



1991

A Role of the Principal in the Administration and Supervision of Special Education with External Mandates Including School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dyer-Dawson, Diane F., "A Role of the Principal in the Administration and Supervision of Special Education with External Mandates Including School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools" (1991). *Dissertations*. 2758.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2758

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1991 Diane F. Dyer-Dawson

The Role of the Principal in the
Administration and Supervision of
Special Education with External Mandates
Including School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools

by

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty
of the School of Education of Loyola University
Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

May

1991

Copyright

by

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson, 1991

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study is an examination of the role of the principal in the administration and supervision of special education in Chicago. It considers the external mandates present at this time including School Reform and the Consent Agreement that has been entered into between The Office of Civil Rights, The Illinois State Board of Education, and the Chicago Board of Education. The study also examines some attitudes and practices of the Chicago Public School principals.

The research was conducted by means of survey. The population consists of the 620 principals employed by the Chicago Public Schools in May of 1990. The survey included 31 items including both descriptive and attitudinal questions. Some questions allowed for responses to open ended questions. There were also seven items using a Likert-scale for responses. Two hundred twenty one (221) responses were received. The rate of return for this study was 36 percent.

Some conclusions were that principals engage in a variety of practices when students appear in need of special education. The Chicago Public School principals felt prepared to be administrators of special education programs in their schools. They gave a number of suggestions to improve special education delivery of service and programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Arthur Safer who chaired my dissertation committee. His continued encouragement and guidance were invaluable to me. Special gratitude is also due the other members of my committee: Dr. Philip Carlin for his support throughout my entire doctoral program and Dr. Joy Rogers for her sustained interest and enthusiasm in my study.

In addition this study could never have been completed without the encouragement and cooperation of my many colleagues in the Chicago Public Schools. To them I express deep gratitude. I also thank my fellow students at Loyola who were always helpful and supportive. And also, gratitude is owed the faculty, staff, and parents of Park Manor School who rallied around every milestone in this process.

Finally, I thank God for the love and encouragement of my parents, Geraldine and Coy Smith. There are no words to express the gratitude I feel for the love and understanding shown by my husband, Bernarr Dawson. Also, I thank my daughters Ouida and Deidre and my son Nelson for giving me the freedom to pursue my studies. Certainly, I must also thank my best friends, Bettye and Velma, who have been there for me throughout every significant event in my life.

VITA

The author, Diane F. Dyer-Dawson, was born in Chicago, Illinois, on February 16, 1941. She obtained her elementary and secondary education in the Chicago Public Schools. She was graduated from Parker High School in 1957.

She was granted the degree of Bachelor of Education in 1970 from Chicago State University. In 1976, she graduated from the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana with a Master of Education Degree. Her major was Special Education with a concentration in the area of Learning Disabilities. Later she returned to Chicago State University to take additional courses in Administration and Supervision. She continued to pursue her education by entering the doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University Chicago in 1986.

Mrs. Dyer-Dawson has taught at three public schools in Chicago. These were Luella, Betsy Ross, and Cather Elementary Schools. Her teaching experience includes both regular and special education. Later she became the assistant principal at Cather. After passing the Principal's Examination, she was assigned in 1984 to the principalship of Park Manor Elementary School in Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES.....	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	11
Methodology of the Study.....	12
Definition of Terms.....	14
Limitations of the Study.....	18
Organization of the Study.....	19
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	21
Regular Education Initiative.....	25
Integration.....	29
The Role of the Principal.....	33
School Reform.....	39
Policy Formulation.....	43
Summary.....	45
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	48
The Research Questions.....	49
The Pilot Study.....	49
Permission of the School System.....	50
The Target Population.....	51
Survey Content.....	51
Distribution and Follow-Up.....	57
Method of Recording Results.....	58
Survey Returns.....	59
Summary.....	59

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	61
Demographic Information.....	62
Research Question #1.....	69
Research Question #2.....	73
Research Question #3.....	75
Research Question #4.....	80
Research Question #5.....	84
Research Question #6.....	93
Summary.....	101
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	104
Conclusions.....	106
Recommendations.....	108
Recommendations for Further Study.....	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	111
APPENDIX A.....	117
APPENDIX B.....	120
APPENDIX C.....	124
APPENDIX D.....	128
APPENDIX E.....	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Information.....	63
2	Demographic Information Relating to the Type of School.....	68
3	Frequency of Reported Practices Used When a Student Appears in Need of Special Education Services.....	70
4	Frequency of Practices for Enrolling a Student With an IEP.....	72
5	Frequency of Special Education Divisions Reported.....	74
6	Frequency of Attitude Responses of Principals Who Do Not Have Special Education Classes in Their School.....	76
7	Scores of the Position Responses Summarizing the Attitudes of the Principals as to the Importance of Special Education and Their Perception of Their Own Administrative Ability.....	78
8	Frequency of Reported Years of Experience as a Principal.....	81
9	Frequency of Responses Indicating Administrative Preparation.....	83
10	Frequency of Reported Number of Staffings Attended Per Year by Each Principal.....	85
11	Frequency of Responses to Items Indicating the Principal Involves the Faculty and the Local School Council with Special Education.....	87

Table		Page
12	Frequency of Reported Conferences Held by the Principal with Special Education Parents.....	87
13	Frequency of Reported Suggestions for Ways to Improve the Administration of Special Education in CPS Schools.....	88
14	Frequency of Reported Suggestions for Providing Special Education Services Another Way.....	94
15	Frequency of Suggestions to Improve the Delivery of Special Education Services.....	97

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Special Education, its definition and implementation has remained controversial ever since PL 94-142 was enacted. At present in Chicago three major concerns influence policy decisions and affect how principals oversee special education in their schools. First, the concept of Least Restrictive Environment continues to be an area that must be defined by both the courts and the theorists. From this debate the Regular Education Initiative has emerged as a basis for delivery systems in special education programs.

The Chicago Public School System has been cited as a troubled and ineffective school system by many critics. Second, a school reform plan (Public Act 85-1418) was passed in 1988 after many public debates. Parents, private citizens, businessmen and special interest groups provided input on this plan designed to improve the Chicago Public School System. This law is an amendment to The School Code of Illinois. It was designed to change the governance and decision making structure in the Chicago Public Schools. And it created Local School Councils composed of 6 parents, 2 teachers, and 2 community people which are now the governing bodies of each school in Chicago.

A third force to impact on the administration and supervision of special education entered the scenario in 1989. The Office of Civil Rights found against the Chicago Public Schools regarding compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended 29 O.S.C. sec. 794. Judge Bernard Ries issued the following finding:

the Board has been and is discriminating within the meaning of the Act, by failing to ensure that qualified handicapped persons are evaluated., provided access to meaningful educational services and reevaluated, without unreasonable delay ¹

At this point the OCR and the CPS entered into an agreement to correct these findings. The administration of special education in Chicago remains under court supervision.

This agreement required the Board to reorganize its delivery services and central department structure. The agreement called for the Department to be directed by an Associate Superintendent of Special Education and this person should report directly to the General Superintendent. The courts have further interpreted this agreement to give the Associate Superintendent powers that supersede that of the building principals.

¹ U.S. Department of Education, Administrative Proceedings, Chicago Bd of Education and ISBE (Docket No 87-504-2), 1989, 2.

The Chicago Public Schools have complied with this stipulation. The agreement further requires, "To the maximum extent possible, services shall be provided and decisions about services shall be made in the local schools...Essential centralized services, however, will be performed by the Central Services Division reporting directly to the Associate Superintendent." ²

It is prudent to review the history of any organization to understand what have been the guiding practices, the existing paradigms, and, both the formal and informal policies. If we look at Chicago in terms of how special education has been addressed throughout the years, this history has been long and somewhat noteworthy.

In September 1870, the first step was made towards the establishment of a School for the Instruction of Deaf Mutes in the city, at which time the use of a room in the LaSalle Street Primary School building, on North Clark Street, opposite Lincoln Park was given to Mr. D. Greenberger for the instruction of deaf mutes in the use of the vocal organs. ³

² (Chicago Bd of Education and ISBE, 1989), 5.

³ Chicago Public Schools, Historical Sketches to 1879 (Board of Education Library), 42.

Thus, Chicago was a pioneer in providing day school instruction for students who were deaf and mute. Originally deaf classes were located in rooms in regular schools.

It was not until 1912 that a movement was set on foot by the 'Society of Parents of Deaf-Oral Children of Chicago' looking toward the consolidation of the classes for the deaf in permanent centers and the building for these centers adequate school accommodations. That year centers were designated for each of the customary subdivisions of the city the South, the West, and the North.⁴

Classes for socially maladjusted students were also developed prior to 1900. "In 1895 the Worth School was opened to provide facilities for teaching boys who were committed to the Bridewell by the Courts."⁵

⁴ Chicago Public Schools, Development of Deaf Oral Education in the Chicago Public Schools, (Board of Education Library, 1937), 3.

⁵ John Howatt, Notes on the First Hundred Years Chicago School History, (Board of Education Library, 1940), 30.

And "In 1899 the Board of Education established Chicago's first class for the education of crippled children."⁶ Shortly after 1900 there were special education classes available in almost every discipline with the exception of learning disabilities.

The special education programs in Chicago were generally moving in the same direction as the rest of the country.

Compulsory education laws brought large numbers of handicapped students into the American public school system in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By 1910, special classes were quite common in the United States. Prior to that time, these handicapped children were educated in private institutions or, if parents were able, by tutors in the home. With the compulsory attendance laws, the school also opened its doors to other groups of children including immigrant poor, and physically ill youngsters.⁷

⁶ Chicago Public Schools, Special Education in the Chicago Public Schools: The Physically Handicapped, (Chicago Public Schools Library, 1951), 13.

⁷ Elizabeth A. Herbert & Steven I. Miller, "Role Conflict and the Special Education Supervisor: A Qualitative Analysis", The Journal of Special Education, vol 19 no 2 218.

Special Education in Chicago moved with the pedagogical thinking of the times. Chicago was often a forerunner of implementing innovative programs. Textbooks for methods in teaching visually handicapped students often cited Chicago as both using and developing exemplary methods and programs.

While some European countries experimented with the placement of blind pupils in public schools primarily in Scotland and London pragmatic American education began to develop a system of braille classes for blind children in the public schools for the first of which opened in 1900 in Chicago. *

By 1925 "Bus transportation for the handicapped children" was a budgetary concern.⁹ And in 1957 "Rooms for trainable mentally handicapped children previously not provided for, helped parents appreciably."¹⁰

In 1964 the Chicago Public Schools produced a document, study report number nine Programs for Handicapped and Socially Maladjusted Children which described partially seeing students as being served on an itinerant basis and

* Berthold Lowenfeld, ed., The Visually Handicapped Child in School. (New York: The John Day Company, 1973), 15.

⁹ Mary Herrick, The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History, (Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage, 1971), 178.

¹⁰ Ibid., 308.

blind students as being serviced in the regular classrooms and also offered speech therapy services. This same report saw orthopedic programs returning students with borderline handicaps such as cardiac problems and epilepsy to regular education programs. Service to the mentally retarded was also changing. Students with an IQ ranging from 75 to 80 were being allowed to remain in the regular program.

But, even more interesting this same 1964 monograph described the CPS special education program as follows.

Special pupils in Chicago are educated in as normal a setting as possible and with as much interaction with the regular pupils as is consistent with their maximum development. If feasible, the special program is close to the homes of the pupils but, if transportation must be provided, the great majority of parents have evaluated the program as well worth the trip. The ability of the pupils who have received special education services to function adequately in a school and society geared to the normal has consistently been a basic criterion of the overall effectiveness of the program. ¹¹

Chicago, as most of the nation, and many other countries, developed a dual education system. Often the philosophy that was the driving force for the implementation

¹¹ Chicago Public Schools Study Report Number Nine, Programs for Handicapped and Socially Maladjusted Children, (Board of Education Library, 1964), 2

of the programs fell prey to the over all problems of the school system. When overcrowding became an issue it was often the special education classes that were given unfavorable locations within schools or ultimately pushed out. As new schools were built in order to meet the growing needs of special education, these divisions were often clustered in these new facilities because this is where there was available space.

Consequently, the emerging segregated patterns for special education were more the result of de facto circumstances than intent to isolate students. Other determinants were the clustering of supportive services, conservation of resources, and parental advocacy of special education centers.

The pressure for school reform has now made it necessary to improve the quality of education for all students in Chicago. The delivery of special education services must also be improved in a way that is more consistent with the current social policy, and also to comply with the laws and rules for the delivery of service and placement of students. At present there are 43,000 students identified as needing special education services.

So it is that regular education initiative, the Office for Civil Rights, the Consent Agreement and state school reform become the guiding principles for restructuring and

reorganizing of special education in the Chicago Public schools. While the building principal has always played an important role in the administration and supervision of special education, it would seem that the expectations of school reform will require even more decision making at the local school level. Decisions regarding delivery of service, the placement of students, and the placement of special education divisions within a school will be guided by the policies established at the central service center.

PURPOSE

Further, the study will define the role of the principal in providing special education services with the aforementioned external mandates present. The study will develop an understanding of these mandates and clarify the new roles and responsibilities of the principal. In addition, it will describe the function of the LSC as it relates to special education.

Specific policies must be established to ensure continuity and consistency in systemwide implementation. It is also necessary to protect the rights of both students and parents. However, there must be increased opportunities for principals with the LSC to design new delivery systems at the building level. The attitudes and goals expressed at this level will actually determine the type and quality of

services delivered to students. It is no longer feasible to expect the Central Service Center to be able to assume complete control over special education programs in the local schools as it has in the past.

To adequately discuss and analyze this survey it is necessary to review the literature which discusses the current concept of delivery of services. In general, this delivery system is focussed on the legal requirement to serve each child in the least restrictive environment. The school administrative functions will be investigated in terms of site-based management. These have become the dominant variables, therefore, dictating the course of actions in Chicago. Herein lies the major basis for developing and implementing policy decisions in the Chicago Public Schools.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Six questions were posed to direct the thrust of this study:

- 1) How do these administrators in the CPS schools secure special education services for students in their attendance areas?
 - 2) How do these administrators describe or identify their special education divisions? *teaching and learning*
 - 3) What are some of the administrator attitudes about the importance of special education and how do they perceive their ability to administer it?
 - 4) How are these CPS principals prepared to be administrators for special education programs? ✓
 - 5) What are some of the administrative practices concerning special education in these schools? ✓
 - 6) How do these principals perceive changing or improving the delivery of special education services? ✓
- Programs 2/14/92*

METHODOLOGY

A study was conducted using Chicago Public School principals as the population. A survey was mailed to all principals employed by CPS in May of 1990. The focus of this study was to gain information on the knowledge bases and attitudes of the building principals. The assumption is that in most cases this is the person who will disseminate information to the LSC, administrate special education programs, provide the day to day supervision in the school, and implement policy.

The research was conducted by means of a survey. The survey included both descriptive and attitudinal questions. It was mailed through the CPS internal mail system to 620 principals. 221 responses were received for a rate of return of 36 percent. The questions allowed for direct responses, ranking of 1 to 5 of some attitudinal information on a Likert-Scale. Other items required narrative responses. The survey was reviewed and pilot-tested by five principals.

The descriptive method of research was used:

was used:

Descriptive research attempts to describe the existing behaviors, opinions, attitudes, or other characteristics of the group or culture under study. ¹²

The research method used was nonexperimental. No attempt was made to manipulate the data. The events were described as they exist.

Nonexperimental researchers tend to observe, analyze, and describe what exists rather than manipulating the variable under study. Nonexperimental researchers do not use direct control such as a laboratory in the same fashion that is characteristic of experimentation. Additionally, nonexperimental research is more often conducted in the natural environment than experimentation. ¹³

The responses to the survey were tabulated and referenced. The narrative responses were summarized. In some cases principals added comments. These have also been noted and incorporated in the analysis. The Likert-Scale responses were summarized and presented in percentages for each range on the scale.

¹² Clifford J. Drew, Introduction to Design and Conducting Research, (St. Louis: The C. N. Mosley Co., 1980)-,120.

¹³ Ibid., 32.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. CENTRAL SERVICE CENTER

The Central Service Center of the Chicago Public Schools. The Board of Education Offices are located in this facility at 1819 West Pershing Road. The General Superintendent of Schools as well as the Associate Superintendent of Special Education have their offices at this location.

2. CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

These are public schools located within the city limits of Chicago, Illinois. These schools are designated as School District 299 in the state of Illinois. The district is also referred to as "cities over 500,000" in the School Code of Illinois.

3. INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN (IEP)

This phrase "means a written statement for an exceptional child that provides at least a statement of: the child's present levels of educational performance, annual goals and short-term instructional objectives; specific education and related services; the extent of participation in the regular education program; the projected dates for initiation of services; anticipated duration of services;

appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures; and a schedule for annual determination of short-term objectives. ¹⁴

4. INTEGRATION

"With regard to school integration, the term has evolved to mean: the location of students with disabilities on a regular campus, in an age-appropriate setting, with integrated transportation; where special classes are in immediate proximity of regular classes; where frequent interactions occur between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers; where there is a natural proportion of students with disabilities to their nondisabled peers; and where there is inclusion of students with disabilities in all school activities." ¹⁵ This is functional integration and is achieved by providing for both locational and social integration. All students are involved in joint participation of educational activities. In this type of integration children contribute to the full activity of the school.

¹⁴ 122 Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02.

¹⁵ William C. Wilson, "Administrative Strategies for Integration, In Robert Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps, (Baltimore, Md: Brookes, 1989), 299.

4. MAINSTREAMING

Mainstreaming is an informal term describing the practice of placing a student whose basic placement is special education in regular education classrooms for a portion of the day.

5. LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL (LSC)

Local School Councils were established by SB 1840, the School Reform Law. The LSC is composed of 6 parents, 2 community members, 2 teachers, and the building principal. The members are elected for a term of two years. The LSC selects the principal, approves the budget, and must develop a three year School Improvement Plan.

7. PL 94-142 (EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT)

This law deals only with education and handicapped persons 3 to 21 years of age. The intent of Congress was to provide "free and appropriate" education and related services to all within the "Least Restrictive Environment". It also calls for non discriminatory evaluation and assessment, an annual review of a required IEP, and the involvement of parents. Furthermore, it requires cooperation of state, local, public and private agencies, and requires states and agencies to apply for funds.

8. REGULAR EDUCATION INITIATIVE (REI)

(Will, 1986) This phrase was popularized by Madeline Will in a report issued by the United States Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the U.S. Department of Education. "The purpose was to find ways to serve students classified as having mild and moderate disabilities in regular classrooms by encouraging special education and other special programs to form a partnership with regular education." ¹⁶

9. SPECIAL EDUCATION

"Special education refers to instruction that is specifically designed to meet the individual needs of the exceptional student. Special education actually involves many components, each of which must be considered by the teacher when working with exceptional students...The types

¹⁶ William Stainback, Susan Stainback & Gary Bunch, Introduction and historical background, In Susan Stainback, William Stainback, & Marsha Forest, Eds., Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education, (Baltimore, Md: Brookes, 1984), 11.

or labels of students who are usually thought of as exceptional include mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered, blind/partially sighted, deaf/hard of hearing, speech impaired, gifted, and physically or other health impaired. It is also possible for a student to have a combination of these exceptionalities." ¹⁷

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are a number of factors limiting this study:

1. A survey was mailed, this in itself has some inherent limitations. Control was an issue. There was no way to determine that the CPS principals who returned them gave unbiased responses. There may be differences between reported attitudes and actual responses.

¹⁷ Ronald L. Taylor & Les Sternberg, Exceptional Children: Integrating Research and Teaching (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1989), 1-2.

2. Surveys are subject to low response rates. 620 were mailed. This study was limited to the data collected from 221 returned surveys. The rate of return for this study was 36 percent, therefore results must be viewed with caution. Because of the sensitivity of the issue, the rate of return did not come as a great surprise.

3. The survey was mailed near the end of the school year, therefore, not at a time to ensure optimum response. This is a busy time of the year for most principals.

4. Due to the principal selection process resulting from SB 1840, there is no guarantee that all of the participants in the study are still principals. Therefore, it is difficult to state the exact percentage of the population that is actually represented.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The first chapter provides a history and overview of special education in the Chicago Public Schools. It is meant mandates that exist in Chicago.

Chapter II begins with a review of the related literature addressing the Regular Education Initiative. In addition, it is necessary to review literature relevant to school reform, including SB 1840, the role of the principal as an administrator and supervisor of special education, and indicators for setting policy.

Chapter III is a discussion of the method and process used for collecting the data. It is meant to provide information if the study is to be replicated.

In Chapter IV there is analysis and discussion of the survey responses. An attempt is made to draw conclusions and apply information to situations that are not static at this time.

Chapter, V, provides suggestions for establishing policies at the local school level. These policies consider those external mandates that exist in Chicago.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Special education is undergoing great philosophical changes at this time. Some theorists are taking the position that the Regular Education Initiative should generally be the focus for establishing whole school programs to address the needs of all students including those requiring special education. At this time, this is the direction in which Chicago is beginning to move. This school system is in the process of developing more fully integrated schools.

The impetus for this change in Chicago is also being impacted upon by two external mandates. One being "The Settlement Agreement between the Chicago Public Schools and the State Board of Education. The expected outcome of this agreement is to ensure the rights of special education students in Chicago by reinforcing some of the previously mandated concerns of Pl 94-142 regarding placement and delivery of services in a timely manner. This settlement makes certain requirements for reorganization within the Department of Special Education at the Central Service

Center level. As a result of this, a nationwide search was conducted and Dr. Thomas Hehir was appointed the Associate Superintendent of Special Education and Pupil Support Services.

In the minutes of the CPS Inclusive School Project Meeting held in November of 1990, Dr. Leonard Burrello recorded the following goals and values which Dr. Hehir presented as the present vision for the schools targeted to participate in the Inclusive Schools Project:

1. Increasing the capacity of school faculties to deal with students with differences particularly with those in special education who have moderate to mild disabilities.
2. To develop inclusive individualized educational programs.
3. Disabled students would attend the school they would normally attend if they were not otherwise identified as disabled.
4. The school population and the number of programs for disabled children would be in their natural proportion and will be age appropriate for those disabled children from that attendance area.

5. The schools would be physically accessible to provide for the wide range of students with physical and or multiple disabilities.
6. The school curriculum for all students, particularly those who are the most severely disabled would be focused on preparation for life and the targeted schools would build their programs with community and LSC support.

The mission of the department is stated in the proposed "Reorganization of Special Education and Pupil Support Services" report dated January 23, 1991.

"The mission of the Department of Special Education and Pupil Support Services is to provide effective support services and technical assistance to students, parents, principals, school staff, and Local School Councils in the identification, evaluation, placement and instruction of students with special needs. The Department is committed to assuring the right of each child to a free and appropriate education is maintained. The Department also oversees the provision of programs for gifted students and is responsible for providing ancillary support services to Chicago Public School students."

Chicago is also in the midst of School Reform. Decentralization is one of the outcomes of SB 1840 also known as P.A. 85-1418. This moves the governance of schools to the local school level. The law requires each school to make a three year School Improvement Plan to address speci-

fic instructional objectives, school climate, the physical condition of the building, student attendance, parent involvement, and other concerns, including special education. In actuality, the plan is a design for the entire school, a way to address the stated mission of each individual school. The Reform Law specifically refers to special education six times. (SEE APPENDIX A)

These external mandates dictate that Chicago develop new policies for the administration and supervision of special education programs. As we move to the new site based managed schools we realize that it is the principal who assumes additional responsibility in the administration and supervision of these programs. The role of the principal must therefore be redefined. Also, we must acknowledge that the nature of special education itself is changing. This new model requires that we must learn to initiate change within a changing structure.

The role of the principal will be defined in terms of external mandates present at this time. It is assumed that the administration and supervision of special education in Chicago will have some unique characteristics. The review of the literature will consist of the following discussions. The Regular Education Initiative, integration of special education students, and the role of the principal within the

context of Chicago School Reform. From this will ensue a discussion of policy formulation as it applies to Local School Councils, of which the principal is a member in Chicago.

The Regular Education Initiative

The concept of the Regular Education Initiative was first introduced by Madeleine Will the former U. S. Department of Education Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education. She challenged a number of existing practices, noting that general and special education had evolved into separate education systems.

Lipsky and Gartner summarized Will's report as follows:

1. fragmented approaches

["Many students who require help and are learning effectively fall through the cracks of a program structure based on preconceived definitions of eligibility..."]

2. a dual system

["The separate administrative arrangements for special programs contribute to a lack of coordination, raise questions about leadership, cloud areas of responsibility, and obscure lines of accountability within schools."]

3. stigmatization of students producing in students

["low expectations of success, failure to persist on tasks, the belief that failures are caused by personal inadequacies and a continued failure to learn effectively."]

4. "placement decisions becoming a battleground between parents and schools. In light of such practices, the panel called for experimental programs for students with learning problems-- programs that incorporate increased instructional time, support systems for teachers, empowerment of principals to control all programs and resources at the building level, and new instructional approaches that involve "shared responsibility" between general and special education [Educating Students, 1986, pp. 7-9] ¹⁸

Stainback, Stainback, and Bunch defended the merger of special and regular education. They argued that instructional needs do not warrant a dual system, a dual system is inefficient, and that a dual system fosters inappropriate attitudes.¹⁹ Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg also advocate REI under the rationale that the present system consists of (1) flawed classification and placement (2) disincentives for program improvement (3) excessive regulatory requirements (4) fragmentation and lack of coordination of programs (5) loss of program control by school administration. ²⁰

¹⁸ Dorothy Kerzner Lipsky and Alan Gartner, "School Administration and Financial Arrangements." Chap. in Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps, ed. R. Gaylord-Ross (Baltimore, Maryland: Brookes, 1989), 110. loss of program control by school administration. ²⁰

¹⁹ (Stainback, Stainback, and Bunch, 1989 15)

²⁰ Margaret C. Want, Maynard C. Reynolds, and Herbert J. Walberg. "Rethinking Special Education." Educational Leadership 44 (September 1986): 248.

Hegarty would caution that PL 94-142 does not require all pupils to be educated in ordinary schools. While education is expected to be nonrestrictive, it must also be appropriate.²¹ Keogh would encourage the dissolution of special classes on the grounds of lowered expectancy

The lowered expectancy, be it conscious or unconscious may divert instructional efforts away from academic pursuits and towards a maintenance function, as such, the special class may become an instrument for preserving social order and not necessarily an arrangement for providing a better education.²²

An additional concern when evaluating the present dual system is the need for classification or categorization to determine in which system a student is to be educated. Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg found "Most procedures for classifying children in special programs are unreliable and invalid."²³ Stainback, Stainback, and Bunch see the issue is whether educators should

²¹ Seamus Hegarty, Keith Pocklington, with Dorothy Lucas, Educating Pupils with Special Needs in the Ordinary Schools. (Atlantic Highlands, N. J.: Humanities Press, 1981), 23.

²² (Hegarty 1981, 228)

²³ (Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg 1986, 50)

approach students according to their categorical affiliation of if all students should be educated as individuals and whole persons. ²⁴

Categorization is encouraged since it becomes necessary with a dual system to determine who belongs in which system. A great deal of time, money and effort are currently expended trying to determine who is regular and who is special and what "type" or category of exceptionality each special student fits. ²⁵

Vergason and Anderegg, however, would present an opposing attitude which views it as unrealistic to create a new approach because certain weaknesses exist.

The presence of flaws in assessment and in determining the eligibility of students for special education services does not constitute a valid argument for dismantling the special education system and integrating all handicapped children into regular education full time. ²⁶

Even with the above expressed concerns, the Regular Education Initiative is emerging as a guiding school of thought in special education.

²⁴ (Stainback, Stainback, and Bunch 1989 18)

²⁵ William Stainback and Susan Stainback. "A Rationale for the Merger of Special and Regular Education" Exceptional Children 56 (September 1989): 104.

²⁶ Glenn A. Vergason and M. L. Anderegg, "Save the Baby! A Response to Integrating the Children of the Second System." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1989): 63.

Integration

Greenburg supplies us with a historical perspective on the development of the dual systems.

For the decades prior to the discussion of reintegration programs, special educators demonstrated a general willingness to assume total responsibility for the education of children identified as handicapped. At the same time the general education community appeared willing to relinquish all educational responsibilities for those youngsters. To a considerable extent, one posture complemented the other, and both historically, contributed to the exclusion of handicapped students from general education programs. ²⁷

Integration is thought to be the best practice for addressing the needs of special education students.

Hegarty would describe it "In theory integration should mean a process where by an ordinary school and a special group interact to form a new educational whole." ²⁸

Lipsky addresses the original position of REI which was to integrate the mildly to moderately handicapped students.

²⁷ David E. Greenburg, A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education: A Review for Administrators, at the Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va., 1987 ERIC, ED 280 211. p.10.

²⁸ (Hegarty 1981, 15)

Increasingly, efforts have been underway to break down the wall between special and general educational process designed to serve students now in special education, those variously called mild or moderately handicapped. ²⁹

Hegarty would caution that integration cannot become a dumping activity. "Integration is not a self-evident goal and must be justified in a rational way... the essential criterion must be the development and well being of the pupil." ³⁰

The concept of integration most often accepted at this time includes the properties which Wilson points out. (1) students are located in regular schools (2) the setting is age-appropriate (3) transportation is integrated (4) special classes are close to regular classes within a school (5) frequent interaction between disabled and non disabled peers (6) a natural proportion of disabled and nondisabled students in a school. ³¹

²⁹ (Lipsky 1989, 109)

³⁰ (Hegarty 1981, 14)

³¹ (Wilson 1989, 299)

There is also a movement to address the needs of more severely handicapped students within the regular education system. Westling states "In accordance with the concept of normalization, the goal for persons with mental handicaps is no different from that of their nonhandicapped peers, to function as participating members of the community." ³²

Certo would call attention to the necessity for a natural proportion of disabled and non-disabled students.

If the number of severely handicapped students assigned to a regular education campus becomes too large, their opportunities to interact with their peers in regular education may become limited due (due to the system's inability to accommodate the range of needs presented by the group) and their school building may become identified as a "special education" building. On the other hand, if the number of severely handicapped students assigned to a regular education campus is too small, the severely handicapped students may become insular and the likelihood of frequent and meaningful integration between the two groups will be deminished. ³³

³² David L. Westling, "Leadership for Education of the Mentally Handicapped," Educational Leadership 46 (March 1989), 19.

³³ Frances Stetson, "Critical Factors that Facilitate Integration: A Theory of Administrative Responsibility," Chap. in Public School Integration of Severely Handicapped Students, eds. Nick Certo, Norris Harring, and Robert York, (Baltimore, Md.: Springer-Verlag, 1989), 69-7

Lipsky and Gartner provide a description of special education as presently exists.

The current organization of special education has developed an elaborate system to assess and classify students for the purpose of placing them in appropriate programs, broadly organized in a bimodal design of special and general education systems. ³⁴

There are many descriptions of the components of an inclusive educational system. An inclusive system would provide a continuum of services. Mayer would see a way of providing integration through noncategorical placements. Noncategorical models usually include the following.

1. a single classification system
"children with special needs"
2. classes are not restricted to one group -- assignments are based on educational need and changing a students environment
3. there is a continuum of direct programs and supportive services
4. placement could be anything from full time in special education to full time in regular education
5. supportive services that will help a students remain in the LRE
5. funding is allocated according to a special disability category ³⁵

³⁴ (Lipsky 1989, 107-8)

³⁵ Lamar C. Mayer, Education Administration and Special Education: A Handbook for School Administrators, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1982), 166.

The Role of the Principal

Burrello, Schrup, and Barnett see the principals routine behaviors, a partial list of which includes, building true consensus, pre-referral, IEP conferencing, team building, and delegating, to be effected by three major categories of input. This input they refer to as context. Context consists of community, beliefs, and experiences of the administrator and institutional context. The output of the principal behaviors includes instructional climate and instructional organizational outcomes. They concluded from their research "Principals have a critical role in creating and maintaining effective school programs for students with disabilities." ³⁶ An early study by Raske (1979) as cited by Madsen and Reyes found that principals spend 14.6 percent of their time in special education duties. ³⁷

³⁶ Leonard C. Burrello, Marie G. Schrup and Bruce G. Barnett, The Principal as the Special Education Leader (Special Project #G008730038-88, 1988) US Department of Education, 35.

³⁷ Jean Madsen and Pedro Reyes. Managerial Behavior of Special Education, Elementary, and Secondary Principals: An Empirical Assessment (Chicago, Ill.: Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Research Associates, 1986) ERIC, ED 275-073, 7.

Greenburg in a summary of Robson (1981) stated that principals were expected to take major responsibility in direct service to pupils and in all supervisory evaluative aspects of personnel. ³⁸

The administrator who is responsible for supervision and evaluation must become knowledgeable about what to look for in observing instructional practices in special classrooms. Improvement of administrator skills is more likely to occur if districts, offer administrative evaluation, and administrators clearly understand their unique role in the process. ³⁹

In a 1989 doctoral study, Hayward concluded that principals were not assuming responsibility for special education. He saw an administrative matrix as being composed of 17 special education responsibilities. Principals perceived themselves responsible for only four of these. This study concluded that principals were not the dominant administrative influence in special education. ⁴⁰

³⁸ David E. Greenburg, A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education: A Review for Administrators (Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, Contract No. 400-0010, 1987) ERIC, ED 280-211, 17.

³⁹ Daniel Sage and Leonard C. Burrello, Policy and Management in Special Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1986), 181.

⁴⁰ Joseph Thaddeus Hayward, "The Special Education Director, The Elementary School Principal and Special Education Leadership," (Ed.D. Columbia University Teachers College, 1989), Dissertation Abstracts International, June 1990. DA 9013547, 3808-A.

Lietz and Towle describe the role of the principal in administrative functions as a joint venture.

The delivery of services to the educationally handicapped child is a share responsibility for special education personnel, including building principals. The passage of PL 94-142 has blurred the historical distinctions between exceptional and regular education and increased the need for all staff to work together as a team. ⁴¹

The role of the principal has been described in a number of ways. Schlechty and Joslin see the principal as a manager of managers, like the director of research and development, "or the plant manager of a semi-autonomous branch of the 3M Corporation". ⁴² Quite often principals are grouped with regular educators, and therefore claim exemption from certain special education tasks.

⁴¹ Jeremy Jon Lietz and Maxine Towle, The Elementary Principal's Role in Special Education (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1982), 122.

⁴² Philip C. Schlechty and Anne Walker Joslin, "Images of Schools," Chap. in Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft, and Concept. ed., Ann Lieberman, (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986), 157.

Principals often choose to associate with the regular education programs to avoid being stigmatized by the students disabilities. Goffman in his classical analysis defined a person with a stigma as:

...an individual who might have been received easily in ordinary social intercourse posses a trait that can obtrude itself upon attention and turn those of us whom he meets away from him breaking the claim that his other attributes have on us. ⁴³

He further added that by definition we believe a person with a stigma is not quite human.

In addition we are defined or identified by the people we are with.

To be "with" someone is to arrive at a social occasion in his company, walk, with him down a street, be a member of his party in a restaurant, and so forth. The issue is that in certain circumstances the social identity of those an individual is with can be used as a source of information concerning his own social identity, the assumption being that he is what the others are. ⁴⁴

⁴³ Erving Goffman, Stigma (Englewood Cliffs, Jew Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1963), 5.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 47

Curriculum decisions are often left entirely to special education teachers and administrators. This too is changing.

It is becoming apparent that regular educators will be assuming a more direct role in the provision of education to students with mild or moderate handicaps. This is probably due to the fact that students, with mild or moderate handicaps are more like than unlike students with no handicaps.⁴⁵

In terms of readiness for integration Jenkins, Pious and Jewell say it is when principals have "sufficient knowledge about instruction and learning to distribute resources across classrooms so that students with special needs can be accommodated and served effectively."⁴⁶

Hopkins and Wideen state "The most effective principals (by reputation) do draw more extensively on external sources, and name curriculum or instruction as a higher priority."⁴⁷

⁴⁵ (Taylor and Sternberg 1989, 43)

⁴⁶ Joseph R. Jenkins, Constance G. Pious and Mark Jewell, "Special Education and the Regular Education Initiative," Exceptional Children 56 (April 1990): 489.

⁴⁷ David Hopkins and Marvin Wideen, Alternative Perspectives on School Improvement (Philadelphia, Pa.: The Falmer Press, 1984), 100.

An important function of the building principal is that of organizational support. Stetson pointed out that "Building principals are in positions to strengthen the commitment of regular educators to be accepting, flexible, and creative in meeting their responsibilities to severely handicapped students."⁴⁸ Lewis described the function of a principal as that of culture builder.

...principals are expected to be active participants in the formulation and inculcation of the school organization philosophy. First, they will be expected to serve on the philosophy committee to help develop the purposes, mission, and shared values of the school organization. ...Second, they are expected to preach and teach the tenets of the philosophy in order to build a strong and healthy culture. To this end, they will be expected to serve as role models, supporting and nurturing chairpersons who personify the values of the school organization, assisting school people whose personalities are consonant with the values of the school organization.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ (Stetson 1989, 68).

⁴⁹ James Lewis Jr., Re-Creating Our Schools for the 21st Century: Managing America's Schools with Distinction Westbury, N.Y.: J. L. Wilkerson Publishing Co., Ltd., 1987), 172.

School Reform

The term reform has more than one meaning in this discussion. Reform in one sense refers to "educational reform" or the redesigning of educational programs, a revised curriculum, and the revisiting of standards to provide improved instruction with an expected outcome of "excellence in education". School reform as initiated in Chicago addresses the restructuring or decentralization of the school system. In a purist sense, an aim of school reform in Chicago is to allow individual schools to produce a school improvement plan that would provide a framework in which to achieve educational reform.

The issues addressed under the educational reform article 34-1.02 of the Illinois School Code include:

- (1) increasing the graduation rate by 5%
- (2) increasing the average daily attendance
- (3) reducing the failure and non-graduation rate
- (4) by 1993-94 having 50% of the students at national norms on a standardized test.
- (5) "appropriate improvement and progress are realized each school year in each attendance center within the district..."⁵⁰

⁵⁰ 122 Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02

Therefore, it must clearly remain in the forefront of the interpretation and implementation of this law that educational reform is a mandate.

Throughout the nation, and in fact the world, there are movements to provide improved educational experiences for all students. A major concern addressed by these movements is a concern in developing policies that affect students found eligible to receive special education services.

Equity...implies that the goal of education is to intellectually and socially prepare ALL individuals for economic and social survival, not just the most able. ⁵¹

There are those that have criticized the present educational system by calling attention to the fact that the pursuit of educational equity could also be the root cause of the condition in which we find the public schools today.

Many conservatives currently dominating the educational reform movement claim that American education's failures in recent years have been due to the emphasis on equity at the expense of excellence. ⁵²

⁵¹ Samuel B. Bacharach, "Four Themes of Reform: An Editorial Essay." Educational Administration Quarterly 24 (November 1988): 487.

⁵² Ibid., 488.

Additionally, Haskins, Lanier, and MacRae call attention to the fact that many programs dealing with students "Unserved or underserved...are often promoted under the rubric of education equity."⁵³ Nonetheless, in establishing educational policies at all levels we must in some way speak to the issue of equity.

Current reform initiatives which are designed for all students, align needed special services with core curriculum and instructional activities, and aim to create schools that function as "organic wholes"--offer more promise than did our previous efforts to promote equity.⁵⁴

In Chicago, an effort has been made to address educational reform through site-based management. Bacharach cited Honig to emphasize that "implementation of educational reform is truly local and site-based."⁵⁵

⁵³ Haskins, Mark W. Lanier, and Duncan MacRae, Jr, "Reforming the Public Schools and Strategies of Reform," chap. in Policies for American Public Schools: Teachers, Equity, and Indicators, ed. Ron Haskins and Duncan MacRae (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp, 1988), 12.

⁵⁴ Joseph Murphy, "Is There Equity in Educational Reform?" Educational Leadership 46 (February 1989): 32.

⁵⁵ (Bacharach 1988, 491)

Raywid stated "The logic of site-based management requires that each school decide for itself which sorts of changes it will undertake." ⁵⁶

We define a self-managing school as one for which there has been significant and consistent decentralization to the school level of authority to make decisions related to the allocation of resources. This decentralization is administrative, rather than political with decisions at the school level being made within a framework of local, state, or national policies and guidelines. ⁵⁷

Also in Chicago, it is the local school councils that have the responsibility and power to choose the principal of the school. The Revised Illinois School Code states in reference to the principal "that his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction." ⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Mary Anne Raywid, "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform, and Restructuring," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1989): 142.

⁵⁷ Brian J. Caldwell and Jim M. Spinks, Education Policy Perspectives: The Self-Managing School (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1988), 5.

⁵⁸ 122 Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02.

The law describes the responsibilities of the principal as:

- (1) The principal, with the assistance of the local school council shall develop a school improvement plan as provided in Section 34-2.4 and, upon approval of the plan by the local school council, shall be responsible for directing implementation of the plan.
- (2) The principal, with the assistance of the Professional Personnel Advisory Committee, shall develop the specific methods and contents of the school's curriculum within the board's systemwide curriculum standards and objectives and the requirements of the school improvement plan.⁵⁹

Policy Formulation

It is necessary to formulate policies to address all educational issues.

Policies foster stability and continuity: administrators and teachers may come and go but well-written and constantly updated policies make clear the general 'direction' of the school, and therefore facilitate orientation of newly appointed members of the staff of the school and of the council or governing body where such a group exists.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ 122 Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02.

⁶⁰ (Caldwell and Spinks 1988, 93)

To formulate policies for special education at the central and the local school level in Chicago, careful consideration must be given to an understanding of REI, and integration, as well as, school reform. In addition, it is necessary to keep in mind the courts interpretation of the least restrictive environment. Anderson in his doctoral dissertation which examined federal court cases pertaining to LRE presented the following statement.

While the federal courts recognize the importance of LRE, most courts view an "appropriate" education as the over-arching principle in educational programming for a child. Accordingly, the courts have tended to place greater emphasis on the intensity of the educational services needed by a child than on the restrictiveness of the educational setting. Therefore, an educator will need to be prepared to argue for the LRE for a child within the context of evidence that receiving an educational program calculated to assure educational progress.⁶¹

It is clearly evident that attention must be given to policy formulation because of the number of changes being made in a changing environment. Changes in attitudes and

⁶¹ John Anderson, "Issues and Outcomes of Federal Court Cases Addressing the Educational Mainstreaming of Students with Handicaps -- Implications for Educational Leaders--" (Ph.D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago, 1988), 191-92.

L. J. L.

responsibilities regarding students with disabilities, changes regarding the restructuring of the school system, and changes in both the actual and perceived roles and responsibilities of the principal. Policies that were previously written in regard to special education more than likely address attitudes and educational practices not necessarily considered "best practices" at this time.

...policy practice, whether written, stated or enacted must be examined not only for its discourse themes, objectives and tactics (professionalism or democratism for instance) but also for their effects: have such policies meant more or less inclusion for school children described as disabled. ⁶²

Summary

The delivery of special education services in Chicago has been directly affected by the concepts of REI and integration and school reform in Chicago. As well as by Chicago's obligation to comply with the court ordered consent agreement. The Regular Education Initiative as introduced in a report by Madeline Will indicated there is a need

⁶² Gillian Fulcher, Disabling Policies? A Comparative Approach to Education Policy and Disability (Philadelphia, Pa: The Falmer Press, 1989), 52.

need to change the way we approach education for all students, special education students, as well as, other students with special needs. This report challenged present educational practices on the grounds that fragmented approaches and a dual educational system have developed resulting in stigmatized students with constant battles of placement decisions in order to determine in which system a student belongs.

The integration of special education students into the mainstream of regular education is now emerging in schools.

Though it may not be apparent to those unfamiliar with the history of special education efforts to include handicapped individuals in the "Mainstream" of everyday life have always raised profound social questions.⁶³

The integration of students is determined by a number of indicators. Students should be educated in regular schools, in age-appropriate settings in regular classrooms whenever possible or, when necessary, in special classrooms located close to regular classrooms. There should be frequent interaction between disabled and non-disabled peers.

⁶³ Michael Gerger and Deborah Levine-Donnerstein, "Educating All Children: Ten Years Later", Exceptional Children 56 (September 1989): 26.

A school should have a natural proportion of disabled and non-disabled students. Additionally, Schmid interjects one more aspect, students should be in a placement near to home.

The language of the 504 regulation is in most important respects, nearly identical to the least restrictive statute in PL 94-142. There remains one notable distinction, however. The 504 regulation would seem to consider the "nearest placement to home." as an additional determinant of instructional placement in the least restrictive environment. (refer to #84.34 (a) of the 504 regulation. ⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Dianne Muehrer Schmidt, "Illinois School Administrators Knowledge of Special Education Laws and Regulations." Ed.D, diss. (Northern Illinois University 1987) Dissertation Abstracts International DA 8721812,

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methods used to collect the data used in the study. It also examines the procedures used to analyze the data. The areas addressed in this chapter include (1) the research questions (2) the pilot study (3) permission of the school system (4) the target population (5) survey content (6) distribution and follow up (7) method of recording results (8) survey returns and, (9) summary.

This study was analyzed as objectively as possible. Every attempt was made to eliminate "experimenter bias". It should be noted that while the researcher herself is a principal in the Chicago Public Schools, the data presented are based on data provided by the participants and not from previous knowledge. All comments are included, none were screened or classified inappropriate. The study is an attempt to ascertain some present attitudes and practices with respect to special education. The intent of the study was to gather data about the perceptions and attitudes of the principals themselves. It was meant to give some indication of the importance the principals place on special education.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

- 1) How do these administrators in the CPS schools secure special education services for students in their attendance areas?
- 2) How do these administrators describe or identify their special education divisions?
- 3) What are some of the administrator attitudes about the importance of special education and how do they perceive their ability to administer it?
- 4) How are these CPS principals prepared to be administrators for special education programs?
- 5) What are some of the administrative practices concerning special education in these schools?
- 6) How do these principals perceive changing or improving the delivery of special education services.

The Pilot Study

The original survey was reviewed by a committee of five principals. An effort was made to eliminate ambiguous terms and statements. The format, the time needed to com

plete the survey, and general readability of it were also examined. No major changes were recommended.

The pilot test would simply involve having a few individuals complete the questionnaire before the actual study is begun to be certain that the instructions and questions are clear and to assess the time and effort required on the part of the respondents.⁶⁵

It was decided to use the survey with very few changes.

Permission of the School System

Before the survey was undertaken the researcher contacted Robert A. Sampieri, Chief Operating Officer of the Chicago Public Schools to obtain permission to conduct a survey in the school system. A letter was written to Mr. Sampieri outlining the nature and intent of the survey. (SEE APPENDIX B) The letter also asked permission to interview the Interim Associate Superintendent of Special Education, as well as, department heads and other individuals responsible for policies concerning special education. A list of individuals that were assigned to the position at the time was prepared. However, many of these people as well as positions themselves changed during the writing of this paper. Mrs. Barbara Williams and Dr. Thomas Hehir were both consulted during the writing of this paper.

⁶⁵ (Drew 1980, 124)

Additionally, the letter explained the time lines and a request was made to use the internal main system to distribute this survey. All requests were granted and there was full cooperation on the part of the CPS.

The Target Population

The survey was mailed to all principals working in the Chicago Public School system in June, 1990. The decision was made to mail it at this time because July 1 would be the beginning of a new contract period. It was thought that a mailing after July 1 would generate responses from a number of new principals who had little knowledge of how special education is handled in a particular school. Another assumption was that most principals who were not being retained would probably not respond to this survey. Therefore, this would eliminate negative input from those that would be directing it to the reform process rather than the issues being studied. Still another assumption was that by mailing to every principal it would reduce the chances of collecting biased information.

Survey Content

The survey itself was mailed with a cover letter explaining the purpose and intent of the study. The actual

survey consisted of thirty one (31) items. Of the questions in the survey, six (6) required openended responses, eighteen (18) required yes, no, or a number response, and seven (7) of the questions required that answers be entered on a Likert-scale. (SEE APPENDIX B) There are a great variety of schools existing within the Chicago Public Schools. Some schools have little or no special education others have an over representative population of special education or a concentration of a particular disability. Therefore it was necessary to gather some data that would indicate what type of school the principal was making references to. This section of the survey was meant to be an assessment. "Assessment is a fact finding activity that describes conditions that exist at a particular time." ⁶⁶

Survey items 1-8 collect the demographic information for this study. These items include (1) student enrollment (2) number of classroom teachers (3) number of special education teachers (4) other non-quota teachers (ESEA, OEEEO) (5) number of teacher aides (6) number of counselors (7) ancillary staff assigned 5 days a week (8) type of school, with the choices including early childhood, K-6, K-8, Middle School, High School, or Other

⁶⁶ (Best 1989, 22)

Research Question Number 1 asked: "How do these administrators in the Chicago Public Schools secure special education services for students in their attendance area?" Two items were designed to gather information about what a principal would do if a student that requires or appears to be in need of special education service was enrolled in the attendance center.

The following is a list of the survey items corresponding to Research Question Number 1.

- #10. What do you do when a student enrolled in your school appears to be in need of special education services?
- #11. What would you do if a student came to enroll in your school with an IEP?

Research Question Number 2 asked: "How do Chicago Public School Principals describe or identify their special education divisions?" The answer to this question was obtained through survey Item 12. This item was not presented as a check list intentionally. It was left open ended for the purpose of allowing principals to indicate cross-categorical arrangements or other options used to deliver services.

The following survey item corresponds to Research Question Number 2.

#12. If you have special education divisions in your school, please list types.

Research Question Number 3 asked: "What are some of the administrator attitudes about the importance of special education and how do they perceive their ability to administer it?" This section of the survey consisted of a group of seven questions using a Likert scale with a 1-5 rating, 5 being the highest. The questions had to do with how the administrators felt about their own supervisory skills, the importance of special education, the ability of the school to deliver services, and a question to indicate how much responsibility the school is willing to assume in the delivery of this service. There is also one item in this section designed to assess the attitudes of principals who do not have special education in their schools.

The following items correspond to Research Question Number 3.

- # 9. If you do not have special education in your school:
Do you wish you had some?____ Are you glad you don't
have any?_____
- #13. How prepared do you feel that you are as an administrator in the area of special education?

- #14. How important do you feel it is to see that all students that are in need receive special education services?
- #15. Do you think students in special education should be allowed to transfer with only the local school responsible for placement?
- #16. Would you provide special education services at your school if it were not mandated?
- #17. Is special education an important program in your school?
- #18. Do you feel proficient as an administrator when it comes to the area of special education?
- #19. Could you provide remediation suggestions to a special education teacher who was not providing adequate instruction?

Research Question Number 4 asked: "How are these CPS principals prepared to be administrators for special education programs?" This area of the survey was included to provide some information about the level of administrative experience and preparation.

The following items correspond to Research Question 4.

- #20. Number of years as a principal
- #21. Have you taken a survey course on the exceptional child?
- #22. Were you ever a special education teacher?
- #23. Have you read an article from a professional journal pertaining to special education this year?
- #24. Have you attended a workshop or inservice to improve your knowledge of special education this year?

Research Question Number 5 asked: "What are some of the administrative practices concerning special education in these schools?" These items were included to gain insight as to the amount of direct involvement in special education that the principals demonstrated in their respective schools. Five items were included in this section, two questions required a numerical response, two required a yes or no response, and one was an open ended question calling for a narrative response.

The following survey items correspond to Research Question Number 5.

- #25. How many staffings have you personally attended this year?
- #26. Have you discussed special education with your LSC?

- #27. Have you had special education on a faculty agenda this year?
- #28. How many conferences have you had with a special education parent this year?
- #29. What would help you become a better special education administrator?

Research Question Number 6 asked: "How do these principals in the Chicago Public Schools perceived changing or improving the delivery of special education services?" Two open ended questions asked the respondent to suggest other or better ways to discriminate special education services. The items ask the person completing the survey to see if there are any changes that can be made in his or her own paradigm as far as delivery of services. The following items pertain to Research Question Number 6.

- #30. Could special education services be provided some other way than we presently provide service?
- #31. What would help this system provide better special education services?

Distribution and Follow-Up

The survey and cover letters were mailed through the CPS internal mail system of June 8, 1990. The CPS Department of Facilities was contacted was contacted, and arrange-

ments were made to have the surveys picked up by special order. Mailing labels were also supplies by CPS. This was to insure that all attendance centers were included in the mailing. One was also mailed to the attendance center of the researcher to record the date that the surveys were received in the schools. They were delivered on June 11, 1990.

As a follow up, letters were sent to each of the eleven (11) subdistrict superintendents requesting their assistance and support. The letter asked them to encourage each principal in their respective districts to complete the survey. (SEE APPENDIX D) Most responded by placing messages to the principals in their districts on the BBS which is the internal computerized bulletin board system.

Additionally, a letter was sent to the Chicago Principals Association to solicit the support of this organization. (SEE APPENDIX E) The Principals Association included this item in their newsletter of June 21, 1990. This newsletter was mailed to all members of the association.

Method of Recording Results

The surveys were compiled using descriptive statistics in most instances. The surveys were recorded and totaled.

The data are presented in tabular form and in simple percentages for items requiring yes or no and number responses. The scores of the position responses for each of the separate scales on the Likert-scale were summarized and a percentage was given for each range on the scale. The responses to the open ended questions were categorized and reported in frequency distributions.

Survey Returns

Completed surveys were accepted until July 1, 1990. The survey was mailed to 620 attendance centers of the 626 center that existed in June of 1990. The five schools of the principals that participated in the pilot were not included, nor was the attendance center of the researcher. 221 completed returns were received. The rate of return for this survey was 36 percent.

Because of the rate of return on this survey the results must be viewed with a certain amount of caution. On the other hand, the time the distribution took place and the sensitivity of the issue the rate of return did not come as a great surprise.

Summary

The method of collecting the data for this study was by means of a survey. This instrument was designed by the

researcher and pilot tested by a group of five principals. It was distributed by a mailing through the CPS internal mail system to every principal in the Chicago Public Schools.

The survey was designed to collect information about the kind of school in which the principal is an administrator as well as the attitudes and practices of the administrator with regard to special education. The survey also presented open ended questions to allow for responses to address ways to improve delivery of special education services in the opinion of these principals.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The objective of this chapter was to present and analyze the compiled data obtained from this survey. Implications of such findings were cited and discussed. The survey items were related to the research questions and presented in that order.

The information from the survey was categorized. Appropriate tables were utilized in this chapter to efficiently depict the findings. Data from the survey identified categories of demographics and were related to the research questions. Raw scores of the responses, percentages, and frequencies of grouped scores were all utilized. The Likert-scale responses were presented and analyzed by scale. The open ended responses were studied, categorized, and analyzed in further discussion.

Demographic Information

Demographically the study included all schools in the Chicago Public Schools. In June 1990 there were 626 special, elementary and high schools in Chicago.

The Chicago Public School system is the third largest in America...The total number of school age children and youth in Chicago is 410,000...The total number of students identified as requiring special education services is 43,000.⁶⁷

These figures are approximations. The actual enrollment of special education students as reported by the Chicago Public Schools as of June 24, 1990 was 42,698 students.

"In the city of Chicago, one in every nine or ten children has a disability, about one in a hundred has a disability that impacts them severely in daily life."⁶⁸ This survey provided information from schools that had a total population of 153,229. Based on the total student population of 410,000, the student population of the schools represented in the survey is thirty seven percent (37%).

⁶⁷ Chicago Public Schools: "A Prospectus for the Integration and Inclusion of Chicago Public School Students with Disabilities in Home School, Community, and Work." Chicago Board of Education, January 1991.

⁶⁸ Chicago Public Schools Department of Special Education and Howard Blackman. "Integrating Students with Disabilities: Questions and Answers for Chicago Public Schools." [1991]

The first seven items on the survey consisted of demographic information which is summarized in Table 1. Student enrollment represents the number of reported students enrolled in each of the schools. One concern regarding school integration addresses class size. The number of classroom teachers in a school is an indicator of student teacher ratio. The number of classroom teachers assigned to a school is defined by contractual agreement, however, some schools have significantly reduced the student teacher ratio by hiring additional teachers. The number of special education teachers, teacher aides, and ancillary staff should also be considered. Ancillary staff will be defined as school psychologists, social workers, and school nurses.

Table 1

Demographic Information

Item	Information	Total
1	student enrollment	153,229
2	classroom teachers	6,246.2
3	special education teachers	1,325.6
4	non-quota teachers (ESEA,OEE0)*	868.5
5	teacher aides	1,053
7	ancillary staff (5 days a week)	338

*positions purchased with Federal or State Chapter I Funds

There is great diversity in the type and kinds of schools in Chicago. Data from item 8 of the survey were collected in six subcategories, Early Childhood, K-6, K-8, Middle School, High School, and Other. A number of respondents completed this item as "other". A summary of this data are compiled in Table 2.

A description of the classifications included in this section of demographic information follows. The programs offered by these schools were presented in two categories, regular and special. For this study regular education schools in Chicago will be defined as schools which serve the population of students considered likely to benefit from a regular education program. Some special education classrooms may or may not be located within these schools. Special education schools will be defined as those schools in which the majority population of the school is disabled and there is a specialized or adaptive program offered. The classifications within the regular education schools as presented by the respondents include the following.

Early Childhood (K-4), 6 schools was described as this by the principals. These schools serve students the primary grades. In addition, they usually offer pre-school programs for students ages 3-5

- K-5, 4 schools were described as this by the principal. These elementary schools serve students in grades kindergarten through 5.
- K-6, 14 schools were described as this by the principal. These elementary schools serve students in grades kindergarten through 6.
- K-8, 3 schools were described as this by the principals. These schools serve populations that are expected to participate in intermediate and uppergrade programs.
- 5-8, 1 school was described as this by the principal. This school is much the same as the schools described in 4-8. Students come to this school when they enter the fifth grade.
- 7-8, 2 schools were described as this by the principal. These schools are upper grade centers. They serve students in grades 7-8 who generally come to them from neighborhood feeder schools.
- Middle School, 4 schools were described as this. These schools serve students in grades 6, 7, 8. They usually are departmentalized.
- K-8, 146 of the schools were described as this by the principal. This is the elementary education program most often offered in Chicago. Students are educated in this kind of school from kindergarten through grade 8.

High School, 27 of the schools were described as this by the principal. High schools provide a program of instruction for students in grades 9 through 12.

The second classification shown on Table 2 is special schools, or schools that primarily serve students who are disabled.

Center (Early Childhood), 3 schools were described as as this by the principal. These schools serve young students and are generally bussed to this location. They have classes for students ages 3-5. Students are educated in a segregated setting.

Center, 4 schools were described as this. These schools educate students in a segregated environment. Generally students are bussed to these locations.

Center/w General Education, 1 school was described as this by the principal. This school has a population of regular and a population of special education students. Disabled students and nondisabled students may or may not interact with each other.

High School, 1 school was described as this. Special education high schools serve high school age students with disabilities.

Detention Center, 2 schools were described as this.

Students in these schools are being held in detention in the juvenile or adult centers of Cook County.

EVGC, Educational Vocational Guidance Center

1 school was classified as this by the principal. These schools service upper grade students who are not achieving in regular education schools. They usually have smaller class size, but students have not been classified or otherwise been made eligible for special education.

Post Secondary (Trade), 1 school was described

as this by the principal. The school serves young adults who have completed high school or have obtained a GED.

The curriculum offers preparation for a trade.

Other demographic information provided by the respondents follows. It was reported that fifty seven (57) of the schools had one or more pre-school or a head-start programs. One (1) school was described as a scholastic academy. Another school was described as a magnet school by the principal. These were the kinds of schools providing the data for this study. Table 2 follows to present the data.

Table 2

Demographic Information Relating to the Type of School

Item 8

school program	classification	frequency
Regular	Early Childhood (K-4)	6
	K-5	4
	K-6	14
	4-8	3
	5-8	1
	7-8	2
	Middle School	4
	K-8	146
	High School	27
Special	Center (early childhood)	3
	Center	4
	Center/w general ed	1
	High School	1
	Detention center	2
	EVGC	1
	Post Secondary (Trade)	1
unusable survey returned without first page		1

N=22

Research Question #1: How do these administrators in the Chicago Public Schools secure special education services in their attendance areas?

Items 10-11 of the survey addressed this question. Item 10 asked the administrators what they would do if a student in their school appeared to be in need of special education services. The responses to these items were reported in frequencies. The practices of these principals were to refer the student to someone else or to refer the student for something else.

Five (5) principals reported they would refer the matter of a student needing special education services to the case manager. This is the person in the school designated to maintain IEP records and other document for special education students. Twenty nine (29) reported they would refer the matter to the counselor. Nine (9) would refer the matter to a teacher asking them to initiate the referral process. Four (4) others gave the position of a person other than those listed above. They include the psychologist, the social worker, one stated "ancillary staff", and another principal named the speech pathologist.

Seventy nine (79) principals did not respond to this item. The other reported practices were 8 listed they would follow procedures, 19 stated they would seek intervention, 3 reported that they would transfer the student. Table 3 follows to summarize the data.

Table 3

Frequency of Reported Practices Used
When A Student Appears in Need of Special Education Services

Item 10		
practice		frequency
referral to	case manager	5
	counselor	29
	teacher	9
	person other than above	4
referral for	evaluation	28
	screening	36
other options	following procedures	8
	intervention	19
	transfer student	3
No response		79
unusable survey first page missing		1

N=221

Item 11 asked the principals what they would do if a student came to enroll in their school with an IEP. The responses to this item were given as an answer to an open-ended question. The practices were categorized by the researcher in two ways. The categories were "find some way to confirm the placement" and "some other option". The summary of these data are presented in Table 4.

The responses which categorize the way the principal sought to confirm the placement follow. Two (2) reported that they would review the IEP, 9 responded that they would "call placement" probably referring to someone or somewhere at the central service center. Thirty-three (33) reported that they would refer the matter to the counselor or the case manager, often this is the same person in a school. Six (6) reported they would convene an IEP conference.

Responses listed as other options include 6 indicating DNA or that this does not refer to a practice in their school. One stated that the school was a magnet school and therefore selected only eligible students. Ninety-seven (97) reported that they would provide service for the student. Seven (7) principals reported that they would transfer the student or send the student to another school if they were unable to provide service. Other reported practices, eight (8) listed they would follow procedures, nineteen (19) reported they would seek intervention, thirteen (13) reported that they would transfer the student.

Table 4

Frequency of Practices Reported for
Enrolling a Student with an IEP

Item 11		
practice	frequency	
confirm placement	review IEP	2
	call placement	9
	*refer to counselor/CM	33
	convene a conference	6
other options	DNA	6
	provide service	97
	transfer	7
no response		61
*CM case manager		221

In summary, principals secure services for students who are in need or eligible for special education services in a number of ways. They indicated they would monitor intervention strategies, they would refer the student to another person such as the counselor to direct the process, or they would refer the student for evaluation or follow procedures. A significant group of seventy nine (79) principals did not respond to this item.

Principals enrolling students would confirm the placement by reviewing the IEP, calling central office, convene a conference or direct the counselor to do these things. Ninety-seven (97) said that they would provide service. A significant number of 61 surveys were returned with no response for this item.

Research Question #2 asked the administrators how they describe or identify special education divisions in their schools.

The term division was used to describe special education rooms. It was intended to have the data reflect teachers and students assigned to a school rather than inflating the number by including teachers servicing the school on an itinerate basis. The survey finds twenty five categories of special education divisions in these schools. The data for this item is presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Frequency of Special Education Divisions Reported

Item 12

Category	Frequency
Autistic (AUT)	5
Behavior Disordered (BD)	46
PreSchool Blind (P/Bl)	1
Deaf/Hard of Hearing (D/HOH)	10
Deaf/Emotionally Disturbed (D/ED)	1
Deaf/Trainable Mentally Handicapped (D/TMH)	1
Emotionally Disturbed (ED)	27
Emotionally Disturbed/Mentally Handicapped (ED/MH)	1
Early Childhood Educationally Handicapped (ECEH)	12
ECEH/ED/BD	4
Educational Vocational Guidance (EVG)	1
Educable Mentally Handicapped (EMH)	79
EMH/Speech (EMH/Sp)	1
Early Remediation Assistance (ERA)	2
Gifted	1
Moderate/Severe Learning Disabilities (MSLD)	69
Other Health Impairments (OHI)	5
Orth/Physically Handicapped O/PH)	9
PH/EMH	2
PH/TMH	1
Reading Learning Disorders (RLD)	1
Severe Learning Disabilities (SLD)	57
Speech (Sp)	16
Trainable Mentally Handicapped (TMH)	14
Visually Impaired (VI)	13

*Number of divisions varies with each school N=379

The five most frequently reported kinds of divisions for these schools were EMH (79), MSLD (69), SLD (57), BD (46), and ED (27). Systemwide these categories serve the following percentages of students. This information was compiled by the Department of Special Education. EMH serves (5.4%) of the school population, MSLD (13.7%), SLD (4.6%), BD (3.0%), ED (4.1%). The only disability reported to serve more students was speech. Six percent (6%) of the school population receive speech services. The students in this category are usually served by itinerate teachers. Therefore the data collected from this survey seems to be consistent with the distribution of the special education population served by the Chicago Public Schools.

The category most often referred to in other parts of the survey was BD. In Chicago special education divisions are described in specific categories. The data did not present cross categorical arrangements or other unusual categories that might indicate efforts to provide more integrated delivery systems.

Research Question #3 sought to find administrator attitudes about the importance of special education and how they perceive their administrative ability.

Survey Items, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 address this question.

Survey Item 9 asks the respondent to indicate if they wished they had special education or if they were glad that they do not have any divisions. This question was intended for principals who do not have special education in their schools. This accounts for the large number of no responses or eighty five and nine tenths percent (85.9%) of the principals completing the surveys. Five and nine tenths percent (5.9%) of the respondents indicated that they would like to have special education students or added comments that they would like to serve all students. The responses of 8.18% indicated that they were glad that they do not have special education divisions in their schools. Several principals commented that they did not have space in their school. One would like to get rid of ED. The data for this item are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

**Frequency of Attitude Responses of Principals
Who Do Not Have Special Education Classes in Their Schools
Item 9**

If you do not have special education divisions in your school: Do you wish you had some? Are you glad you don't have any?

	frequency	percent
would want	13	5.90%
would not want	18	8.18%
No response	189	85.90%
Unusable survey	1	

N=221

Items 13-19 continue to address Research Question #3. The data for these responses are presented in Table 7. These 7 items required the respondents to give responses on a 5 point Likert-scale. The questions were designed to gather data on attitudes principals have about special education and their administrative abilities. The questions asked the principals to assess their preparation to administer special education, to rank their feelings about the importance of special education, to indicate their abilities to assume responsibility for placement, to make the decision not to provide special education, to rank their proficiency as a special education administrator, and to rank their competence in the supervision of special education teachers.

The data for these items were presented as percentages which were calculated with an accuracy of five hundredths percent (05%). Thirty four and fifty five hundredths percent (34.55%) of these principals feel they are prepared in the area of special education administration. Eighty two and sixty five hundredths percent (82.65%) feel that all students in need of special education should receive services. Forty-one and fifty five hundredths percent (41.55%) do not think it would be good for local schools to be responsible for placement. Fifty one and six tenths percent (51.6%) gave the highest rating indicating they would provide service for a student. Fifty three and eighty eight percent (53.88%) rated special education important in their schools.

Table 7

Scores of the Position Responses
Summarizing the Attitudes of the Principals
as to the Importance of Special Education
and Their Perceptions of Their Own Administrative Ability

LIKERT-SCALE RESPONSES_(IV, V being highest)

How prepared do you feel that you are as an administrator in the area of special education?

	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
	7	22	51	62	76	2
%	2.73	10.0	23.18	28.18	34.55	.91

Item 14

How important do you feel it is to see that all students that are in need receive special education services?

	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	9	2	1	24	181	2
%	4.11	.91	.46	10.99	82.65	.91

Item 15

Do you think students in special education should be allowed to transfer with only the local school responsible for placement?

	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	91	29	33	14	23	29
%	41.55	13.24	25.07	6.39	10.50	13.24

Item 16

Would you provide special education services at your school if you were not mandated?

	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	12	11	24	46	113	13
%	5.48	5.02	10.96	21.00	51.60	5.94

continued

Table 7 (Continued)

Item 17						
Is special education an important program in your school?						
	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	8	7	19	61	118	6
%	3.65	3.20	8.66	27.85	53.88	2.74
Item 18						
Do you feel proficient as an administrator when it comes to the area of special education?						
	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	7	17	51	62	81	1
%	3.20	7.76	23.29	28.31	36.99	.46
Item 19						
Could you provide remediation suggestions to a special education teacher who was not providing adequate instructions?						
	I	II	III	IV	V	no response
N	7	18	50	59	85	0
%	3.20	8.22	22.83	26.94	38.8	0
Total surveys received					221	
Unusable surveys					2	
no response this section (1)						
second page not returned (1)						
Total number of usable surveys for these items					<u>219</u>	

In summary the principals do not give a high response in rating their preparedness to be an administrator in the area of special education. They do rank special education as an important service. They do not think the local school should be responsible for placement. They do not give the highest ranking for the question "Would you provide special education services at your school if you were not mandated?" Only half of these principals rate special education as an important program. They only indicate moderate proficiency as a special education administrator and in their abilities to supervise special education teachers.

Research Question #4 asked: How are these CPS principals prepared to be administrators of special education?

Five items address this question, 20,21,22,23, 24. Item 20 asked the administrators to provide information about their years of experience as a principal. The data for this item are compiled in Table 8. The range of experience was from less than six months to 28 years. Fifteen (15) principals indicated that they had less than 6 months of experience, These were not presented in the data along with survey that was completed by an acting principal and by four (4) giving no response to this item . The number used for computation for this item was 201. Over half of these principals or one hundred eleven (111) had six or less years of experience. The average years of experience of these principals was nine and seven tenths (9.7).

Table 8

Frequency of Reported Years of Experience as a Principal
Item 20

N years of experience	frequency	extension
1	29	29
2	16	32
3	17	51
4	16	64
5	14	70
6	19	114
7	2	14
8	3	24
9	1	9
10	6	60
11	1	11
12	4	44
13	3	39
14	6	84
15	7	105
16	7	112
17	5	85
18	5	90
19	7	133
20	5	100
21	5	105
22	4	88
23	2	46
24	4	96
25	5	125
26	3	78
27	3	81
28	2	56

N=201 N=1945

Mean=9.6766

15 principals reported that they were new with less than six months experience

1 survey was completed by an acting principal

4 surveys were returned with no response for this item

20 unusable surveys for this item

Items 21,22,23, and 24 provide the rest of the data for consideration in relation to Research Question #4. The data for these items are presented in Table 9. The data are presented in frequency and simple percentages. In response to Item 21, seventy-four and two tenths percent (74.2%) of the principals indicated that they had taken a survey course on the exceptional child.

Item 22 asked the principals if they had been a special education teacher. The assumption is that persons with special education training would be more sensitive to the issues raised in this survey. Forty seven (47) or twenty one and twenty six hundredths percent (21.26%) of these principals reported that they had been special education teachers. A number of principals listed credentials in comments made on this item. Some comments were that the respondent taught at DePaul, another was certified in LD, BD, Ed, and PH, one indicated having earned a masters degree in special education, others identified themselves as former counselors, master teachers, and as having directed a program for the multiple handicapped blind program. One hundred ninety seven (197) principals reported in Item 23 that they had read at least one article on special education in a professional journal this year. In response to Item 24, one hundred fifty one (151) reported that they had attended a workshop. Comments indicated this had been a busy year, others planned to attend a two day workshop in July.

Table 9

Frequency of Responses Indicating
Administrative Preparation

Item 21

Have you taken a survey course on the exceptional child?

	frequency	percent
Yes	164	74.20%
No	52	23.53%
no response	5	2.26%

Item 22

Were you ever a special education teacher?

	frequency	percent
Yes	47	21.26%
No	166	75.11%
training	4	1.80%
no response	4	1.80%

Item 23

Have you read an article from a professional journal pertaining to special education this year?

	frequency	percent
Yes	197	89.14%
No	22	9.95%
no response	2	.90%

Item 24

Have you attended a workshop or inservice to improve your knowledge pertaining to special education this year?

	frequency	percent
Yes	151	68.32%
No	68	30.76%
no response	2	.90%

N=221

In summary the data finds that while some principals reported many years of experience as school administrators over half of the principals completing this survey had six or less years of experience. Only 21.16% of these principals have taught special education classes. Time seems to be an issue this year. Sixty eight and thirty two hundredths percent (68.32%) of the principals indicated that they had attended a workshop or inservice for special education. Eighty nine and fourteen hundredths percent (89.14%) did read an article about special education this year and 74.20% had taken a survey course on the exceptional child.

Research Question #5 asked: "What are some of the administrative practices concerning special education in these schools?"

This question was examined in survey items 25,26,27,28, and 29. Survey Item 25 asked the question "How many staffings have you personally attended this year?" A multidisciplinary staffing for the placement of any student is required by law. It is the process that follows an evaluation to determine the eligibility of a student for special education classes. Twenty two principals reported that they had not attended any staffings this year. Zero (0) was the response reported most frequently. Many of the principals indicated that they had only attended one, two, or three. The data for this survey item are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequency of Reported Number of Staffings Attended
Per Year by Each Principal

Item 25

number	frequency
0	22
1	11
2	20
3	27
4	21
5	19
6	15
7	8
8	3
9	1
10	14
11	1
12	5
13	0
14	1
15	6
16	0
17	1
18	0
19	1
20	4
21	0
22	0
23	0
24	0
25	4
26	1
27	1
28	1
29	0
30	4
50	1
115	1
No response	11
Not a number response	17

N=221

Items 26 and 27 were designed to gather data about the principals involvement of the LSC and the faculty in the special education program. School reform requires each school to address special education in the School Improvement Plan. Each school should have completed a plan by May 1 of 1990. The implication is that all principals should have discussed special education with both the faculty and the LSC by the time this survey was conducted. The data presents 78.28% of the principals discussed special education with the LSC and 81.90% had special education on a faculty agenda. The data are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Frequency of Responses to Items
Indicating the Principal Involves the Faculty
and the Local School Council with Special Education

Item 26

Have you discussed special education with your LSC?

	frequency	percent
Yes	173	78.28%
No	43	19.46%
no response	5	2.26%

Item 27

Have you had special education on a faculty agenda this year?

	frequency	percent
Yes	181	81.90%
No	31	14.02%
no response	9	4.07%

N=221

Item 28 asks the principal about the number of conferences held with special education parents. The data were compiled within a range and then presented as a frequency. Sixty (60) principals reported that they had one to five conferences with special education parents this year. The data for this item are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Frequency of Reported Conferences Held by the Principal
with Special Education Parents
Item 28

range	frequency
0	14
1-5	60
6-10	53
11-15	18
16-20	10
21-25	3
26-30	6
31-35	1
36-40	2
41+	7
No response	47
	N=221

Item 29 was presented as an open ended question. The respondent was asked to list those things they felt would make them a better administrator for special education programs. The responses were tallied and categorized then presented as a frequency. The data are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
 Frequency of Reported Suggestions for Ways to Improve
 the Administration of Special Education in CPS Schools

Item 29

categories listed		frequency
<hr/>		
2 or more times		
<hr/>		
additional staff	ancillary	5
	clerical	2
	classroom	5
	counselor	12
	lead teacher	2
<hr/>		
utilization of ancillary staff	direct service	4
	additional service	14
	service to parents	2
<hr/>		
central/district	cooperation	9
	leadership	4
<hr/>		
placement	adequate	5
	appropriate	4
<hr/>		
resources	money	7
	parents	2
	time	24
<hr/>		
staff development	principals	53
	teachers	8
	legal issues	9
<hr/>		
other	bilingual	2
	networking	4
	newsletter	4
	rules	11
<hr/>		
comments	don't know	4
	less paper work	5
	satisfied	12
<hr/>		
no response		24
*the number of responses varies		*N=237

Principals indicated that additional staff in their buildings would in fact help them to improve their administrative skills in overseeing special education programs. Some of the specific responses supplied by the principals are included in the following discussion. Four (4) principals requested additional ancillary staff. Concerns were raised that ancillary staff personnel is assigned to most buildings only one day a week. Ancillary staff being the school psychologists, social workers, and teacher nurses. The requests included the assignment of full time psychologist, social worker, teacher nurses. Another principal asked that these personnel be assigned to assist in classrooms. A further request was to have these personnel work directly with parents.

Additional clerical assistance was mentioned twice. One requested a clerk for the special education program. Positions of this nature have been opened subsequent to the time this survey was taken. Special education clerks are available in some schools one day per week. Five (5) principals felt they needed additional special education teachers and two wanted to have lead teachers assigned to oversee the program in schools with large populations of special education programs.

The counselors position was most frequently mentioned. The Consent Agreement with OCR and ISBE directed that a full time counselor be placed in every school. In most cases this has taken place. Nonetheless, twelve (12) principals mentioned this position. Comments included the statement that one counselor is inadequate, more help from the counselor is needed, a full time counselor is needed, an aide to work with the counselor is needed, to place a computer in the counselor's office. Counselors are required to keep special education tracking forms updated on the centralized computer system. One principal stated that a special education counselor was needed.

Twenty (20) principals made more specific suggestions as to how they felt that ancillary staff could best be utilized. In most instances because they are usually only in the building one day per week. In addition, persons in these positions spend their time completing assessments and participating in multidisciplinary staffings. Principals wanted ancillary staff to provide additional services for students. Two (2) principals mentioned that ancillary staff should provide direct service to parents.

Generally, remarks pertaining to central and district office staff indicated that they would like them to be more cooperative, consistent, and to provide leadership. A principal expressed the need for better service from 39th Street

Remarks about district offices include an expressed need for district office coordinators. A principal made the suggestion that district offices should have hearing and vision testers available to service students not tested during the regular testing schedule. A comment about central office was that since the reorganization central office does not provide help. It was also noted that central office should respond promptly to individual case problems. Central office should also provide more advance notice about programs that schools were expected to implement.

Placement concerns were of two natures. Principals wanted both adequate and appropriate placements for students. Some principals requested that adequate placement be provided. More space should be made available. It was also stated that there was a need for more help when placing students. Another way this concern was expressed was that a stable meaningful method of testing and placing children with special needs be established. One principal felt that there was a need for access to information regarding space availability and for the authority to place a child directly without intermediary interference. The opposing view was also stated, and that is the local school was not prepared to handle the responsibility of placement.

The responses of 24 of the principals listed "time" as a resource that they would need to help them become better special education administrators. This need was simply stated on almost all of these surveys as "more time". The second resource was more money. (Seven) 7 principals noted this need. There were no indications of how this money was to be used. Two (2) principals stated that more parent involvement was a need.

The category listed most frequently was staff development. It was mentioned fifty three (53) times that principals need additional opportunities to participate in inservice and workshops related to special education. It was suggested that these inservices be included in the Administrators Academy. Suggested topics included teacher supervision, trends in special education, more information about specific disabilities, and nine (9) principals expressed a need to have an inservice on legal issues in special education.

Other concerns include requests for additional bilingual services. Eleven (11) expressed a need for written guidelines and policies. Four (4) suggested a newsletter from central office specifically for administrators. Four (4) principals expressed a need for networking opportunities.

Additional comments by five (5) principals was that they did not know what might help to improve. Also five (5) stated that they should be less paperwork and twelve (12) stated that they were satisfied with the way things were. The needs of these principals while somewhat similar cover touch on many subjects.

Research Question #6 asked: "How do these principals perceive changing or improving the delivery of special education services?"

The data was collected for the last research question in survey items 30 and 31. These were both expressed as opened questions to allow the principals to provide a multiplicity of responses. They were not guided by any categories, but again the data were able to be categorized because the suggestions were generally easy to group. The responses were tallied, grouped and presented in frequency.

Item 31 asked the question, Could special education services be provided some other way than we presently provide service? The responses were grouped into the following categories. Placement was one way that principals described the possibility of providing service in a different way. Within this category, principals discussed students remaining in the home school, mentioned integration specifically, argued for segregated services or private school placements.

Other principals approached the solution by addressing specific special education programs. The third category was grouped "other" concerns together. These were ancillary staff, IITs or Instructional Intervention Teachers, and a reduction in paperwork. The data are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Frequency of Reported Suggestions for Providing Special Education Services Another Way

Item 30

Categories listed two or more times		frequency
placement	home school	5
	integration	18
	private/special	16
	segregated	2
program	BD/ED	5
	classification	4
	early identification	2
	placement	4
other	ancillary	9
	IITs (return)	3
	paperwork (reduce)	2
	REI (no)	3
specific	did not respond	28
	responded no	9
	responded yes	29
	don't know	22

*N=161

*Responses vary with some principals providing a number of suggestions others providing none

Continuing to discuss the data from Item 30, principals addressed placement concerns in their comments. One principal stated that all schools should have services for special education children within the home school to eliminate travel because bus service is really terrible. Others more simply stated that children should be able to go to school in their own neighborhoods.

Comments about mainstreaming varied. One principal stated that EMH students should be returned to regular classes. It was expressed that special education students should be in more school activities. It was stated that labels and placement should only be provided for severe and profound students.

Many comments were included about BD students and BD programs. Students classified as behavior disordered seemed to raise the most concerns. One principal suggested that incentives should be offered to encourage principal to take these programs in their schools. These incentives would include extra help, extra supplies, more aides, and equipment. One principal stated that BD students travel too far. Another noted that when these students are grouped they act out even more. Still another mentioned that BD students and their parents needed counselling services. It was stated that incentives should be offered to encourage teachers to enter into training for teaching in BD classes.

In the category described as other nine (9) principals again noted that they felt that the amount of time ancillary staff spend in a school must be increased. Also the kinds of services provide must be extended to include direct student service. Three (3) respondents stated that they felt IIT's should be reinstated. These were instructional intervention teachers who came out to the schools to monitor and assist special education programs in schools. These positions were abolished in the reorganization of the Department of Special Education. As in earlier discussion two (2) complained that some way must be found to reduce the amount of paperwork. Three (3) principals specifically mentioned that they do not think REI can work. Twenty eight (28) principals gave no response to this item and nine (9) responded with the word no. Twenty nine (29) principals completed the item with the word yes but gave no further explanation of how they thought service delivery could be improved. Twenty (22) principals completed the question by saying I don't know.

Item 31 asked the principals to provide suggestions or state ways to improve the system. Again the data were collected from responses to an open ended question. The question was, "What would help this system provide better services?" The responses were tallied and categorized and reported as a frequency. Principals offered responses

that were categorized as central office, inservice, service delivery, additional staff, and other. The data were presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Frequency of Suggestions to Improve the Delivery of
Special Education Services

Item 31

categories listed 2 or more times		frequency
central office	organization	12
	remove staff	5
	retain staff	3
inservice	administration	3
	LSC	2
	parent	4
	teacher	13
service delivery	BD program	6
	mainstreaming	5
	placement	28
	self-contained	3
additional staff	ancillary	28
	bilingual	4
	counselor	8
	teaching	24
other	district services (needed)	7
	funding (increased)	8
	paperwork (reduced)	6
	procedures (clear)	11
no response		33

*Responses vary

* N=213

The following are some suggestions principals made as ways to improve the system, the most radical being to "nuke Pershing Road". Many of the comments were replications of concerns and suggestions noted in Items 29 and 30. The suggestion was made 12 times to do something about the organization at central office. One (1) suggestion was for a complete sweep of everyone in central office and to replace them with people willing to work. Another asked for a clear line of communication to central office. Still another noted that central office should be forced to place kids in accordance to rules and regulations. One simply stated that there should be more organization at central office. Five (5) principals identified particular persons at central office who should be removed. Three (3) stated that Barbara Williams should be retained.

Among the statements that fell within the category of inservice, three (3) respondents felt there should be additional inservice for administrators. One stated that inservice should be provided for new principals. Two (2) mentioned the need for LSC and four (4) identified a similar need for parent training. Thirteen (13) of these principals noted that there should be more teacher training. One comment was that inservice for classroom teachers should be available on the topic how to effectively work with LD and BD students that have been mainstreamed

into their classrooms. Another suggestion was that teachers should be trained in individualization of instruction and learning modalities.

The category of service delivery on Table 15 includes the categories of program, mainstreaming, placement, and self-contained. Twenty eight (28) principals made notations about placement concerns. Six (6) respondents commented specifically about the BD program. A comment about the behavior disordered program is that we need better results with BD children at the high school level, the dropout rate is too high. Another principal stated that all BD students were bussed to the school, none of these students live in the attendance area. Placement was the most frequently mentioned concern in this category. The consensus about placement was that it should be quicker and with more speed.

Comments about mainstreaming for some were to continue to mainstream some students and have more closed classes for others. Another suggestion is to have full time teams who work in classrooms with regular education teachers. The opposing position was mentioned by three principals. One of these statements was that there should be more clustering of classes. One (1) called for more self-contained MSLD classes to provide intensive remediation and then return these students to the mainstream.

Additional staff was mentioned sixty four 64 times in the responses to Item 31. Twenty eight (28) of these suggestions were that ancillary staff need to be available in the schools more than one day a week. One suggestion was to contract outside of the system to obtain extra service if needed. It was noted by four (4) principals that there is a need for bilingual psychologists, social workers, and nurses. Eight (8) principals cited a need for additional counselling services in the school. 24 respondents stated that additional teaching staff was needed. More special education teachers are needed was once comment.

In the category entitled other, seven (7) respondents noted that more services are needed at the subdistrict level. One principal noted that the system is just to big and that it should be decentralized. It was mentioned twice that specialists should be returned to provide service from the subdistrict offices. Eight (8) called for increased funding. Six (6) principals stated the need to have the amount of paperwork reduced. It was also stated that only state required forms should have to be completed. Eleven (11) principals stated that clearer procedures are needed. A statement was made that the procedures should be clear and placed in writing.

Summary

In conclusion, the results of the survey provided insight into the practices and attitudes of Chicago Public School principals about special education. The data yielded several things principals do when a student appears to be in need of special education services. The practices are to refer the matter to the case manager or counselor, teacher, or some other designated person in the building. Other practices are for the principal to refer students for screening or evaluation. There were other options, principals also follow procedures, monitor interventions, or transfer students.

When a student comes to enroll in a school the practice is to review the IEP, call the placement office meaning somewhere in central office, delegate this responsibility to a counselor or convene a conference. Most would provide service. Again a few principals stated that they would transfer the student.

Principals described their special education programs in terms of standard or traditional categories. The data did not yield any unusual or innovative arrangements for service delivery. MSLD and BD were the most frequently reported categories. Of the principals participating in the survey that did not have special education divisions in

their schools, more responded that they did not want special education divisions than did those requesting them.

The principals generally perceived themselves as being prepared to be special education administrators. They rated the importance of students in need of service receiving service very high. The principals generally were not in favor of schools being able to make special education placements on their own. The principals gave a moderate rating to providing services if they did not have to do so. They did however say that special education programs were important in their schools. Most feel proficient in the area of special education and they feel they could provide remediation suggestions for a special education teacher.

The average years of experience for the principals surveyed was 9.67. Over half of the respondents had six or less years of experience. Approximately 75% of these principals had taken a survey course on the exceptional child, 29% had been special education teachers, 90% have read articles in a professional journal this year, and 69% have attended a special education workshop or inservice. Most principals attend very few staffings. Seventy eight percent (78%) have discussed special education with their LSC's and 81% have had special education as an item on a faculty agenda. Principals all hold at least one conference with special education parents.

The needs of principals on systemwide concerns were also categorized. Principals see a need to improve the amount and the kind of service that ancillary staff provide. They expect more cooperation and leadership from central office. They want written policies and procedures. Principals are concerned about adequate and appropriate student placement. There is an expressed need for principals to find ways to have more time. They need inservice opportunities for themselves and for their teachers with at least one of these focused on legal issues for principals.

Other concerns were expressed as a need for more bilingual personnel, opportunities for networking, a newsletter for administrators, consistent rules and procedures and less paperwork. There were many concerns raised that expressed a need for more organization at the central office level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to define the role of the principal in providing special education services with the external mandates that exist in Chicago.

Six research questions were utilized to direct the course of the analysis:

- 1) How do these administrators in the CPS schools secure special education services for students in their attendance areas?
- 2) How do these administrators describe or identify their special education divisions?
- 3) What are some of the administrator attitudes about the importance of special education and how do they perceive their ability to administer it?
- 4) How are these CPS principals prepared to be administrators for special education programs?
- 5) What are some of the administrative practices concerning special education in these schools?
- 6) How do these principals perceive changing or improving the delivery of special education services?

In the review of the literature the role of the principal is found to be critical to developing and implementing programs for students with disabilities. Building principals are responsible for the instructional climate and the instructional organization. They must make certain that all mandated procedures such as referral and IEP conferencing as well as initiation of placement take place in a timely manner. The building principal delegates tasks but still retains responsibility for special education concerns. Integration is considered a best practice for educating both regular and special education students. School reform has restructured the configuration for the governance of schools in Chicago.

The research was conducted by means of a survey. A survey was mailed to all principals working in the Chicago Public School system in June, 1990. The survey included both descriptive and attitudinal questions. The questions allowed for direct responses and ranking on a Likert-scale from I-V. Other items called for narrative responses. The survey was reviewed and pilot tested by five principals. Two hundred twenty one (221) completed surveys were received. The rate of return was 36 percent.

The responses to the survey were tabulated and referenced. The narrative responses were summarized. Principals

added comments which were categorized and presented in the data. The Likert-scale responses were summarized and presented in percentages for each range on the scale.

1. Principals engage in a variety of practices when a student appears to be in need of special education services. There is no one standard procedure.

The practices are to refer the matter to the case manager or counselor, teacher, or some other designated person in the building.

Other practices are for the principal to refer students for screening or evaluation.

Principals also follow procedures, monitor interventions, or transfer students. There is also no set practice for when a student comes to enroll in a school with an IEP, but generally they check the placement, provide service, or transfer the student.

2. The administrators describe special education divisions in their schools in traditional or standard terms.

The data did not yield any categories of special education divisions that indicated that any unusual or innovative arrangements had been tried in their schools.

3. The administrators felt that special education is an important program and that they are prepared as administrators.

The data yielded that the principals perceived themselves as being prepared as administrators. They indicated that it is important to serve students in need of special education. They gave a high rating on a Likert-scale that they felt proficient in the area of special education.

4. The principals prepared themselves to administer special education programs through reading and attending classes or workshops.

The data yielded that ninety percent (90%) of the principal had read an article in a professional journal, sixty nine percent (69%) had attended workshops, and seventy five percent (75%) had taken a course on the exceptional child.

5. The administrators engage in a number of administrative practices with varying intensity.

Administrators do not attend all staffings.

Twenty two (22) did not attend even one staffing last year. They indicated a greater degree of involvement when it came to placing these items on the LSC agenda and on the faculty agenda.

6. These principals perceive changing the system in a number of ways that involves increased staffing, inservice opportunities, written polices and guidelines, a more responsive central office, and quicker placement for students.

The principals expect central office to respond more directly to their needs. They would like to have more use of ancillary staff personnel in their schools. Other staffing concerns are more counselling services. The data yielded a need for written policies and guidelines. The principals also indicated that improved placement procedures would do much to improve the system.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings and general conclusions of this study:

1. There is a need to find a way to place students eligible to receive special education in a more timely manner. In addition this procedure must be conveyed to the principals so that they understand the process.

2. There is a need to develop a clear set of guidelines, written regulations, and develop a written policy that will guide the practices for special education in all schools.
3. There is a need to provide more inservice opportunities for administrators, teachers, and parents. There should be at least one inservice focused on legal implications for special education administrators.
4. A careful study should be made of the assignment and use of ancillary personnel in schools. There is a need to have their services more than one day per week, and for them to have more direct contact with students.
5. Principals should be provided with information and workshops on time management skills so that they find more ways to have time to participate in special education programs in their schools.
6. A newsletter or bulletin should be published on a regular basis to provide information to principals about special education.

7. There should be a focus on the behavior disorder programs to change the perception and provide additional strategies and support for principals who have these programs.
8. There should be a constant investigation of ways to integrate students in Chicago. Principals will need many support mechanisms to implement inclusive schools.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study should be replicated with principals after the 1991 contracts are in place. This would allow a sample to be taken with a stable population. By that time all principals would have at least 3 years to work including those receiving a contract in 1990.
2. The replication could be supplemented by interviews with principals to provide further data.
3. Finally, a study could be made with principals employed in systems other than Chicago to determine if their attitudes about special education match those of principals working in Chicago.

REFERENCES

Books

- Best, John W. and James V. Kahn. Research in Education, 6th ed., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1989.
- Caldwell, Brian J. and Jim M. Spinks. Education Policy Perspectives: The Self-Managing School. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Falmer Press, 1988.
- Cruickshank, William M. Concepts in Learning Disabilities Selected Writings. vol 2. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1981.
- Drew, Clifford J. Introduction to Design and Conducting Research, 2nd ed. St. Louis, Missouri: The C. V. Mosby Company, 1980.
- Fulcher, Gillian. Disabling Policies? A Comparative Approach to Education Policy and Disability. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Falmer Press, 1989.
- Goffman, Erving. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.
- Gordon, Marshall and Norman Schumberger. A First Course in Statistics. New York: Collier MacMillian Publishers, 1978.
- Haskins, Ron, Mark W. Lanier, and Duncan MacRae, Jr. "Reforming the Public Schools and Strategies of Reform." Chap. in Policies for American Public Schools: Teachers, Equity, and Indicators, ed. Ron Haskins and Duncan MacRae. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1988.
- Hegarty, Seamus, Keith Pocklington, with Dorothy Lucas. Educating Pupils with Special Needs in the Ordinary Schools. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc., 1981.
- Herrick, Mary J. The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1971.

- Hopkins, David and Marvin Wideen. Alternative Perspectives on School Improvement. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Falmer Press, 1984.
- Lewis, James Jr., Re-creating Our Schools for the 21st Century: Managing America's Schools with Distinction. Westbury, New York: J. L. Wilkerson Publishing Co., Ltd., 1987.
- Lietz, Jeremy Jon and Maxine Towle. The Elementary Principal's Role in Special Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1982.
- Lipsky, Dorothy Kerzner and Alan Gartner. "School Administration and Financial Arrangements." Chap. in Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps, ed. R. Gaylord-Ross, 105-113. Baltimore, Maryland: Brookes, 1989.
- Lowenfeld, Berthold, ed., The Visually Handicapped Child in School. New York: The John Day Company, 1973
- Mayer, C. Lamar. Education Administration and Special Education: A Handbook for School Administrators. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1984.
- Roaf, Caroline. "Whole School Policies: A Question of Rights?" Chap. in The Management of Special Needs in Ordinary Schools, eds. Neville Jones and Tim Southgate, 45-61. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Sage, Daniel and Leonard C. Burrello. Policy and Management in Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1986
- Schlechty, Phillip C. and Anne Walker Joslin. "Images of Schools." Chap. in Rethinking School Improvement Research, Craft, and Concept. ed., Ann Lieberman. 147-161. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.
- Schmid, Rex E. and Lynn M. Nagata. Contemporary Issues in Special Education, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- Stainback, William, Susan Stainback, and Gary Bunch. "Introduction and Historical Background." In Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education, eds., Susan Stainback, William Stainback, and Marsha Forest, 3-14. Baltimore, Maryland: Brookes, 1989.

- Stetson, Frances. "Critical Factors that Facilitate Integration: A Theory of Administrative Responsibility." Chap. in Public School Integration of Severly Handicapped Students, eds. Nick Certo, Norris Haring, and Robert York, 65-82. Baltimore, Maryland: Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- Taylor, Robert L. and Les Sternberg. Exceptional Children: Integrating Research and Teaching. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- Wilson, William C. "Administrative Strategies for Integration." Chap. in Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps, ed., Robert Gaylord-Ross, 299-319. Baltimore, Maryland: Brookes, 1989.

Documents

- Administrative Proceedings in the United States Department of Education. Chicago Board of Education and ISBE Settlement Agreement. Docket No 87-504-2., 1989.
- 122 Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02.

Will, Madeleine "Educating Students with Learning Problems --a Shared Responsibility. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, 1986.

Periodicals

- Bacharach, Samuel B. "Four Themes of Reform: An Editorial Essay." Educational Administration Quarterly. 24 (November 1988): 484-495.
- Gerber, Michael and Deborah Levine-Donnerstein. "Educating All Children: Ten Years Later." Exceptional Children 56 (September 1989): 17-27.
- Herbert, Elizabeth A. and Steven I. Miller. "Role Conflict and the Special Education Supervisor: A Qualitative Analysis." The Journal of Special Education 19 (Summer 1985): 215-229.

- Jenkins, Joseph R, Constance G. Pious, and Mark Jewell.
 "Special Education and the Regular Education Initiative: Basic Assumptions." Exceptional Children 56 (April 1990): 479-491
- Murphy, Joseph. "Is There Equity in Educational Reform?" Educational Leadership 46 (February 1989): 32-33.
- Raywid, Mary Anne. "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform, and Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 72 (October 1990)" 139-143.
- Stainback, William and Susan Stainback. "A Rational for the Merger of Special and Regular Education." Exceptional Children 51 (October 1984): 102-111.
- Vergason, Glenn A. and M. L. Anderegg. "Save the Baby! A Response to Integrating the Children of the Second System." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1989): 61-63.
- Wang, Margaret C., Maynard C. Reynolds, and Herbert J. Walberg. "Rethinking Special Education." Educational Leadership 44 (September 1986) 26-31.
- Westling, David L. "Leadership for Education of the Mentally Handicapped." Educational Leadership 46 (March 1989): 19-23.

Unpublished Materials

- Anderson, John "Issues and Outcomes of Federal Court Cases Addressing the Educational Mainstreaming of Students with Handicaps - Implications for Educational Leaders-" Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1988.
- Burrello, Leonard C., Marie G. Schrup and Bruce G. Barnett. "The Principal as the Special Education Leader. (Special Project #G008730038-88), US Department of Education, 1988.
- Chicago Public Schools: A Prospectus for the Integration and Inclusion of Chicago Public School Students with Disabilities in Home School, Community, and Work." Chicago Board of Education, January 1991.
- Chicago Public Schools. "Development of Deaf Oral Education

- Chicago Public Schools: A Prospectus for the Integration and Inclusion of Chicago Public School Students with Disabilities in Home School, Community, and Work." Chicago Board of Education, January 1991.
- Chicago Public Schools. "Development of Deaf Oral Education in the Chicago Public Schools." Chicago Public Schools Library, 1937.
- Chicago Public Schools. "Historical Sketches to 1879 of the Chicago Public School System City of Chicago." Chicago Public Schools Library.
- Chicago Public Schools. "Special Education in the Chicago Public Schools, The Physically Handicapped." Chicago Public Schools Library, 1951.
- Chicago Public Schools. "Study Report Number Nine: Programs for Handicapped and Socially Maladjusted Children." Board of Education Library, 1964.
- Chicago Public Schools Department of Special Education and Howard Blackman. "Integrating Students with Disabilities: Questions and Answers for Chicago Public Schools." [1991].
- Greenburg, David E. "A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education: A Review for Administrators." Reston, Virginia: Contract No 400-94-0010. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1987. ERIC, ED. 280 211.
- Hayward, Joseph Thaddeus, "The Special Education Director, The Elementary School Principal, and Special Education Leadership." Ed.D. Columbia University Teachers College 1989 Dissertation Abstracts International June 1990. DA9013547.
- Howatt, John. "Notes on the First Hundred Years of Chicago School History." Board of Education Library, 1940.
- Madsen, Jean and Pedro Reyes. "Managerial Behavior of Special Education, Elementary, and Secondary Principals: an Empirical Assessment. Chicago, Illinois: Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, October 16-18, 1986. ERIC, ED 275 073.
- Schmidt, Dianne Muehrer. "Illinois School Administrators Knowledge of Special Education Laws and Regulations." Ed.D. Northern Illinois University 1987 Dissertation Abstracts International January 1988. DA8721812.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

such district or city, a tax for special education purposes for fiscal year 1985 and each fiscal year thereafter at a rate not to exceed .04% of the value of such property, as equalized or assessed by the Department of Revenue for the year in which such levy is made.

The revenue raised by such tax shall be used only for special education purposes, including but not limited to the construction and maintenance of special education facilities and the purposes authorized by Article 14. Upon proper resolution of the board of education, the school district may accumulate such funds for special education building purposes for a period of 8 years. No such accumulation shall ever be transferred or used for any other purposes.

If it is no longer feasible or economical to use classroom facilities constructed with revenues raised and accumulated by the tax for special education purposes, the district may, with the approval of the regional superintendent of schools and the State Superintendent of Education, use such facilities for regular school purposes. The district shall make comparable facilities available for special education purposes at another attendance center which is in a more practical location due to the proximity of the students served.

Sec. 34A-412. The School Finance Authority

(7) To ensure the provision of sufficient staff and facility resources for students beyond those enumerated in the categorical programs cited in item d of part 4 of Section 34 2.3 and not served in the regular classroom setting.

APPENDIX B



Office of the General Superintendent • 1819 West Pershing Road • Chicago, Illinois 60609 • 312/890-3700 • FAX 312/890-8461

Robert A. Sampieri
Chief Operating Officer

May 29, 1990

To: Whom It May Concern
From: Robert A. Sampieri *R.A.S.*
Subject: Authorization to Conduct Research/
Survey Activities

This memorandum shall confirm authorization for Ms. Diane F. Dyer-Dawson to conduct research and survey activities as outlined in the attached letter dated May 14, 1990.

Ms. Dyer-Dawson will be completing her doctoral dissertation on the topic of "The Role of the Principal in the Administration and Supervision of Special Education in Compliance with the Consent Decree, State and Federal Laws While Respecting the Authority Afforded the Local School as the Result of School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools".

The General Superintendent and I view this as a very important topic and, therefore, encourage all appropriate staff members to cooperate with this study to the extent possible.

RAS:jp
Attachment



Park Manor Elementary School • 7037 South Rhodes Avenue • Chicago, Illinois 60637 • Telephone 1-312/962-2670

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
Principal

James H. Norris
Assistant Principal

May 14, 1990

Mr. Robert Sampieri
Chief Operating Officer
Chicago Public Schools
Office of the General Superintendent
Chicago, Illinois 60609

Dear Mr. Sampieri:

This letter is a summary of my proposed dissertation study to be completed at Loyola University. It is also a request for permission to survey principals, interview certain personnel in the Department of Special Education and Pupil Support Services, and have some interaction with the Department of Research and Evaluation.

The topic of study will be "The Role of the Principal in the Administration and Supervision of Special Education in Compliance with the Consent Decree, State and Federal Laws while Respecting the Authority Afforded the Local School as the Result of School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools". The actual title of the project is yet to be finalized.

This study should provide clarification of the present policies and practices with regard to the administration of special education. The investigation will include practices involving identification, placement, and termination of services. Also, the supervision of special education programs presently in place in school. These programs and practices will be analyzed in terms of the Consent Decree, PL 94-142, ECH 504, and court decisions.

The expected outcome will be policy recommendations that will serve as guidelines for the administration and supervision of special education programs at the local level. It will also provide an analysis of the documents used in the administration of special education using school reform as a point of reference.

To facilitate this project the following authorizations are needed:

1. A letter giving authorization to conduct a survey involving principals
2. Permission to request statistics from the Department of Research and Evaluation (data that has been previously collected)
3. A current list of schools and principals and/or a set of mailing labels
4. Permission to use the internal mail system
5. Permission to interview any or all of the following people:

Barbara Williams, Interim Associate Superintendent
Special Education and Pupil Support
Services

Dr. Victoria Cadavid, Director, Division of Instructional
Experts

Billie J. Gray, Administrator, Section of Learning Disabilities

Dr. Shelia Mingo-Harper, Administrator, BD/ED Programs

Dr. Edith Fifer, Administrator, Early Childhood Education
for the Handicapped

Yvonne Williams, Administrator, Visually Impaired

Dr. Lolita Bacon, Administrator, Hearing Impaired

Vivian Rankin, Administrator, Home and Hospital

Gwendolyn G. Boutee, Administrator, Low Incidence

James Hall, Administrator, Speech and Language

Carol Hudson, Administrator, Orthopedically Handicapped

Dr. Frances G. Carroll, Director, Coordination/Assistance
Division

Dr. Elziena Smith-Dawson, Director, Monitoring Division

Dr. Sung OK Kim, Director, Support Services Experts Division

Eleida Gomez, Social Work Coordinator

Dr. Sandra Givens, Guidance and Counseling Coordinator

Lynell Stubbs, Coordinator, Psychological Services

Carline Loreys, Department of Research and Evaluation

Thank you for allowing me to study this important role that principals must perform. It is hoped that as well as serving as a professional growth experience for me personally, the information collected will also benefit all principals in this system and ultimately improve the quality of special education services provided for the students enrolled in this system.

Sincerely,


Diane F. Dyer-Dawson

cc: Loyola University
Dr. Arthur Safer, Committee Chairman
Dr. Philip A. Carlin
Dr. Joy Rogers

APPENDIX C



Park Manor Elementary School • 7037 South Rhodes Avenue • Chicago, Illinois 60637 • Telephone 1-312/962-2670

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
Principal

James H. Norris
Assistant Principal

June 5, 1990

Dear Colleague:

I realize that this is an inopportune time to seek your assistance. However, I am involved in an important project. Your input is the integral part of this study.

This research project will review the administration and supervision of special education from the perspective of the principalship. The enclosed survey will provide valuable information. Please complete it as soon as possible.

I am in the process of writing my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University. This research will benefit the special education students, as well as, students waiting to be placed in programs in Chicago Public Schools. In addition, the study will clarify the role of the principal in overseeing special education at the local school site.

Enclosed you will find a letter authorizing me to conduct this study. Please complete the enclosed survey and return it marked:

SURVEY
PARK MANOR SCHOOL
MR #46

I sincerely appreciate your cooperation.

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
Principal

**SURVEY - THE PRINCIPAL AS THE ADMINISTRATOR AND SUPERVISOR
OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

compiled by: Diane F. Dyer-Dawson

**Description of School
statistics**

1. Student enrollment_____
2. Number of classroom teachers_____
3. Number of special education teachers_____
4. Other non-quota teachers (ESEA, OEE0)_____
5. Number of teacher aides_____
6. Number of counselors_____
7. Ancillary staff assigned 5 days per week (social worker, nurses, psychologists, etc.)_____

8. *type of school*

Early Childhood_____

K-6_____

K-8_____

Middle School_____

High School_____

Other (please designate)_____

If you do not have special education divisions in your school.

9. Do you wish you had some?_____ Are you glad you don't have any?_____

10. What do you do when a student enrolled in your school appears to be in need of special education services?_____

(2)

11. What would you do if a student came to enroll in your school with an IEP? _____

12. If you have special education divisions in your school. please list types.

On a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest please rank the following:

13. How prepared do you feel that you are as an administrator in the area of special education?

1___2___3___4___5___

14. How important do you feel it is to see that all students that are in need receive special education services?

1___2___3___4___5___

15. Do you think students in special education should be allowed to transfer with only the local school responsible for placement?

1___2___3___4___5___

16. Would you provide special education services at your school if it were not mandated?

1___2___3___4___5___

17. Is special education an important program in your school?

1___2___3___4___5___

18. Do you feel proficient as an administrator when it comes to the area of special education?

1___2___3___4___5___

19. Could you provide remediation suggestions to a special education teacher who was not providing adequate instruction?

1___2___3___4___5___

Administrative Preparation for special education

- 20. Number of years as a principal_____
- 21. Have you taken a survey course on the exceptional child?_____
- 22. Were you ever a special education teacher?_____
- 23. Have you read an article from a professional journal pertaining to special education this year?_____
- 24. Have you attended a workshop or inservice to improve your knowledge of special education this year?_____

Administrative Practices

- 25. How many staffings have you personally attended this year?_____
- 26. Have you discussed special education with your LSC?_____
- 27. Have you had special education on a faculty agenda this year?_____
- 28. How many conferences have you had with a special education this year?_____
- 29. What would help you become a better special education administrator?_____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- 30. Could special education services be provided some other way than we presently provide service?_____
- _____
- 31. What would help this system provide better special education services?_____
- _____
- _____

Thanks

RETURN TO: SURVEY
PARK MANOR SCHOOL
MR# 46

May, 1990

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

Sample follow-up letter mailed to the following CPS District Superintendents:

Dr. Joan M. Ferris
District Superintendent
CPS District 1
5945 N. Nickerson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60631

James P. Maloney
District Superintendent
CPS District 2
District 3 Office
2021 N. Burlington Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60614

Noel Rosado
District Superintendent
CPS District 3
Pritzker School
2021 W. Schiller Street
Chicago, Illinois 60622

Dr. Major Armstead
District Superintendent
CPS District 4
Skinner School
111 S. Throop
Chicago, Illinois 60607

Mrs. Dolores Engelshirchen
District Superintendent
CPS District 5
3100 S. Kedzie
Chicago, Illinois 60623

Dr. Ora B. McConnor
District Superintendent
CPS District 6
District 14 Office
4071 S. Lake Park
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Daniel J. Trahey
District Superintendent
CPS District 7
3810 W. 81st Place
Chicago, Illinois 60652

Dr. Sherwood C. Daniels
District Superintendent
CPS District 8
Dyett School
555 E. 51st Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Dr. Richard Stephenson
District Superintendent
CPS District 9
Harlan High School Mod Bldg
9652 South Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Marjorie Branch
District Superintendent
CPS District 10
Hughes Modular Building
226 W. 104th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Dr. Grady C. Jordan
District Superintendent
CPS District 11
Whitney Young
1470 W. Jackson
Chicago, Illinois 60607



Park Manor Elementary School • 7037 South Rhodes Avenue • Chicago, Illinois 60637 • Telephone 1-312/962-2670

Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
Principal

James H. Norris
Assistant Principal

June 11, 1990

Dr. Joan M. Ferris
District Superintendent
CPS District 1
Norwood Park
5945 N. Nickerson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60631

Dear Dr. Ferris:

This letter is to inform you of a doctoral study which I am in the process of conducting as a student at Loyola University. The study involves Chicago Public School principals and their role in the administration and supervision of special education programs.

Enclosed is a copy of the survey and letter of authorization which was mailed to each principal. Please urge the principals in your district to complete and return the survey as soon as possible.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,


Diane F. Dyer-Dawson
principal

APPENDIX E

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Diane F. Dyer-Dawson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies, Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies, Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Joy J. Rogers
Professor Counseling and Educational Psychology,
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 19, 1991
Date

L. Arthur Safer
Director's Signature