school educators to understand and embrace the proposition that nothing short of fundamental restructuring of schools will suffice if the continuing vitality of public

> education is to be assured (Schlechty in Lieberman, 1990, p. 233).

Asa Hilliard III promotes restructuring as a means to change the schools into systems that have never existed before, schools in which everyone meets his or her potential.

> *Deep restructuring* is a matter of drawing up an appropriate vision of human potential, of the design of human institutions, of the creation of a professional work environment, of the linkage of school activities and community directions, of creating human bonds in the operation of appropriate socialization activities, and of aiming for the stars for the children and for ourselves academically and socially (Hilliard, 1991, p. 35).

Mainstreaming is one delivery system to meet the goal but the approach means nothing unless the belief system supports the vision of a school as a place of learning for all (Hilliard, 1991).

Continuation phase

Peter Vaill defines purposing as "that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which has the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes" (Vail, 1984, in Sergiovanni, 1984, p. 7). Although there is no one right way to plan for change, analysis of the proposed change should suggest a model to use. The factors to be considered when developing the plan for implementation of change include the apparent consensus within the school and the community with regards to the need for the proposed change and the strategies to be used, the complexity of

the problem, the energy level behind the change and the energy level opposed to the change and the degree of autonomy available to the school (Louis & Miles, 1990).

Although the initiative for mainstreaming sprang from parent advocacy groups demanding that students with special educational needs be educated in their neighbourhood schools (Wiederholt, 1989), there will likely be parents within any particular community who wish their child to continue in a segregated program (Sussel, 1990). Most notably, many parents and specialists question the efficacy of the environment afforded deaf students in a hearing classroom (Carver, 1984). Also, as previously discussed, some staff members, special education and regular classroom teachers will be uncomfortable with the role changes implicit in mainstreaming and will need to be brought along more slowly (Lewis & Doorlag, 1987). Will the school be in a position to make its own decisions with regards to processes and timelines and restructuring? (Glickman, 1990, Wangberg, 1987).

Shared decision-making

Rosenholtz (1989) found that in schools in which consensus and teacher collaboration were supported, new ideas directed to student learning were much more likely to be successfully implemented, whereas in schools in which no opportunity or support for collaboration and shared decision-making was provided, teachers were less likely to be successful at implementing change and were more likely to feel alone

and frustrated in the struggle to improve teaching and learning (Rosenholtz, 1989, Wangberg, 1987).

School district support of decentralized school-based management alone is insufficient to ensure active involvement by staff members in meaningful decision-making.

> Looking back over our experience, we now appreciate the complexity of change. Our process was not as smooth as we had hoped, and we wish we could have avoided the mistakes we made ... Through collaboration, conflict management, and continual reconceptualization, we are shaping our own version of site-based management (Harrison, Killion, & Mitchell, 1989, p. 58).

Participative management is based on the premise that teachers are professionals who make numerous decisions every day and who should be involved in important schoolwide decisions which affect them (Conley, 1989). Conley and Bacharach (1990) ask administrators to consider the importance of reconciling the participatory nature of school-based management with the locus and source of innovations. Mandating a change and then expecting the staff to buy into decision-making on how to implement the mandated change implies a restraint on the influence of the teachers and may lead to undermining tactics on the part of teachers and unions (Conley, 1989, Conley & Bacharach, 1990, Perelman, 1988). Glickman asks "Why should teachers not have equal say with administrators about the professional work of teaching and learning?" (Glickman, 1990, p. 74).

Monitoring and problem-coping

Fullan theorizes that monitoring is poorly attended to by those involved in educational initiatives (Fullan, 1985, 1991). The principal and the school support team must ensure that a means is in place for monitoring the innovation of mainstreaming, revising plans and strategies accordingly and re-evaluating the process and outcomes (Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

> Reflective practice assumes that problems are opportunities that support professional growth and enhance organizational effectiveness. In contrast, perhaps in response to continued external review and criticism, schools tend to engage in a conspiracy of silence (Osterman, 1990, p. 147).

The real issue may well be that many staff members who appear to be involved in the change are merely biding their time, waiting for the project to pass. Gifford (1987) clarifies this issue: "Can we convince the major actors in the educational establishment to surrender the comfort of old familiar habits, in exchange for the opportunity to play a major role in ushering in long overdue improvements?" (Gifford, 1987, p. 440).

Marris (1974) extended the theme further when he developed his theory of loss and grief to explain the conservatism of those who oppose change. He concluded that the attributes of conservatism, to avoid change, to isolate innovation, to ignore uncomfortable events, are all ways to maintain sense in one's life (Marris, 1974). In keeping with his metaphor of the grieving process, he theorizes the necessity of putting

some kind of moratorium on other business, so that the minds of those involved in the change can "repair the thread of continuity in their attachments" and that "we should not burden ourselves with so many simultaneous changes that our emotional resilience becomes exhausted" (Marris, 1974, p. 150).

Collaboration and reflection

The principal plays a major role in establishing an environment of trust which will support reflective practices (Barth, 1990, Fullan, 1992, Sergiovanni, 1991). Both continuous pressure and on-going support are essential for lasting improvements, according to the research into effective staff development (Fullan, Bennett, Rolheiser-Bennett,1989, Joyce, Showers & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987, Lambert, 1989). "Collegial practice expands cognitive complexity, leads to thoughtful planning and reflective practice, and increases teachers' satisfaction with their work" (Lambert,1989, p. 79). The implementation of a school support team to support the integration of all students in the regular classroom provides an opportunity for the teacher "to receive and give help and more simply to *converse* about the meaning of change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 132).

Proponents of reflective practice maintain that the habit of reflection is an important component of effective organizational leadership, and is essential for educational reform (Hart, 1990, Sergiovanni, 1991).

> If organizations, schools and universities want to foster reflective practice in the workplace or the classroom, they must create an atmosphere that values communication, participation, and the ability to openly discuss problems without fear of embarrassment or retribution. They must focus their efforts on finding ways that work, rather than on trying to find a list of reasons why things would not work (Osterman, 1990, p. 148).

The merits of collegiality have been well established (Little, 1982, McLaughlin & Yee, 1988, Rosenfield, 1987, Rosenholtz, 1989, Yatvin, 1992). "The principals most effective in implementing change were team-oriented, working collegially with their second change facilitators" (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 84). Building collegiality is an important function of the principal (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989).

Unfortunately, "the least common form of relationship among adults in schools is one that is collegial, cooperative and interdependent" (Barth in Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989, p. 230). Barth (1990) described four behaviours of principals that can serve to enhance collegiality in the school:

- stating the expectation for cooperation amongst teachers
- modelling collegiality
- providing resources to support collegiality
- protecting teachers involved in collaborative efforts.

The school support team can provide an opportunity to enhance collegiality in all four ways.

> Empowered schools are better because of the way that teachers, administrators, and students treat one another. Over time empowered schools will achieve many of their goals. Equally important, the way that people work together in empowered schools is a sign of what is possible for the next generation of students and educators (Glickman, 1990, p. 75).

CHAPTER 5

Reflections

> Real change, then, whether desired or not, represents a serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty; and if the change works out it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth. The anxieties of uncertainty and the joys of mastery are central to the subjective meaning of educational change, and to success or failure - facts that have not been recognized or appreciated in most attempts at reform (Fullan,1991, p. 32).

Reflections

On July 31 of 1990, I was appointed principal of a fairly large elementary school, having served one year as vice-principal of the same school.

In May of 1990, the school was chosen to be a pilot school for a resource program since many students with identified special educational needs and who were currently placed in segregated special classes would be returning to our school in September, 1990. In the second year of our resource program, September of 1991, the school was designated a 'special needs school", an indication that a significant number of our students required special instructional attention. The school had had a school support team in place for two years. My goals were to facilitate the development of a shared vision of our school as an inclusive school, to improve the functioning of the school support team, to facilitate the accommodation of students with special educational needs returning to the neighbourhood school from previous special class

placements and to support and encourage reflective practices leading to improvement in instruction for all students. The school support team seemed an ideal place to start.

The school district had first implemented school-based decision-making several years previously. Staffs were encouraged to take an active role in decision-making at the school. One of the first decisions was the constitution of the school support team. The role of the school support team as a support for teachers working with students with special educational needs in the regular classroom was articulated prior to choosing members for the team. The composition of the school support team which developed from the discussion regarding roles and processes included all special needs support staff, (learning assistance teachers, resource teachers, counsellor), administrators, and one classroom teacher member. At least once a month, the team would schedule consecutive half-hour consultative meetings with teachers who had requested assistance in developing programs for students with special educational needs in their classrooms.

Critical to the success of the school support team as a model for collaborative problem-solving was the allocation of time for the team to assist the classroom teacher in developing strategies to be used to help solve difficulties identified by the classroom teacher. At least one morning a month, a substitute was provided for the classroom teacher on the team and another substitute was provided to release the teachers presenting cases. Every other meeting was a shorter 'business' meeting

commencing early and ending before school, without the need for a substitute. Issues which were discussed with all staff at a staff meeting were the issues of confidentiality and of completing a referral form before attending the school support team meeting to assist in focusing in on the specific problem to be addressed.

Classroom teachers soon became comfortable with the process. If they had a student in their class who required special attention and they felt frustrated in their attempts to provide the appropriate program for the student, a referral was completed and initially discussed with the Learning Assistance teacher. The Learning Assistance teacher completed any necessary assessment or observation and worked out a plan of action with the classroom teacher. Frequently discussion at a school support team meeting was one facet of the plan.

Before a classroom teacher presented a problem to the school support team, he or she was asked to clarify the problem and identify which solutions had already been tried by completing a request for assistance form. The form evolved over time to a simple yet informative two-sided sheet which encouraged the classroom teacher to be specific about what the discrepancy was and what remedies had been attempted and what strengths and weaknesses the student had. At the school support team meeting, a systematic model for consultative problem-solving was employed, allowing time for presentation of the problem, brainstorming solutions, choosing a plan of action, identifying who would be responsible for which parts of the plan and setting a follow-up date.

What occurred naturally in the setting of the school support team was the enhancement of the best staff development practices. Teachers talked about teaching, about meeting the educational needs of all students in their classrooms. They shared successes and failures, they struggled together to find the 'solution' for thorny problems, such as how to help students who were destructive to themselves, others and property, how to encourage students who felt poorly about themselves and who had given up, how to best support students whose low reading level interfered with their enjoyment of some aspects of the regular classroom program. Teachers were thrilled to hear new and creative solutions from their colleagues and readily shared ideas for improvement.

Teachers came to the meeting expecting to leave with a mutually agreed-upon plan for improvement in instruction and a date for follow-up and review. They did not expect that the student would be 'removed', nor did they expect that they would be told, directly or indirectly, the student was their problem to solve. From the first school support team meeting of the school year, our vision was clear, all students belong to the school, not just to the teacher who currently had them on his or her register, and it was our job to help each student to achieve to the level of his or her capacity, in a caring and supportive learning environment. By working together and sharing the ownership of all of our students, we empowered teachers to ask for and expect to receive support from other colleagues.

Reflective practice became the norm of teachers involved with our students with special educational needs. Often, a teacher would reflect on a particularly successful day or lesson and attempt to isolate what it was that made it so successful. The school support team reflected frequently on the processes and outcomes of previous meetings in order to improve the quality of intervention offered to teachers seeking assistance.

In my experience, implementation and administrative support of a school support team for facilitating the necessary changes in practices to accommodate the integration of students with special educational needs served as a jumping off point for staff development strategies and enhanced collegiality and led to significant school improvement. The kernel of the school support team was a nurturing cocoon of caring, trusting professionals striving to offer the best chances for success to each student of the school.

Recommendations for implementation

The principal plays a key role in facilitating significant educational change. A school which is successful in institutionalization of the change initiative, mainstreaming, improves in its ability to meet the educational needs of all students, and, most importantly, improves in its capacity to continually change and improve.

Studies of educational change provide philosophical frameworks and leadership themes to guide the principal in the role of change

facilitator (Barth, 1990, Fullan,1985, 1991, 1992, Fullan & Hargreaves,1991, Louis & Miles,1990, Schlechty,1990, Sergiovanni,1984, 1991, 1992, Sergiovanni & Moore,1989, Stainback & Stainback,1990):

1. Understand the culture of the school - assess the level of readiness for the change to inclusive schooling
2. Value and model growth and change
3. Develop and articulate, with staff, a vision of what the school should be:
   - an inclusive school;
   - a place where students work successfully on activities through which they develop skills and understanding to enable them to participate fully as citizens of society as a whole;
   - the school is an extension of the community and is accountable to the community
   - a school in which the needs of the *individual* are met
4. Understand the multi-dimensional changes inherent in the move from segregated classes for students with special educational needs to inclusive schooling
5. Commence deliberations on how best to provide service for students with special educational needs by dealing with the ambiguity and multiple meanings of the language of mainstreaming and inclusive schooling

6. Implement a school support team to provide assistance for teachers working to meet the diverse needs of the individuals in the classrooms of the 1990's
7. Promote and reward collaboration in the school support team
8. Promote the professional growth of staff members
9. Be reflective, value reflective practices
10. Screen change initiatives - what's worth changing? Mainstreaming is a choice made by school districts.
11. Focus on the learner (student and teacher) as a unique individual
12. Be resourceful in accessing necessary resources
13. Involve staff in evolutionary planning - the outcome may well look different from the pre-initiation plan
14. Celebrate change and improvement

Recommendations for future research

The role of the principal as facilitator is critical to the successful initiation, implementation and institutionalization of educational change (Barth, 1990, Fullan, 1991, Fullan & Newton, 1988, Schlechty, 1990, Sergiovanni, 1991, Wilson, 1989). Fullan (1991) and Hopkins (1992) emphasize the necessity for the principal to understand the complex dynamics of actualizing significant change in what happens in the classroom. "An important characteristic of principals in successful schools is their greater understanding of the complexity of educational programs and their ability to reflect this complexity in the leadership they provide" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p.193).

Specific to the initiative of mainstreaming, the principal is in a position to lead the school to improvement in instruction for all students while supporting the mainstreaming initiative. The principal is able to allocate resources of time and people to the development of a school support team (Bowers, 1987, Chalfont, VanDusen Pysh & Moultrie, 1979). One function of the school support team is to provide a structure for collaboratively solving problems involved in the integration of students with special educational needs into the regular classroom (Brain, 1987, Haydek, 1987) and a second function is to value and model reflection on teaching practices (Adamson, Matthews, & Schuller, 1990). The principal and the school support team can set the pattern for development of a capacity for change and improvement in the school and in the individuals involved, the goal of educational change (Barth, 1991, Fullan, 1991).

Further study of the role of the principal in facilitating educational change, specifically, mainstreaming, through the development of a school support team is recommended. Ethnographic research to study the interdependent relationships and individual growth of school support team members should lead to a new understanding of the complexity of the context of the educational change initiative, mainstreaming.

Further study of the processes and outcomes of the implementation of school support teams in particular schools should include an analysis of the various factors and themes at play in the social

milieu of collaborative problem-solving. A combination of techniques including observation of the participants during team meetings, in-depth interviews of the members of the school support team, and artifact collection including minutes of meetings, records of follow-up and outcomes, is recommended as a means to deepen the understanding of the processes involved in initiating, implementing and institutionalizing mainstreaming, reflective practices and the capacity for change through the development and on-going support of a school support team.

The role of the principal in moving the school from an organization to an institution, initially focussing on mainstreaming and moving on to continual improvement, should also be studied using ethnographic research methods.

> Organizations become institutions as they are *infused with value*, that is prized not as tools alone but as sources of direct personal gratification and vehicles of group integrity. This infusion produces a distinct identity for the organization. Where institutionalization is well advanced, distinctive outlooks, habits, and other commitments are unified, coloring all aspects of organizational life and lending it a *social integration* that goes well beyond formal coordination and command (Selznick, quoted in Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 323).

Bibliography

Adamson, D., Matthews, P., & Schuller, J. (1990). "Five ways to bridge the resource room-to-regular classroom gap." *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 22 (2), 74-77.

Anderson, P. (1991). "Schools brace for 'crack kids'. *The Seattle Times / Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* August 4, (A) 2.

Ainscow, M., ed. (1989). *Special Education in Change.* Great Britain: David Fulton Publishers.

Ainscow, M. (1991). "Effective schools for all: an alternative approach to special needs in education." *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 21 (3) 293-308.

Bacharach, S., & Conley, S. (1986). "Education Reform: A Managerial Agenda." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 67 (9), 641-45.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make the difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barth, R. (1991). "Restructuring schools: some questions for teachers and principals." *Phi Delta Kappan,* Oct., 123.

Bezeau, L.M. (1989) *Educational Administration for Canadian Teachers.* Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.

Blau, S. (1988). "Teacher Development and the Revolution in Teaching." *English Journal,* April: 30-35.

Booth, T., & Swann, W. (eds.) (1987). *Including Pupils with Disabilities.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Bowers, T. (ed.) (1987). *Special Education Needs and Human Resource Management.* New York: Croom Helm.

Brain, C. (1987). "The school support team: a model for development and maintenance." *B.C. Journal of Special Education,* 11 (4), 360-377.

Burke, J. (1991). "Teenagers, clothes, and gang violence." *Educational Leadership,* 49 (1) 11-16.

Caldwell & Spinks (1988). *The self-managing school.* New York: Falmer Press.

Carnoy, M., & Levin, H. (1976). *The limits of educational reform.* New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Carver, R. (1984) Integrated education: a paradox for the deaf. *Education and the Law,* 2 (3).

Chalfont, J. C., VanDusen Pysh, M., & Moultrie, R. (1979). "Teacher assistance teams: a model for within-building problem solving." *Learning Disability Quarterly,* 2 (3), 85-96.

Conley, S.C., (1989). "Who's on first?: School reform, teacher participation, and the decision-making process." *Education and Urban Society,* 21(4) 366-79.

Conley, S.C., & Bacharach, S.B. (1990). "From school-site management to participatory management." *Phi Delta Kappan,* Mar. 539-44.

Cosden, M. (1990). "Expanding the role of special education." *Teaching Exceptional Children ,* Winter.

Cuban, L. (1988). "A fundamental puzzle of school reform." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 70(5), 341-44.

Cuskey, T. (1986). "Staff development and the process of teacher change." *Educational Researcher,* May, 5-12.

David, J. L. (1989). "Synthesis of Research on School-based Management." *Educational Leadership,* May, 45-53.

Deal, T. (1985). "The symbolism of effective schools." *Elementary school journal,* 85 (5) 601-20.

Deal, T. (1986). "New images of organizations and leadership." *Peabody Journal of Education,* 63 (3) pp. 1-8.

Dickinson, G.M., & MacKay, A.W. (1989). *Rights, Freedoms and the Education System in Canada.* Toronto: Emond Montgomery.

Dwyer, D.C., Ringstaff, C., & Sandholtz, J.H. (1991). "Changes in teachers' beliefs and practices in technology-rich classrooms." *Educational leadership,* 48 (8), 45-52.

Evans, R., ed. (1989). *Special Education Needs: Policy and Practice.* England: Baso; Blackwell.

Fitzpatrick, K.A. (1991). "Restructuring to achieve outcomes of significance for all students." *Educational Leadership,* 48 (8), 18-22.

Fullan, M. G. (1985). "Change processes and strategies at the local level." *The Elementary School Journal,* 85 (3), 391-421.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1992). "Visions that blind." *Educational Leadership,* 19-22.

Fullan, M. G., Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1989). "Linking Classroom and School improvement." Invited address, American Educational Research Association, 1989.

Fullan, M.G., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for?* Ontario: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Fullan, M.G., & Newton, E.E. (1988). "School principals and change processes in the secondary school." *Canadian Journal of Education,* 13 (3) 404-421.

Gardner, W. (1977). *Learning and behaviour characteristics of exceptional children and youth.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). *Integration strategies for students with handicaps.* Maryland: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Gifford, B. R. (1987). "Images, recommendations, and best next steps." *Education and Urban Society,* 19(4), 421-440.

Glickman, C.D. (1990). "Pushing school reform to a new edge: the seven ironies of school empowerment." *Phi Delta Kappan,* Sept. pp. 68-75.

Glickman, C.D. (1991). "Pretending not to know what we know." *Educational Leadership,* May, 4-10.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A Place Called School.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Graden, J.L. (1989). "Redefining 'prereferral intervention' as intervention assistance: collaboration between general and special education." *Exceptional Children,* 56(3), 227-231.

Guthrie, G.P., & Guthrie, L.F. (1991). "Streamlining interagency collaboration for youth at risk." *Educational Leadership,* 49 (1), pp. 17-22.

Hallahan, D. P., Keller, C. E., McKinney, J. D., Lloyd, J.W., & Bryan, T. (1988). "Examining the research base for the Regular Education Initiative." *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 21 (1), 29-35.

Harrison, C.R., Killion, J.P., & Mitchell, J.E. (1989). "Site-base management: the realities of implementation." *Educational Leadership, May.*

Hart, A.W. (1990). "Effective administration through reflective practice." *Education and Urban Society,* 22 (2), 153-169.

Haydek, R. (1987). "The teacher assistance team: a pre-referral support team." *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 20, 1-7.

Hilliard, A. (1991). "Do we have the *will* to educate all children?" *Educational Leadership,* 49 (1) 31-36.

Hopkins, D (1992). *School improvement in an ERA of change.* London: Cassell (forthcoming).

Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. (1987). *Taking Charge of Change.* Virginia: ASCD.

Huberman, M., & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close.* New York: Plenum.

Jones, N., & Southgate, T., ed. (1989). *The Management of Special Needs in Ordinary Schools.* London: Routledge.

Joyce, B. (1991). "The doors to school improvement." *Educational Leadership,* May 59-62.

Joyce, B., Showers, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1987). "Staff development and student learning: a synthesis of research on models of teaching." *Educational Leadership,* Oct. 10-23.

Kauffman, J. (1987). "Strategies for the Nonrecognition of Social Deviance." *B.C. Journal of Special Education,* 11 (3).

Lambert, L. (1989). "The end of an era of staff development." *Educational Leadership,* Sept., 78-81.

LeBaron, M. (1990). *Charter and Legal Considerations in the Provision of Educational Services to Special Needs Students.* Burnaby: Simon Fraser University.

Leithwood, K. (1992). "The move toward transformational leadership." *Educational Leadership,* Feb. 8-12.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. (1986). *Improving principal effectiveness: the principal profile.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Leithwood, K.A., Rutherford, W., & van der Vegt, ed. (1987). *Preparing school leaders for educational improvement.* London: Croom Helm.

Lewis, R. B., & Doorlag, D.H. (1987). *Teaching Special Students in the Mainstream.* Toronto: Merril Publishing.

Lieberman, A. (1990). *Schools as Collaborative Cultures: Creating the Future Now.* New York: The Falmer Press.

Little, J. W. (1982). "Norms of collegiality and experimentation: workplace conditions of school success." *American Educational Research Journal,* 19 (3), 325-340.

Loucks-Horsley, S. & Hergert, L. (1985). *An action guide to school improvement.* Andover, Mass.: The NETWORK, Inc.

Louis, K.S., & Miles, M.B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: what works and why.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McBride, S. (1989). "Rights of special needs students." *B.C. Journal of Special Education,* 13 (2), 101-111.

McLaughlin, M. (1990). "The Change Agent Study Revisited" *Educational Researcher,* 19(9) 11-16.

McLaughlin, M., & Yee, S.M. (1988). "School as place to have a career." In Lieberman, A. (ed.) *Building a Professional Culture in Schools..* New York: Teachers College Press.

MacKay, A. W. (1987a). *The Charter of Rights and Special Education: Blessing or Curse?* Canadian Journal of Exceptional Children, 3(2).

MacKay, A. W. (1987b). "The Elwood case: vindicating the educational rights of the disabled." *Canadian Journal of Special Education,* 3 (2), 103-111.

Marris, P. (1974). *Loss and change.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Nicholls, A.C., & Wuester, T.J. (1989). *Charter Issues in Education.* Vancouver: EduServ.

O'Neill, J.O. (1991). "A generation adrift." *Educational Leadership,* 49 (1) 4-10.

Osterman, K. F. (1990). "Reflective practice: a new agenda for education." *Education and Urban Society,* 22 (2), 133-152.

Perelman, L. J. (1988). "Restructuring the system is the solution." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 70 (1), 20-24.

Phillips, V., & McCullough, L. (1990). "Consultation-based programming: instituting the collaborative ethic in schools." *Exceptional Children,* Jan., 291-303.

Poirier, D., Goguen, L., & Perry, L. (1988). *Education Rights of Exceptional Children in Canada.* Toronto: Carswell.

Province of British Columbia (1985). *Special Programs: a manual of policies, procedures and guidelines.* Victoria: Province of British Columbia, Schools Department.

Province of British Columbia (1989a). *B.C. School Act.*

Province of British Columbia (1989b). *Year 2000: A Framework for Learning.*

Province of British Columbia (1990). *Language Arts English Primary - Graduation Position Statements.*

Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1988). "Rethinking the relationship between consultation and collaboration." *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 21(4), 2-8.

Raynes, M., Snell, M., & Sailor, W. (1991). "A fresh look at categorical programs for children with special needs." *Phi Delta Kappan,* Dec., 326-331.

Rosenfield, S. A. (1987). *Instructional Consultation.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools.* New York: Longman.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and Change.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Sailor, W, Anderson, J. L., Halvorsen, A. T., Doering, K, Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). *The Comprehensive Local School, Regular Education*

for All Students with Disabilities. Toronto: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). *The culture of school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sarason, S., & Doris, J. (1979). *Educational Handicap, Public Policy, and Social History.* London: Collier Macmillan Pub.

Schlechty, P.C. (1990). *Schools for the 21st Century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). "Leadership and excellence in schooling." *Educational Leadership,* Feb. 4-13.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1991). *The principalship: a reflective practice perspective.* Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). "Why we should seek substitutes for leadership." *Educational Leadership,* 41-45.

Sergiovanni, T.J., & Moore, J.H. (1989). *Schooling for tomorrow: directing reforms to issues that count.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shanker, A. (1988). "Restructuring leadership." *The College Board Review,* Fall 1988.

Shapiro, E.S., & Kratochwill, T.R. (1988). *Behavioral Assessment in Schools.* The Guildford Press, New York, 3-11, 494-510.

Silberman, C.E. (1970). *Crisis in the classsroom.* New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, S.C., & Scott, J.J. (1990). *The Collaborative School: a work environment for effective instruction.* Oregon: University Publications.

Sparks-Langer, G.M., & Colton, A.B. (1991). "Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking." *Educational Leadership,* Mar. 37-44.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1988a) "Educating all students with severe disabilities in regular classes." *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 21, 16-19.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1988b) Letter to the editor . *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* (22) 452-453.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1990). *Support networks for inclusive schooling: interdependent integrated education.* Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Co.

Stephens, T.M., Blackhurst, A.E., & Magliocca, L.A. (1988) *Teaching Mainistreamed Students.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Sussel, T. (1988). "The Charter's 'desegregation' of handicapped students." *Education Leader,* Sept., 2.

Sussel, T. (1989). "Court finds for board in special education ruling." *Education Leader,* Sept., 2.

Sussel, T. (1990). *Controversies in School Law.* Vancouver: EduServ.

Sussel, T., & Manley-Casimir, M. (1987). " Special education and the charter: the right to equal benefit of the law." *CJLS/RCDS,* 2 ( ), 45-71.

Thousand, J.S. & Villa, R.A. (1990). "Strategies for educating learners with severe disabilities within their home schools and communities." *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 23(3).

Vaill, P.B. (1989). *Managing as a Performing Art.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Walberg, H.J. (1984). "Improving the productivity of America's schools." *Educational Leadership,* 41, 19-30.

Walker, H., & Sylvester, R. (1991). "Where is school along the path to prison?" *Educational Leadership,* 49 (1), 13-16.

Wang, M.C., Reynolds, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (eds.) (1986). "Rethinking special education." *Educational Leadership,* 44(1), 27.

Wangberg, E.G. (1987). "Listening to teachers: the missing link in reform." *The Clearing House,* 61, 76-80.

Wideen, M.F. (1987). "Perspective on staff development." In M. Wideen, & I. Andrews (eds.), *Staff development for School Improvement.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Wiederholt, J.L. (1989). "Restructuring special education services: the past, the present, the future." *Learning Disability Quarterly,* 12 (3), 181-91.

Will, M. (1986). "Educating children with learning problems: a shared responsibility." *Exceptional Children*, 52, 411-415.

Wilson, W.C. (1989). " Administrative strategies for integration." In Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). *Integration strategies for students with handicaps.* Maryland: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Yatvin, J. (1992). "Memoir of a team player." *Educational Leadership*, Feb., 50.

Yell, M.L. (1989). "Honig v. Doe: The Suspension and Expulsion of Handicapped Students." *Exceptional Children*, 56(1).