In Susan Stainback & William Stainback (1992). Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students. Baltimore Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

14

Curriculum in Inclusion-Oriented Schools

Trends, Issues, Challenges, and Potential Solutions

Michael F. Giangreco

A TEACHER IN one classroom gives instructions to 23 students seated at desks arranged in the shape of a horseshoe. In other classrooms, students are working in small groups on a social studies assignment or taking a weekly quiz. While these and similar scenes may seem ordinary based on outward appearances, these particular classrooms are anything but ordinary. What makes them unique is that the adults responsible for designing the educational experiences in these classrooms have purposefully included students with a range of learning characteristics much wider than traditionally found in schools. The people associated with these classrooms have made a commitment to include *all* the children who live in their community in general education classes with the supports they need to

The author conducted a series of seven semistructured interviews with Ann Nevin, Professor of Special Education at the University of Vermont, ranging in length from 1½ to 2½ hours. Questions regarding her searches of the ERIC system and resources used in educational methods courses were asked. I wish to extend my appreciation to Ann for her written input, editing feedback, and perspectives regarding trends, issues, challenges, and potential solutions for facilitating the adoption of curriculum for inclusive schooling. Thanks are also extended to my colleague Chigee Cloninger for her helpful and often amusing editing suggestions. Finally, I wish to express sincere thanks to the many people at Charleston Elementary, Irasburg Elementary, Park Street Elementary (Springfield), Sheldon Elementary, and St. Alban's Bay Elementary for providing me with the opportunity to learn from their inclusion-oriented efforts.

learn. Ordinary classrooms have been rearranged to create a new educational experience that seeks the extraordinary in each member of the classroom community.

This chapter offers perspectives based on a review of literature of selected educational issues and the author's work in schools with people who are striving toward full inclusion, hereafter referred to as *inclusion oriented*. The term *inclusion oriented* is offered not as a descriptor of programs that are necessarily fully inclusive at the moment or models to be emulated and exactly replicated. Rather, inclusion-oriented people seek to establish an inclusionary ethic that welcomes all children into their local schools and simultaneously pursues a range of individually meaningful learning outcomes through effective instructional practices. The purpose here is to present ideas to encourage the reader to question the way schools currently do business. Similar to the introduction, the focus in this chapter is on the overall context for decision making about curriculum. The chapter is organized in five sections. First, common features of inclusion-oriented education are described based on observations and discussions with educators at schools where inclusive practices are being implemented.[1] Second, an overview of selected societal and educational trends that affect inclusion-oriented schooling efforts are discussed. Third, some major challenges and opportunities facing the development of inclusion-oriented curricula in schools are described. Fourth, potential courses of action people might take at both "macro" and "micro" levels are suggested to facilitate inclusion-oriented schooling now. The chapter concludes by encouraging the pursuit of the vision of inclusion-oriented curriculum in all community schools.

FEATURES OF INCLUSION-ORIENTED SCHOOLING

To claim that general education classes in neighborhood schools welcome and provide meaningful learning experiences for *all* students, regardless of their characteristics, would be to ignore the obvious. As the inequities of separate and unequal education continue to be debated and analyzed, a growing number of parents and professionals are making efforts to do something about it.

During visits with some inclusion-oriented people who work in

[1]Semistructured interviews were conducted with individuals who work in or with inclusion-oriented schools. These interviews ranged in length from 30 to 60 minutes each. Questions regarding the features of the school or personnel that make them inclusive were asked. Thanks are extended to Michael Collins, Richard DeYoung, Laurie LaPlant, George Salambier, and Richard Villa for their input regarding a variety of Vermont schools, and to Gordon Porter for his insights regarding inclusion in New Brunswick, Canada.

Vermont schools, the author observed a number of similarities among the schools and the people who work in them. The majority of these people place a balanced emphasis on both the academic/functional achievement of their students as well as the social/personal aspects of schooling.

In contrast, some people in traditional schools de-emphasize the social/personal aspects of the school experience. In some cases, tracking, segregation, and homogeneous grouping of students are rationalized by a claim of academic integrity. Programs with an exclusively academic/functional focus may graduate students who have basic literacy or survival skills, but who lack the social networks and life experiences to apply these skills in ways that facilitate their ongoing development and participation in personally and societally valued activities. A more likely outcome of separate schooling rationalized by academic integrity is a widening equity gap between the "haves" and "have nots" (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989).

Earlier attempts at heterogeneous groupings of students focused exclusively on the social/personal benefits of inclusion (e.g., affiliation, friendship). Academic/functional achievement was de-emphasized, resulting in wasted human potential. Such practices call into question the interdependencies between participation in shared instruction, student self-image, and social acceptance/affiliation. How students perceive themselves and each other as belonging may be affected, in part, by their presence in the same locations and their shared learning experiences (Schnorr, 1991). Inclusion-oriented advocates seem unwilling to sacrifice either the social/personal or academic/functional aspects of students' educational programs.

In the process of identifying a variety of social/personal and academic/functional outcomes for their students, inclusion-oriented school personnel attempt to establish a clear link between the school's educational program and students' quality of life. They seek to ensure that students' lives are improved as a result of being in school. Learning opportunities are created to achieve outcomes and then evaluated to determine if they are producing the intended results. Evaluation of a student's success in school does not need to be limited to narrowly defined target behaviors, but extended to include measures of meaningful outcomes that directly or indirectly relate to the quality of a person's life (Meyer & Janney, 1989).

In each of the inclusion-oriented schools that the author visited, at least one leader was identified who spearheaded inclusive reforms. As part of their ongoing school responsibilities, inclusion-oriented leaders emphasized the value of quality education for *all* youngsters, provided varying types of supports to facilitate inclusion on a practi-

cal level, and promoted inclusion-oriented activities by collaborating with members of the school community.

The nature and quality of education is primarily dependent upon people. People who work in inclusion-oriented schools seem to approach the challenges of school restructuring with optimism. These individuals are problem solvers who focus on how to make education better for all students rather than on enumerating a myriad of reasons for inaction. Making an attempt at a task, whether successful or not, is admirable. Hearing someone say, "Well, at least she tried," suggests that while trying and succeeding may be most valued, trying and only partially succeeding or even failing is more highly valued than not trying at all. Regardless of the level of perceived success, inclusion-oriented advocates actively try to improve education for all students.

Inclusion-oriented personnel tend to be flexible and individualize their approaches to both students and colleagues. They tend to reject highly standardized approaches to curriculum and instruction where students with particular characteristics are offered educational "one size fits all" programs. Their willingness to learn, ability to critically self-evaluate, and propensity for action have led to constructive school improvement. The presence of inclusion-oriented people can, and usually does, positively affect the status of inclusion and curriculum in schools.

INFLUENCE OF SOCIETAL AND EDUCATIONAL TRENDS ON CURRICULUM

Societal Trends

As social institutions, schools cannot be fully understood outside the context of societal and cultural influences. Regardless of whether one believes that schools reflect society, respond to societal needs, or exist to provide a model for society, schools are undeniably linked to multiple features of culture and society. Contemporary domestic issues such as fundamental changes in the configuration of families (e.g., single parent families), homelessness, hunger, immigration of people who speak a variety of languages, unemployment, teen pregnancy, and substance abuse challenge urban, suburban, and rural schools to adapt to meet and/or influence student and societal needs. In the face of these issues, clinging to traditional bureaucratic patterns of school organization that attempt to standardize complex work and reduce it to an assembly line model has exacerbated the challenge of providing appropriate education to a variety of students (Skrtic, 1987, 1989, 1991).

It is clear that the challenges faced in the United States and Canada are not completely influenced by factors within our exclusive control. We are part of an interdependent global economy, characterized by Naisbitt (1989) as "world free trade" and an "era of globalization." As Benjamin (1989) states in his comprehensive summary of societal and educational futures literature, "Our world is shrinking for several reasons. For example, advances in communications, microelectronics, and transportation have made it physically easier and more enjoyable for people to travel about the globe" (p. 8). Moreover, major economic trends such as: 1) a shift to an information/service-based economy, 2) the influence of high technology industries, 3) the need to shift jobs frequently, and 4) the so-called "short half-life" of knowledge will strain beliefs regarding many aspects of the information used by scientists, business people, teachers, and the graduates of our schools (Alley, 1985; Benjamin, 1989). Our graduates must be prepared to learn new information while on the job and be prepared to change jobs frequently.

Collectively, these trends mean that an increasing proportion of our students and their teachers will come from and be required to interact with people of different family structures, cultures, languages, and personal characteristics. This increased heterogeneity will naturally result in increased demands for graduates to value and cooperate with people who have diverse characteristics. Some local public school systems, in their attempts to meet these challenges, may see the demands as reasons to exclude or separate certain students from being served by the public school. Others will capitalize on the same demands by utilizing them as resources to assist students in developing solutions to pursue a better life through inclusion-oriented models of education. The abilities of people with diverse backgrounds and characteristics to live harmoniously in an increasingly interdependent world will be influenced by society's decision to pursue inclusion-oriented or separate schooling for various groups.

Educational Trends

Until recently, the vast majority of school reform initiatives pertained exclusively to students served within the general education system. Minimal national attention was directed toward educational reform for students with a range of educational needs. Recent literature suggests that the issues of school reform cannot be separated from educational equity for all types of students (Biklen, Ferguson, & Ford, 1989; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Graden, Zins, & Curtis, 1988; Lezotte, 1989; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989). In part, widening the scope of students included in reform efforts has meant extending research on

"effective schools" (Bickel & Bickel, 1986; Lezotte, 1989) and "selected best practices" (Fox & Williams, 1990) to include *all* types of students.

Educational trends such as the impact of new technology (Dede, 1989; Levin & Rumberger, 1987; Warren, Horn, & Hill, 1987), global education (Kniep, 1989), advancements in staff development (Showers, 1990; Villa, 1989), teaching strategies for learning (Deschler & Schumaker, 1988), and teachers and teams as decision makers have clear implications for inclusion-oriented curriculum and instruction. The focus here is on two trends having an impact on inclusion-oriented curricular efforts.

Strategies for Learning A resurgent interest in strategies and processes to encourage learning has been spawned by societal changes, particularly the information explosion, the pace of change, and increasing global interdependence. Trends are shifting toward teaching both students and teachers ways to learn. Structural arrangements provided through cooperative learning models have been advocated to facilitate student academic and social learning as well as adult group interaction ("Cooperative Learning," 1990; Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986; Johnson, Johnson, & Maruyama, 1983). Problem solving is increasingly recommended to assist students, teachers, and teams in generating creative alternatives to a range of challenges (Crabbe, 1989; Eberle & Stanish, 1985; Giangreco, 1990; Parnes, 1981, 1988; Torrance & Goff, 1989). Teachers are encouraged to assist students in learning how to learn through approaches such as the "Strategies Intervention Model" (Deschler & Schumaker, 1988). Deschler and Schumaker (1988) describe the five key components of the Strategies Intervention Model as: 1) instructional interventions take place in multiple settings, 2) roles of all those involved in instruction need to be clearly specified, 3) cooperative planning and feedback among team members, 4) retention and generalization of targeted learning strategies in the settings where they will be used (e.g., general education classrooms), and 5) support systems including families, school staff, and relevant nonschool agencies.

Emphasis has been shifting from a focus on content toward a focus on learning strategies such as teaching skills, processes, and practices that allow learners of all ages to sustain and update their acquisition and application of specific knowledge as it continues to change and expand. Rather than homogeneous student grouping based on content-oriented performance levels, the shift toward learning strategies presents opportunities for instruction within heterogeneous groups.

Teachers and Teams as Decision Makers Teacher and student participation in curricular and instructional decision making is a growing trend. Now and in the recent past, teaching basic skills (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics) and subject content (e.g., science, social studies) has been dominated by materials developed by curriculum designers. The teacher's role ranged from using readings and suggested activities that guide instruction to explicitly following highly standardized, scripted lessons. The students had virtually no role. In such cases, decisions about what and how to teach are removed partially or completely from the people most directly involved in the instruction.

While commercially developed curricular materials will probably continue to have a place in public schools, trends are shifting toward approaches that allow for and encourage decision making at the school and classroom level. While the valuable work done by curriculum designers is acknowledged, educators have recognized for many years how unlikely it is that any standardized materials will address the learning needs of all the students in a class or school. Strict adherence to rigid curricular sequences of questionable validity and generic instructional methods may contribute to the exclusion of some students from general classrooms because they do not readily fit into the standard program. The whole language perspective to teaching reading and language arts (Hierbert & Fisher, 1990; Watson, 1989) is one example of a current viewpoint that reestablishes the teacher as a primary decision maker. In doing so, teachers and teams are empowered to individualize instruction to match students' needs, interests, and learning styles.

Shifting away from predominantly textbook approaches has encouraged many teachers to design active learning experiences for students in classrooms, labs, and real-world settings. These motivating learning experiences may be designed not only by teachers, but by teams that include students, parents, and other professionals (see Villa & Thousand, chap. 7, this volume). There is growing recognition that school personnel, with the help of students, parents, and community members, can develop meaningful educational programs that accommodate a range of individual differences. This provides students and parents with opportunities to participate in the design of local education ("Strengthening Partnerships," 1989). Educational trends that rely on learning strategies and encourage classroom level decision making are congruent with inclusion-oriented curricular restructuring because they allow for heterogeneous grouping, encourage individualization, and base methods on situational variables affecting education. While several of the approaches discussed in this section were not introduced into general education as methods to facilitate

inclusion of all students, their compatibility with inclusion-oriented restructuring suggests that many general and special educators are pursuing similar approaches to educational improvement. This proposition provides encouragement that parallel systems of education (general and special) can be merged to provide appropriate education to students without the need to label, sort, and separate.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FACING INCLUSION-ORIENTED SCHOOLS

Curricular Relevance

Ensuring the relevance of curricular content is a challenge that will continually face schools since it is determined, in part, by the ever-changing characteristics of the environment and culture, as well as the needs and perceptions of consumers. While climate, culture, population, technology, and economy vary from one place to another, certain broad goals of education remain relevant across time and settings. Some goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum that can be actualized individually for students with varying characteristics and needs (Dewey, 1897; Goodlad, 1979; Minnesota State Board of Education, 1990; Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1982) are listed below:

1. Acquire basic competencies to participate effectively in current and life-long learning.
2. Develop basic competencies in personal management.
3. Develop a positive self-image.
4. Increase the numbers of environments and personally satisfying activities.
5. Develop, maintain, and expand mutually meaningful relationships with others.
6. Acquire and apply knowledge to community membership and citizenship.
7. Solve problems that are personally and/or societally meaningful.
8. Develop creative and aesthetic appreciation and abilities.
9. Value, accept, and understand human diversity and interdependence.
10. Address human needs through collaborative effort.
11. Cope with change that is self-initiated or initiated by others.
12. Use leisure time in personally and societally valued ways.
13. Acquire competencies that will maintain and enhance personal health.
14. Acquire home living skills.

15. Be vocationally productive (contribute fully or partially to one's own support).

As stated earlier, people in inclusion-oriented schools seek to ensure that all students' lives are improved as a result of having been in school. Therefore, the goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum reflect what society has historically considered desirable outcomes for many students and challenge that these same outcomes be extended to *all* students.

As one examines the goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum, it is difficult to take exception to such pragmatic and philosophically desirable outcomes. Yet, there are arguments that such optimistic outcomes are unrealistic or unattainable for some children, necessitating exclusion of some students. Rationalizing the exclusion of individual students based on certain personal characteristics to serve the majority is inherently detrimental to educational improvement. As Donald Baer (1981) wrote in his essay on educability:

> *I will proceed as if all children are capable of learning under instruction.* Note that this is a very comfortable statement at the level of policy. If I proceed in this way, sometimes—perhaps often—I will be right, and that will be good for children, good for society, and good for behavioral science. What will be good is not that I will have been right (much as I enjoy that), but rather that some children who we otherwise might have thought could not learn now will learn at least something useful to them, and that will be good for them. To the extent that such efforts make it manifest that this society means to do its best for even the least of its children, that is good for society's ethos and therefore for all of its children, even if *these* children progress only one response toward better self-help in their whole lives. And to the extent that we sometimes finally succeed in teaching a child whom we have consistently failed to teach in many previous efforts, we may learn something about teaching technique and about the nature of behavioral prerequisites to behavior changes . . . If we declare only a very few children to be incapable of learning, then we risk a correspondingly small amount of the first two outcomes—but we risk an exceptionally important part of the third: We risk perhaps the best encounters we could have with the nature of behavior. Too often, in my opinion, we teach children who are not only capable of teaching themselves, but eager to do so; in their wisdom, they cheat us of learning completely how the trick is done because they do some of it for us and do it privately. It is when they cannot do much if any of it for us that we get to find out how to do all of it ourselves, as teachers. (pp. 93–94)

In the early 1980s when Baer wrote these passages he was speaking primarily to psychologists and special educators who worked with children and youth labeled "profoundly mentally retarded." The children were typically taught in homogeneous special classes, special schools serving only children with disabilities, or institutions.

Although his ideas were originally intended for this audience of specialists, his message has renewed meaning for today's educators as inclusion-oriented advocates are exploring ways for all children to be part of the mainstream of school and community life and no one is designated "the least of society's children."

Instructional Practices

Pursuing the goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum offers educators significant opportunity to learn and improve. When education in the mainstream was only available for students considered easy to teach, educators could violate almost every known precept of good teaching and students would learn anyway. Teachers knew that if students failed they would become someone else's responsibility. Fortunately, there were enough educators committed to educational improvement that the trend shifted with exciting results, not just for the previously excluded students, but for all students.

Today's inclusion-oriented classrooms are stimulating learning environments for students and adults where active learning is stressed, students work in cooperative groups, and problem solving results in a variety of new solutions rather than a single correct answer. Trying to maintain the status quo of lectures, workbooks, and worksheets will not work in heterogeneous classes if educators seek a range of meaningful outcomes for students. The pressures of heterogeneous grouping on instructional design forces teachers to either exclude students (within or from the classroom) or meet the challenge to accommodate them. Delayed academic progress, low self-esteem, school misbehavior, substance abuse, and dropouts are a few of the major problems that have been associated with tracking and other artificial social constructions that separate children based on varying student characteristics (Natriello, 1987; Oakes, 1985).

Conversely, educators have only scratched the surface of opportunities available for teachers to learn and grow along with their students. The link drawn between the relevance of curricular outcomes sought for students in inclusion-oriented schools and the manner in which they are taught is simple: Instructional practices must match desired curricular outcomes. For students to establish a positive self-image, learning experiences must be designed to combine challenge and success. If students are to value, accept, and understand human diversity and interdependence, they must learn together with students who have different characteristics so they can draw upon the abilities of each other. For students to collaborate and solve problems, educators must design collaborative learning experiences and teach problem-solving skills to address personally and societally relevant

problems. For students to cope effectively with change, educator must allow change to occur and model positive coping strategies. To day's emerging emphasis on cooperative learning, whole language peer tutoring, active learning, problem solving, and learning strat egies match the goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum. Instructiona practices that are congruent with inclusion-oriented curriculum ca facilitate the kinds of skills that children will increasingly need as th world becomes more complex and interdependent.

Leadership in Schools

Curricular and instructional changes can be influenced significantl by the relative presence or absence of leadership in schools. Today, or the brink of an inclusionary explosion, educators are in desperat need of leaders to step forward and facilitate the process. In times o change, leadership often comes from multiple and sometimes unexpected sources. The standard belief that leadership is the exclusiv dominion of administrators is antiquated in inclusion-oriented schools (Villa & Thousand, 1990). People were once considered leaders because it was believed that they had innate skills, knowledge, insight, vision, and/or charisma (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). These and other leadership qualities may be possessed by administrators as well as teachers, support personnel, parents, community members, and students. More recent perspectives suggest that leaders are people capable of engendering leadership qualities and a propensity for action in others. This highlights the need to combine effectively the skills and qualities of group members rather than consolidating leadership in one person or a select group with vested authority (Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Just as instruction must be congruent with the goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum, so must leadership approaches be consistent with both inclusion-oriented goals and instructional practices. It is virtually inconceivable that inclusion-oriented curriculum and instruction could be initiated, sustained, or appropriately modified given incongruent leadership models (e.g., autocratic, laissez faire). Alternative forms of *collaborative leadership* (Johnson & Johnson, 1987), *value-added leadership* (Sergiovanni, 1990a, 1990b), *facilitating leadership* based on group problem solving (Parnes, 1985), and *adhocratic leadership* (Skrtic, 1991, 1987; Thousand, 1990) may be used or combined to form organizational patterns congruent with inclusion-oriented education. These process-referenced approaches seek to strike a "delicate balance" (Parnes, 1988). "How loose can a person stay before falling apart, and conversely, how tight can one remain before freezing up?" (Parnes, 1988, p. 319). Many of the pro-

cesses inherent in collaborative, problem-solving, and adhocratic approaches attempt to balance openness with structure.

The goals of inclusion-oriented curriculum also provide a framework for leadership and organization. School personnel can benefit from a positive self-image, collaboration with colleagues, problem-solving methods, valuing differences, and building upon interdependencies. In fact, the challenges faced by educators today are so complex and massive that faithfully practicing the ideas and strategies is essential.

Diffusion of Innovations

Widespread adoption of an inclusion-oriented curriculum as described in this book would be a significant departure from the status quo in public schools. As an educational innovation, there is much to learn about how inclusion-oriented curriculum can work to effectively serve students with diverse needs. At the same time, many advocates of inclusion-oriented schooling believe there is sufficient knowledge and skill to begin the process of change now. In his book, *Diffusion of Innovations*, E. Rogers (1983) wrote:

> An *innovation* is an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption. It matters little, so far as human behavior is concerned, whether or not an idea is *objectively* new as measured by the lapse of time since its first use or discovery. The perceived newness of the idea for the individual determines his or her reaction to it. If the idea seems new to the individual, it is an innovation. (p. 11) *Diffusion* is the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system. It is a special type of communication, in that the messages are concerned with new ideas. It is the newness of the idea in the message content of communication that gives diffusion its special character. (p. 5) The newness means that some degree of uncertainty is involved. (p. 6)

Whether the innovation is inclusion-oriented curriculum, magnet schools, sex education, or AIDS education, change in today's schools is inescapable and occurring with an increasing frequency that parallels societal change. This highlights the rationale for one goal of inclusion-oriented curriculum, "cope with change that is self-initiated or initiated by others" (see p. 246, this chapter). Diffusion for the purpose of adopting and sustaining an innovation is a major challenge facing inclusion-oriented advocates. Given the scope of inclusion-oriented education, understanding the extensive and complex nature of diffusion becomes imperative.

Change can be facilitated through any combination of structural, political, human resource, and symbolic actions (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Fullan, 1982). Having a framework to conceptualize change can

reduce people's anxiety and thus advance their potential for meaningful participation in the process (Giangreco, 1989). The potential contributions by members of the immediate or extended school community could be too valuable to prevent anyone from active participation in the change process. Chastising others for their "behind the times" thinking is likely to perpetuate defensiveness among group members and impede desired changes. Therefore, initiators of inclusion-oriented curricular changes must actively listen to and consider the perspectives of those with whom he or she disagrees. By deferring judgment regarding the ideas of others while simultaneously building on shared beliefs and goals, inclusion-oriented advocates can facilitate change in ways more likely to be adopted and sustained over time.

Diffusion of innovations including inclusion-oriented curriculum typically advance via standard sources such as preservice preparation, inservice staff development, media resources (e.g., books, journals, videos), and people-to-people contacts (e.g., presentations, technical assistance, collaborative consultation). Initiators of innovation seeking the scope of change required to implement inclusion-oriented curricula use these standard sources in addition to developing new ones, such as the involvement of class peers in joint problem solving (Giangreco, 1990; Giangreco & Cloninger, 1990) or "circles of friends" (Snow & Forest, 1987). Currently, people-to-people contacts and an emerging body of inclusion-oriented media resources (Biklen, 1988; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1990b; Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989; Vandercook, Wolff, & York, 1989; York, Vandercook, MacDonald, Heise-Neff, & Caughey, 1989; York, Vandercook, MacDonald, & Wolff, 1989) are the primary sources of diffusion. While the emergence of inservice staff development approaches offers initial ways to promote diffusion (Showers, 1990; Villa, 1989), preservice preparation for teachers, administrators, and other school-related professionals lags far behind. In part, this may account for the significant time period between the initiation and widespread adoption of educational innovations. Few educators or support personnel (e.g., speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists) enter their profession with an inclusion-oriented ethic or with the competencies and supervised practice required for success in inclusion-oriented schools. Relaying the message about what inclusion-oriented curriculum is, why it is beneficial for students, and how it can be done effectively remains a challenge.

This section identified four major challenges facing the move toward inclusion-oriented schooling: 1) ensuring curricular relevance

for all students, 2) matching instructional practices to the curricular content, 3) establishing leadership and organizational perspectives congruent with inclusion-oriented curriculum and instruction, and 4) diffusing inclusion-oriented innovations through standard and emerging sources. While these and other challenges present formidable obstacles, they also provide sterling opportunities for the rejuvenation and growth of our field. In the next two sections potential courses of action are offered to facilitate inclusion-oriented schooling on both macro and micro levels.

POTENTIAL ACTIONS TO FACILITATE INCLUSION-ORIENTED SCHOOLING (MACRO)

Adhocracy

School administrators are poised to take one of the first courses of action to promote inclusion-oriented school environments, curricula, and instruction. Changes in how school personnel interact with each other seem to be a key ingredient of success for inclusion-oriented schools. Skrtic (1987) articulated the consequences of "machine and professional bureaucracies" (p. 4) on the ability of school personnel to meet the needs of individual learners. Skrtic recommends the development of an *adhocracy*, meaning that "teams of professionals mutually adjust their collective skills and knowledge to invent unique, personalized programs for each student" (Thousand, 1990, p. 32). Given the changing nature of knowledge as well as the unpredictable, and thus nonstandardizable needs of individual learners with educational challenges, an adhocratic model of organization allows invention to occur, in contrast to bureaucracies that standardize production.

One adhocratic example described by Thousand and Villa (1990) as a "teaching team" approach is successfully operating in some inclusion-oriented schools.

> A teaching team is an organizational and instructional arrangement of two or more members of the school and greater community who distribute among themselves planning, instructional, and evaluation responsibilities for the same students on a regular basis for an extended period of time. Teams can vary in size from two to six or seven people. They can vary in composition as well, involving any possible combination of classroom teachers, specialized personnel (e.g., special educators, speech and language pathologists, guidance counselors, health professionals, employment specialists), instructional assistants, student teachers, community volunteers (e.g, parents, members of the local 'foster grandparent' program), and students, themselves. (pp. 152–153)

The result, according to Thousand and Villa (1989), is that any student may receive intensive instructional support within the classroom if the existing staff is reassigned to result in a lower instructor–learner ratio. This redistribution of resources capitalizes on the diverse knowledge and instructional styles of the team members. As Skrtic (1989, 1991) notes, adhocracies can promote successful accomplishment of complex work, coordination through mutual adaptation of skills, and novel services that meet unique client needs in a dynamic, fluid, and changing environment.

Research and practice literature clearly indicate that administrators *can* address several variables associated with successful implementation of inclusion-oriented curricula. Some of these variables, shown in Table 1, include: 1) establishing and building consensus, 2) expecting and creating opportunities for collaboration, 3) expanding the curriculum, 4) redefining roles, and 5) creating common conceptual frameworks through staff development (Thousand et al., 1986; Thousand & Villa, 1990; Villa & Thousand, 1990).

Integrating Existing Innovations

Integrating innovations, although a challenging endeavor, is both necessary and encouraging. It is necessary because innovations must be conceptualized and implemented within the context of an overall school plan if they are to lead to constructive, coherent improvement. It is encouraging because it appears that sufficient knowledge exists to achieve many more inclusion-oriented schools than presently exist. More than 10 years ago, based on a review of effective schools, Edmonds (1979) concluded:

> We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need in order to do this. Whether we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven't done it so far. (p. 29)

Table 1. Organizational strategies for promoting inclusion-oriented schools

Strategy	Outcomes
Establishing and building consensus	Common assumptions and beliefs
Expecting and creating opportunities for collaboration	Flexible and fluid teaching assignments
Expanding the curriculum	Increased variety, options, and responsiveness to student needs
Redefining roles	Acquisition of new job functions and knowledge due to shared expertise
Creating common conceptual frameworks through staff development	Acquisition of best practices and curriculum development

Source: Adapted from Villa and Thousand (1990).

In his summary article on integrating innovations, Guskey (1990) offers five guidelines to assist school leaders in their efforts to synthesize various innovations within the context of overall school improvement plans:

1. All innovative strategies in the improvement program should share common goals and premises.
2. No single innovative strategy can do everything.
3. The innovative strategies in the improvement program should complement each other.
4. All innovative strategies need to be adapted to individual classroom and building conditions.
5. When a well conceived combination of innovative strategies is used, the results are likely to be greater than those attained using any single strategy.

These guidelines represent common sense ideas for selecting and evaluating innovations being considered for adoption in schools. They also presume that schools have articulated a clear mission so they can judge innovations based on their congruence with the goals they seek for students.

Research demonstrating the effectiveness of any particular strategy or innovation is appealing, yet it also has potential drawbacks. Innovations must first be congruent with values embedded in the school philosophy and have a logical basis. While efficacy research is desirable, a congruent value base and underlying logic are sufficient for initial adoption. Evaluation of initiated innovations is then needed to assess the impact of the change. Educators must avoid being enticed by the appeal of efficacy data without corresponding values and logic congruent with the school mission. The following story exemplifies such a situation:

> Three coals miners are working in an underground tunnel when they hear an unusual sound and the lights go out. The miners smell what they believe is a gas leak. Without fully considering the situation, one miner struck a match to shed some light on the situation. Luckily for the miners, the ensuing explosion was minor, resulting only in a few scrapes. The other two miners, who were understandably upset by their coworker's lack of good judgment, asked him why he lit the match. He explained, "We needed light and I knew it would work. It seemed like a good idea at the time."

We have years of data indicating that matches work to produce light and heat. However, just because something works to produce a particular effect does not mean it should be used in all circumstances; other factors must also be considered. If research data supporting the efficacy of a particular innovation lead to its adoption, an educational explosion and potential destruction may occur if it is incongruent with the school's values and logic. Although there may be hundreds of research studies demonstrating the efficacy of a particular approach to teaching basic literacy skills, the approach is unlikely to facilitate inclusion-oriented schooling if it is based on homogeneous grouping and a "one size fits all" approach to instruction. If a particular "discipline" program with impressive efficacy data is aversive (e.g., subjects students to physical or psychological pain) or includes procedures that may constitute public humiliation (e.g., ridicule of a student in the presence of classmates), it would be an incompatible choice since such approaches violate inclusion-oriented goals sought for children. Guskey's (1990) guidelines for evaluating innovations may provide opportunities for members of the school community to clarify their mission and take steps to implement it.

POTENTIAL ACTIONS TO FACILITATE INCLUSION-ORIENTED SCHOOLING (MICRO)

While educational philosophers and scholars struggle with the challenges associated with integrating macrolevel innovations, many educators wonder what they can do to facilitate inclusion-oriented environments, curriculum, and instruction in the meantime. Like any grassroots movement, the collective power of individuals cannot be underestimated. The small changes implemented by individuals and groups can have significant cumulative effects (Carnoy & Levin, 1985; Giangreco, 1989). The ideas presented in Tables 2 and 3 represent two categories for educators to use as guidelines, General Inclusion-Oriented Actions and Curricular/Instructional Inclusion-Oriented Actions. Although these categories are presented separately, they need not be considered consecutively. Many of the suggestions can be addressed simultaneously and in any variety of combinations. The ideas in Tables 2 and 3 are not comprehensive or prescriptive in nature; they are suggestions for educators to initiate or continue inclusion with instructional integrity in schools and communities.

These microlevel actions can be summed up as the four "Ps": *personal, political, professional,* and *practice* (A. Nevin, personal communication, May 24, 1990). Personal actions include expanding personal boundaries at every opportunity and reaching out and interacting on personal, social, and professional levels with people who have a range of individual differences. Educators should find out first hand how these people cope, contribute, and celebrate their differ-

Table 2. Potential actions for facilitating inclusive education: General inclusion-oriented actions

Find out where inclusion-oriented programs are going on and learn more about them.
Plan a conference or workshop for your school on inclusive education.
Establish transition policies and procedures to create the opportunity for all students recently referred for special education and existing students to receive special education and/or related services in general education classes (Thousand et al., 1986).
Establish prereferral procedures to strengthen general education and avoid unnecessary referral, labeling, and placement of students in special education (Graden, Casey, & Bronstrom, 1985).
Design a staff development plan to provide school faculty and staff with information, shared language, skills, and experiences that will allow them to be increasingly successful in teaching heterogeneous groups of students (Villa, 1989).
Establish peer support networks (Stainback & Stainback, 1990a).
Establish policies only to serve students from one district, thus creating the need for neighboring districts to serve their own students.
Present information to the school board regarding the potential benefits to all students by pursuing inclusion-oriented schools.
Ask elected officials (school, local, state, national) what their views are regarding inclusion-oriented schooling; inform them of your views and vote accordingly.
Learn another language (e.g., American Sign Language, Spanish, Russian).
Arrange for people who are pursuing inclusion-oriented schooling in your community to be recognized locally, regionally, and nationally for their exemplary work.
Lobby for reallocation of school budget to support inclusion-oriented schooling.

ences. Political actions include becoming involved in the organizations and systems that can create change in communities. Professional actions include being aware of current trends, research, and literature within and outside the field of education. Some of the best ideas to improve curriculum and instruction may be the result of implementing ideas from other fields. Educators should take steps to ensure that they actively continue their learning. Finally, as educators practice their personal, political, and professional actions, they will create opportunities to take risks and set an example that may inspire others to act with them. In these ways one person *can* make a difference.

Actions for change are often initiated with a "best guess" in an experimental and evaluative mode. This does not mean that initiating change is so haphazard that it does not matter what is done first. Change may start in any variety of ways or places based on many factors unique to a situation. The need for more inclusive schools and

Table 3. Potential actions for facilitating inclusive education: Curricular/instructional inclusion-oriented actions

Converse with a colleague from a different discipline (administration, regular education, special education, psychology, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech pathology) to learn more about what they do.
Take a course to increase teaching skills for learners who have a range of individual differences and learn how to adapt curriculum.
Read literature on innovations that are congruent with inclusive education such as cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986), whole language (Watson, 1989), multilevel instruction (Campbell, Campbell, Collicott, Perner, & Stone, 1988), curriculum overlapping (Giangreco & Meyer, 1988; Giangreco & Putnam, 1991), peer tutoring (Pierce, Stahlbrand, & Armstrong, 1984), and creative problem solving (Parnes, 1981, 1985, 1988).
Establish a school-level or district-level task force to determine if curricular innovations are consistent with each other (Guskey, 1990; Olson, 1989).
Talk to graduates of your school's special education programs to determine what was positive about your services and what could be improved.
Talk to employers and business people in the community to find out what kinds of skills, attitudes, and characteristics they value and consider when hiring employees.
Establish a regular item on the faculty meeting agenda to discuss curricular issues.
Use instructional approaches and inclusive curricular content that potentiate each other (e.g., cooperative group learning promoting collaborative skills).
Photocopy the tables of contents from regular and special education journals and send to faculty members so they can be aware of recent developments and read articles of interest.
Critique recent literature on curriculum/instruction with colleagues on a regular basis.
Establish individual student planning teams.
Develop a peer support group among faculty; teach and coach each other regarding curricular/instructional innovations.

educational programs requires action, regardless of its perceived magnitude. As Alex Osborn, who coined the term *brainstorming* said, "A fair idea put to use is better than a good idea kept on the polishing wheel" (Parnes, 1988, p. 37).

CONCLUSION

The fact that the world is changing is unavoidable. Educators have choices to make about how education can improve the lives of students as a result of having been in school. A good start may be to join with other members of school communities to determine what chil-

dren should learn. Once that is accomplished in at least an initial way (it is always changing), the next tasks are to design instructional practices that will assist in achieving student goals and to select forms of school organization that support curriculum and instruction.

Inclusion-oriented schools exist, yet diffusing them remains a challenge. All inclusion-oriented schools may not be models of excellence for curriculum and instruction. The quality of education in inclusion-oriented schools varies dramatically. Continued efforts to restructure schools and integrate innovations should lead to further school improvements and more widely available models of inclusion with instructional integrity.

Although this chapter has suggested methods for individuals and groups to facilitate inclusion-oriented schooling through curriculum and instruction, the true challenge is not whether educators *can* develop inclusive schools, it is whether educators *will* develop inclusive schools. Do educators think it is worth doing? Can they afford to do it? Can they afford not to do it?

A few cost-analysis studies have documented the economic advantages of including people with significant disabilities in more integrated activities and environments (Hill, Wehman, Kregel, Banks, & Metzler, 1987; Piuma, 1989). It is encouraging that extending new opportunities to previously excluded people is considered money well spent and good news for taxpayers. Yet, the author hesitates to embrace cost-benefit analysis as a criterion to provide or not provide inclusion-oriented education for children in the United States. In Donald Baer's (1981) essay on educability, he symbolically dedicated one of his points to the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB). He wrote:

> The amount we spend on even unnecessarily expensive attempts to teach the most profoundly retarded can always be compared to the amount that we spend on unnecessarily designed jeans, photographs of Saturn's rings, ballistic and antiballistic missiles of unknown necessity, nonfunctional tanks, skirts of a yearly-different length, lapels of a yearly-different width, nuclear alternatives to oil, and Southeast Asian wars. The essence of the OMB-like point is that how much we spend on anything is not determined by its necessity, its value, its frivolity, or even its price, so much as it is determined by behavior modification (most often in the form called politics). Thus, it is always open to remodification. If NARC (formerly the National Association for Retarded Citizens) and its allies think they can move sufficient representatives and senators into investing another millipercentage of the gross national product into the teaching of the most profoundly retarded, the point is either to help them, hinder them, or watch them, but hardly to suggest that they are flying in the face of natural law. Indeed, they are merely acting as if politicians are capable of learning under instruction; they are trying to develop the most effective techniques of that instruction. (p. 95)

Although there is hope that inclusion-oriented efforts can be cost-effective, whether the United States pursues this course of action on behalf of children will probably depend less on cost and more on politics, and whether, collectively, educators are willing to take the risks involved in change.

In closing this book, this author shares a hopeful observation about a phenomenon observed in inclusion-oriented classrooms—an "upward spiraling effect." If people preparing for a career in teaching are asked why they want to be teachers, it is rare that someone would describe their dream as "giving straightforward lectures and having kids complete ditto sheets and fill in workbooks." No, most of the people this author has met during the last 15 years who want to be teachers have a vision to teach relevant content through stimulating activities. They picture themselves designing experiments, real-world field study, provocative discussions, and a multitude of variations that make learning enjoyable and motivating. Yet, somewhere along the way many teachers lose that dream. For whatever reasons, many may realize that after 10 or 15 years they have resorted to giving lectures and using workbooks and ditto sheets. Whether by choice or not, some of the teachers who find themselves faced with inclusion-oriented change have experienced a rejuvenation in their excitement about teaching. That enthusiasm, combined with their skill, has encouraged students to become more excited about learning. This response encourages teachers and the spiral continues upward at varying speeds for different people. The energy inherent in these collaborative and mutually beneficial interactions among adults and students is the fuel that fires the engine of inclusion-oriented schools. Inclusion-oriented people have a vision of schools where all children are welcomed and where teachers design educational experiences to meet student needs and, at the same time, some of their own. To paraphrase Baer (1981), you can help them, you can hinder them, or you can watch them. Your decision, whatever it is, *will* matter.

REFERENCES

Alley, J. (1985, April–May). *Future research data and general education reform.* Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 674)

Baer, D. (1981). A hung jury and a Scottish verdict: "Not proven." *Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities, 1*(1), 91–98.

Benjamin, S. (1989, September). An ideascape for education: What futurists recommend. *Educational Leadership,* 8–14.

Bickel, W.E., & Bickel, D.D. (1986). Effective schools, classrooms, and in-

struction: Implications for special education. *Exceptional Children, 52*(6), 489–500.
Biklen, D. (Producer). (1988). *Regular lives* [Video]. Washington, DC: State of the Art Productions.
Biklen, D., Ferguson, D., & Ford. A. (Eds.). (1989). *Schooling and disability: 88th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1984). *Modem approaches to understanding and managing organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Campbell, C., Campbell, S., Collicott, J., Perner, D., & Stone, J. (1988). Individualizing instruction. *Education New Brunswick—Journal Edition, 3,* 17–20.
Carnoy, M.M., & Levin, H. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
Conn-Powers, M., Ross-Allen, J., & Holburn, S. (1990). Transition of young children into the elementary education mainstream. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 9*(4), 91–105.
Cooperative learning. (1990). *Educational Leadership, 47*(4).
Crabbe, A.B. (1989). The future problem solving program. *Educational Leadership, 47*(1), 27–29.
Dede, C.J. (1989). The evolution of information technology: Implications for curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 47*(1), 23–27.
Deschler, D., & Schumaker, J.B. (1988). An instructional model for teaching students how to learn. In J. Graden, J. Zins, & M. Curtis (Eds.), *Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students* (pp. 391–411). Washington, DC: National Association for School Psychologists.
Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal, 54*(3), 77–80.
Eberle, B., & Stanish, B. (1985). *CPS for kids: A resource book for teaching creative problem-solving to children.* East Aurora, NY: D.O.K. Publishers.
Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. *Social Policy, 9*(5), 25–29.
Fox, T., & Williams, W. (1990). *Selected best practices for meeting the special needs of all students in their local school and community.* Burlington: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.
Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change.* New York: Teacher's College Press.
Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 367–395.
Giangreco, M.F. (1989). Facilitating integration of students with disabilities: Implications of "planned change" for teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 12*(4), 139–147.
Giangreco, M.F. (1990). *Using creative problem solving methods to include students with severe disabilities in general education activities.* Manuscript submitted for publication review. Burlington: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.
Giangreco, M.F., & Cloninger, C.J. (1990). Educational program development for children and youth with dual sensory impairments: Facilitating inclusion through problem-solving methods. *The TASH Newsletter, 16*(5), 10.
Giangreco, M.F., & Meyer, L.H. (1988). Expanding service delivery options in regular schools and classrooms for students with severe disabilities. In J. Graden, J. Zins, & M. Curtis (Eds.), *Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students* (pp. 241–267). Washington, DC: National Association for School Psychologists.

Giangreco, M.F., & Putnam, J.W. (1991). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in regular education environments. In L.H. Meyer, C.A. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), *Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities* (pp. 245–270). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Goodlad, J. (1979). *What are schools for?* New York: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
Graden, J., Casey, A., & Bronstrom, O. (1985). Implementing a prereferral intervention system: Part I. The Model. *Exceptional Children. 51,* 377–384.
Graden, J., Zins, J., & Curtis, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students.* Washington, DC: National Association for School Psychologists.
Guskey, T.R. (1990). Integrating innovations. *Educational Leadership, 47*(5),11–15.
Hierbert, E.H., & Fisher, C.W. (1990). Whole language: Three themes for the future. *Educational Leadership, 47*(6), 62–64.
Hill, M.L., Wehman, P.H., Kregel, J., Banks, P.D., & Metzler, J. (1987). Employment outcomes for people with moderate and severe disabilities: An eight-year longitudinal analysis of supported competitive employment. *Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12*(3), 182–189.
Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, F. P. (1987). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Holubec, E.J. (1986). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom.* (rev. ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.
Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 3*(1), 5–54
Kniep, W.M. (1989). Global education as school reform. *Educational Leadership, 47*(1), 43–46.
Levin, H.M., & Rumberger (1987). Educational requirements for new technologies: Visions, possibilities, and current realities. *Educational Policy, 1*(3), 333–354.
Lezotte, L. (1989). School improvement based on the effective schools research. In D.K. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.), *Beyond separate education: Quality education for all* (pp. 25–37). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A. (Eds.). (1989). *Beyond separate education: Quality education for all.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Meyer, L.H., & Janney, R. (1989). User friendly measures of meaningful outcomes: Evaluating behavioral interventions. *Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 14*(4), 263–270.
Minnesota State Board of Education. (1990, February). *State board of education curriculum rules: 3500.1060, Learner goals.* St. Paul: Author.
Naisbitt, J. (1989, April). *Millenium trends.* Presentation at the Illinois Association of School Boards, Chicago. As quoted by Adkins, G. (1989), *"Megatrends" author foresees the millenium. Educational Leadership, 47,*(1) 16–17.
Natriello, G. (Ed.). (1987). *School dropouts: Patterns and policies.* New York: Teacher's College Press.
Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Olson, J. (1989). Surviving innovation: Reflection on the pitfalls of practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21*(6), 503–508.
Parnes, S.J. (1981). *The magic of your mind.* Buffalo, NY: Creative Education Foundation, Inc.
Parnes, S.J. (1985). *A facilitating style of leadership.* East Aurora, NY: D.O.K. Publishers.
Parnes, S.J. (1988). *Visionizing: State of the art processes for encouraging innovative excellence.* East Aurora, NY: D.O.K. Publishers.
Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies.* New York: Harper & Row.
Pierce, M., Stahlbrand, K., & Armstrong, S. (1984). *Increasing student productivity through peer tutoring programs.* Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
Piuma, M.F. (1989). *Benefits and costs of integrating students with severe disabilities into regular public school programs: A study of money well spent.* San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.
Rogers, E. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
Schnorr, R. (1991). "Peter? He comes and goes . . .": First graders perspectives of a part-time mainstream student. *Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15,* 231–240.
Sergiovanni, T. (1990a). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 23–27.
Sergiovanni, T. (1990b). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Showers, B. (1990). Aiming for superior classroom instruction for all children: A comprehensive staff development model. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 35–39.
Skrtic, T. (1987). An organizational analysis of special education reform. *Counterpoint, 8*(2), 15–19.
Skrtic, T. (1989, May). *School organization and service delivery: Are schools capable of change?* Paper presented at the Vermont Association of Special Education Administrators Conference, Stowe, VT.
Skrtic, T. (1991). *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional knowledge in school organization.* Denver, CO: Love Publishing.
Snow, J., & Forest, M. (1987). Circles. In M. Forest (Ed.), *More education integration: A further collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems.* Downsview, Ontario: G. Allan Roeher Institute.
Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (1989). *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1990a). Facilitating peer supports and friendships. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education* (pp. 51–63). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1990b). *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Strengthening partnerships with parents and community. (1989). *Educational Leadership, 47*(2).
Thousand, J. (1990). Organizational perspectives in teacher education and renewal: A conversation with Tom Skrtic. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 13*(1), 30–35.

Thousand, J., Fox, T., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox, T. (1986). *The homecoming model: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments.* Burlington: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.
Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1989). Enhancing success in heterogeneous schools. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 89–103). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (1990). Sharing expertise and responsibilities through teaching teams. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education* (pp. 151–166). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Torrance, E.P., & Goff, K. (1989). A quiet revolution. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 23*(2), 136–145.
Vandercook, T., Wolff, S., & York, J. (1989). *Learning together: Stories and strategies.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.
Villa, R. (1989). Model public school inservice programs: Do they exist? *Teacher Education and Special Education, 12*(4), 173–176.
Villa, R.A., & Thousand, J.S. (1990). Administrative supports to promote inclusive schooling. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education* (pp. 201–218). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Warren, S.F., Horn, E.H., & Hill, E.W. (1987). Some innovative educational applications of advanced technologies. In L. Goetz, D. Guess, & K. Stremel-Campbell (Eds.), *Innovative program design for individuals with dual sensory impairments* (pp. 283–309). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Watson, D. (1989). Defining and describing whole language. *The Elementary School Journal, 90*(2), 129–141.
York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1989). *Regular class integration: Feedback from teachers and classmates.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.
York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., & Wolff, S. (1989). *Strategies for full inclusion.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.
Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, R. (1982). *Critical issues in special and remedial education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.