



1985

An Investigation of the Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Selected Administrative Functions of Directors of Special Education Cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan Area

Eugenie R. Mirelowitz
Loyola University Chicago

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mirelowitz, Eugenie R., "An Investigation of the Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Selected Administrative Functions of Directors of Special Education Cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan Area" (1985). *Dissertations*. 2378.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2378

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 © 1985 Eugenie R. Mirelowitz

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142
ON SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF
DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES
IN THE GREATER CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA**

by

Eugenie R. Mirelowitz

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION**

January

1985

© Copyright by Eugenie R. Mirelowitz, January 1985.
All Rights Reserved.

Eugenie R. Mirelowitz

Loyola University of Chicago

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 ON
SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTORS OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES IN THE GREATER
CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA**

This research investigated the impact of P.L. 94-142 on the budget, performance of administrative tasks and staff functions of the special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area, as affected by the size and wealth of the cooperative.

Data were obtained from a questionnaire mailed to twenty-eight (28) directors of special education cooperatives in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties, and from in-depth interviews with ten (10) statistically selected directors.

The investigation failed to show evidence of statistical differences among the special education cooperatives on the basis of size and wealth. However, based on the positive responses of over seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents, it can be concluded that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

1. There have been increases in per-pupil expenditures, in staff costs, in the running of the business office and in the total budget.
2. In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, funds had to be allocated which the federal government did not reimburse.

3. Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.

Directors agreed that their first priority has always been and still is the provision of good services to handicapped students, but they are now using their time differently. Directors are spending more time:

1. Keeping abreast of legal matters related to P.L. 94-142.
2. Trying to keep cases out of court.
3. Writing grants and proposals, gathering information and writing reports for the state.

Additionally, staff is now being utilized differently in order to meet the mandates of P.L. 94-142 in relation to the development and utilization of IEPs and in relation to annual reviews.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To the blessed memory of my beloved husband, Seymour (Sy), who nurtured me throughout my years at graduate school. He enabled me to study and write by giving me his support, encouragement, criticism and love. The memory of his unfailing confidence in me served as a catalyst to the completion of this dissertation after his death, on February 12, 1983. Rest in peace.

VITA

Eugenie Victoria Mirelowitz was born in Brooklyn, New York, on November 10, 1926, to Herman and Sadie H. Rivkin, both attorneys at law. She attended the public schools of New York City and was graduated from Erasmus Hall High in 1944.

In 1948, she received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Childhood Education from Brooklyn College. She was awarded the degree of Master of Education in Inner-City Studies at Northeastern Illinois University in 1974. In 1976, she was accepted into the doctoral program in Educational Administration at Loyola University of Chicago.

She has been a teacher of young children since 1948 in both public and private schools in New York City, Syracuse and Chicago. Since 1964, she has been a teacher in the Chicago public schools, assigned in 1967 to the Carnegie School in Woodlawn. Currently a first-grade teacher, her responsibilities have included kindergarten, Head Start, a primary reading lab, and a closed circuit television series, which involved the development and production of primary social studies programs, titled, "Neighbors, Friends and Brothers."

In 1972, Richard B. Ogilvie presented her with the Voluntary Action Community Service Governor's Award in appreciation for her services at the Woodlawn Early Childhood Development Center.

Mrs. Mirelowitz was married to the late Seymour Mirelowitz, a professor of social work at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her son, Geoffrey, lives in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and her daughter, Naomi, resides in Los Angeles, California.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS -----	ii
VITA -----	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS -----	iv
LIST OF TABLES -----	v
CONTENTS OF APPENDIX -----	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW -----	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH -----	17
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES -----	43
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA -----	56
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	131
APPENDIX -----	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Responses to Budget Items in Mailed Questionnaire -----	57
2.	Collapsed Responses to Budget Items in Mailed Questionnaire ---	59
3.	Impact of Size of Cooperative on Budget Decisions -----	68
4.	Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on Budget Decisions -----	70
5.	Responses to Items Related to Performance of Administrative Tasks -----	73
6.	Collapsed Responses to Items Related to Performance of Administrative Tasks -----	74
7.	Impact of Size of Cooperative on Performance of Administrative Tasks -----	94
8.	Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on Performance of Administrative Tasks -----	95
9.	Responses to Items Related to Staff Functions -----	97
10.	Collapsed Responses to Staff Functions -----	98
11.	Impact of Size of Cooperative on Staff Functions -----	107
12.	Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on Staff Functions -----	108
13.	Administrative Decision-Making -----	110
14.	Collapsed Responses to Administrative Decision-Making -----	113
15.	Impact of Size of Cooperative on Administrative Decision-Making -----	116
16.	Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on Administrative Decision-Making -----	117

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

Appendix

I.	Memo to Parents - Special Education District of Lake County -----	136
II.	Congressional Appropriations for Education -----	137
III.	Questionnaire Mailed to Directors of Special Education Cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan Area -----	138
IV.	Outline of Interview With Selected Directors of Special Education Cooperatives -----	141

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Legislation is often enacted with the intent of providing solutions for existing problems or for meeting needs as yet unmet. It was with the intention of guaranteeing "the availability of special education programming to handicapped children and youth who require it" that P.L. 94-142 was passed in 1975. Titled the Education For All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142 contains some provisions already enacted in P.L. 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974, and includes regulations in Section 504 of P.L. 93-112, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973.¹

The effective date of P.L. 94-142 was September 1, 1978. The law "requires states to provide special education and related services to states and Local Education Agencies to develop appropriate programs and services, and to establish and protect the substantive and procedural rights for children and their parents."²

The State of Illinois mandated special education services prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142. The School Code of 1961 includes Article XIV,

¹Joseph Ballard, *94-142 and Section 504 - Understanding What They Are and Are Not*, (Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977), pp. 1, 2.

²Donald B. Weber and Howard S. Rockoff, "The Relationship Between Demographic Characteristics of Local Education Agencies and Compliance with P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 94-142," *Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 14 #2 (Summer, 1980), p. 244.

pertaining to the education of handicapped children. In 1965, the School Code was amended to refine and enlarge powers, roles and duties of those involved in the education of handicapped children.³ When special education became a state mandate in 1969, school districts began to pool their resources in special education cooperatives, "recognizing that, independently, they could not meet the needs of the handicapped students in their districts."⁴ In 1967, Gearheart wrote, "if there is any real hope of extending special education services to smaller school districts, it is through the development of some type of cooperative, inter-district plan."⁵ According to the Illinois Office of Education, in 1981 there were approximately ninety special education cooperatives in the State of Illinois.

When new legislation is enacted, what legislators frequently do not take into consideration are the ramifications of new laws on other situations and conditions in the schools. Directors of special education cooperatives have had to meet the mandates of both state and federal legislation in order to qualify for funds. It can be assumed that these administrators have had to change some of their priorities in order to qualify for funds. Since neither federal nor state laws fully fund the additional cost of educating handicapped students, some changes may be found in the budgets of special education cooperatives. Before

³Joseph M. Cronin and Jack Witkowsky, The School Code of Illinois, (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1979), pp. 88-100.

⁴L.D. Vuillemot and Charles H. Gardner, This Is SEDOL, (Gurnee, Il.: Special Education District of Lake County, undated), unpagged.

⁵B.R. Gearheart, Administration of Special Education, (Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas, 1967), p. 49.

discussing budgets of special education cooperatives, the word "budget" must be defined. Knezevich views budgeting "as a process which describes what goals will be accomplished rather than simply as a record of things and services to be permitted next year." He views the budget itself as a document for fiscal planning and control which helps the administrator "to decide on the division of scarce dollars among competing educational programs."⁶ The old adage, "time is money" may not be reflected in the budget document, but it surely has an impact on the goals to be accomplished.

P.L. 94-142 and Article XIV of the Illinois School Code both specify roles and functions of staff members in relation to special education students. One definition of staff functions, given by Grieder, Pierce and Jordan, is those functions "designed to foster the attainment of a school system's goals by the best possible matching of employees and the work to be done."⁷ Knezevich refines staff functions further as "identifying, employing, assigning human resources needed to pursue an objective and fulfill program demands."⁸ For the purpose of this paper, Knezevich's definitions of budgeting and staffing will be used.

When P.L. 94-142 was passed by the Congress in 1975, it appeared to synthesize previous court decisions relating to special education and

⁶Stephen J. Knezevich, Administrative Technology and the School Executive, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969), p. 64.

⁷Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce and Forbis Jordan, Public School Administration, (New York: Ronald Press, 1969), p. 268.

⁸Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 37.

incorporated what Turnbull called "the five principles of special education law."

Turnbull identified the five principles of special education law as:

- a) zero reject
- b) non-discriminatory evaluation
- c) appropriate education
- d) least restrictive placement
- e) procedural due process.⁹

These principles of special education law, incorporated into both state and federal legislation, have, of necessity, made demands on the time and energies of administrators, teachers, and support staff, so that directors of special education cooperatives may be changing their priorities in relation to the performance of their own tasks as well as in relation to the time and energies of their staffs.

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of Public Law 94-142 on administrative decisions relating to budget, to the performance of administrative tasks, and to staff functions in the special education cooperatives of Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties in the State of Illinois, and to see if the size and/or the wealth of the participating school

⁹H. Rutherford Turnbull III, "The Past and Future Impact of Court Decisions in Special Education," Kappan, 59 (April 1978), p. 523.

districts is a significant factor on the impact of administrative decision-making in these areas.

The administration of P.L. 94-142 calls for interaction between federal and state agencies, local school districts, and special education cooperatives. This interaction can be described, analyzed, and comprehended through a social systems approach, since the interaction of component parts of an organization is the basis for social systems theory. Special education cooperatives, local school districts, the Illinois Office of Education, and the federal government all constitute parts of the educational system. A discussion of the social systems theories of Talcott Parsons stated,

The need for close coordination (within an action system) is most clearly seen in an organization, which may be defined as a "system of cooperative relationships" capable of "continual action in concert" and having primacy or orientation to the attainment of a specific goal.¹⁰

Getzels, Lipham and Campbell view administration "as a social process and its content as a social system."¹¹ Getzels stated further, that as administration is viewed structurally, it "is seen as the hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships in a social system."¹² One is cautioned, however, that,

¹⁰Chandler Harris, "The Functional Imperative," The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons: A Critical Examination, ed. Max Black, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 111.

¹¹Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Ronald F. Campbell, Educational Administration As A Social Process, (New York: Hayes and Row, 1968), p. 49.

¹²Jacob W. Getzels, "A Psycho-Sociology Framework For the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review 22 (Fall 1952), pp. 235-246.

... the person in the superordinate position is not always dominant and the one in the subordinate position is not inevitably submissive. In the structure of an organization there are related higher and lower, as well as parallel, positions having greater or lesser vantages for asserting influence vis-a-vis each other in the affairs of the system as a whole.¹³

It is within this social systems context that this investigation studied the impact of P.L. 94-142 on the special education cooperatives of the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

Local school districts have found participation in special education cooperatives to be a way of qualifying for money and services which might otherwise be unavailable to them as, alone, they do not serve the minimum number of handicapped children required for eligibility under P.L. 94-142.¹⁴ Gearheart agrees that special education cooperatives are a good way of pooling resources and points out several advantages of participation in a special education cooperative. The advantages include:

- 1) having a larger student population base, and therefore being able to utilize federal dollars for which a smaller district would otherwise be ineligible;
- 2) having greater purchasing power by combining funds with other districts;
- 3) being in a position to employ certain kinds of specialized personnel who could not feasibly be hired in smaller districts;
- 4) being the best way to serve low-incidence handicapped students.¹⁵

¹³Getzels, Lipham and Campbell, Educational Administration, p. 52.

¹⁴Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics," p. 250.

¹⁵B.R. Gearheart, Organization and Administration of Educational Programs for Exceptional Children, (Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas, 1974), pp. 83-84, 108.

Gearheart maintains that "mandated cooperatives or intermediate districts established to include all school districts within a state are the most effective."¹⁶ Illinois does not have mandated special education cooperatives. However, according to the Illinois Office of Education, all school districts in the counties of Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry are part of special education cooperatives. The Chicago Board of Education is not included in any special education cooperative.

The demands of P.L. 94-142 are a reality for all public school systems. Major decisions in resource allocations must be made to insure the provisions of the law, and administrators must adjust and adapt in order to meet those provisions. Administrators must now make decisions in relation to their budgets and to their utilization of staff that are based, not necessarily on their own priorities, but on fulfilling the provisions of the law. An assumption can be made that some changes have occurred in administrative decision-making in the areas of budgeting and staffing in order to meet the legal requirements of P.L. 94-142. Lamb and Burello indicate that, in the area of special education, administrators have changed "from developer and programmer to monitor and defender of the appropriateness of their service delivery systems to handicapped children."¹⁷ The central function of administration is the direction and control of the decision-making process.¹⁸ Griffiths so defined

¹⁶Ibid., p. 113.

¹⁷Jack Lamb and Leonard C. Burello, "The Role of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE)," Exceptional Children, Vol. 46, #1 (September 1979), p. 42.

¹⁸Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administration as Decision-making," School Administration-Selected Readings, eds. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getshman, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1965), pp. 220-240.

administrative function in 1965 and his definition is still valid today. It is important to find out if and how the federal law has minimized or undermined this central function of administration.

There has been a study of the relationship between demographic characteristics and local compliance with P.L. 94-142, and another study of the time spent by general school administrators in special education functions.¹⁹ There is little information, however, which ascertains how much time directors of special education cooperatives spend in fulfilling the mandates of P.L. 94-142 rather than in administering the total program of the cooperative. Additionally, it is unknown if P.L. 94-142 has created hardships for smaller and/or poorer districts, and if larger and/or wealthier districts have more options for dealing with the legal requirements of the federal law.

Since special education is now administered through the special education cooperatives, information about the impact of P.L. 94-142 on these cooperatives needs to be gathered and assessed. We need to know if there really has been federal erosion of the state's function of education. If it is found that the impact of the law has been to the detriment of the delivery of services, then information about this impact can be relayed back to legislators and can possibly have bearing on future legislation. While there is a trend in Washington toward reversion to state block grants, the issues remain the same,

¹⁹Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics"; David E. Raske, "The Role of General School Administrators Responsible for Special Education Programs," Exceptional Children, Vol. 45 #8 (May 1979), pp. 645-646.

as it is not expected that the regulations and expectations implicit in P.L. 94-142 will be changed because of reduction in funds.²⁰

QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES TO BE INVESTIGATED

Through the use of a mailed questionnaire and selected personal interviews, several questions will be investigated.

1. Has P.L. 94-142 eroded the decision-making powers of the directors of special education cooperatives?
2. Has P.L. 94-142 created budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives?
3. Have directors of special education cooperatives changed their priorities in relation to the performance of administrative tasks in order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142?
4. Have directors of special education cooperatives changed their priorities in relation to staff functions in order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142?
5. Has P.L. 94-142 created hardships in the areas of budget, performance of administrative tasks, and staff functions for smaller and/or poorer districts?

²⁰Case Alert, CASE newsletter, (Washington, D.C.: Council for Exceptional Children, February, 1981), p. 2.

6. Do larger and/or wealthier districts have more options for dealing with the legal requirements of P.L. 94-142 in the areas of budget, performance of administrative tasks, and staff functions?

Using the statistical method of a one-way analysis of variance, the following hypotheses will be tested and each hypothesis will be accepted at the .05 level of significance.

1. P.L. 94-142 has created budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.
2. In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to the performance of administrative tasks.
3. In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to staff functions.

To avoid giving undue weight to what may be minor problems in each category, the items in the questionnaire were grouped into three categories of a) budget, b) performance of administrative tasks, and c) staff functions, and then analyzed statistically by categorical grouping.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was field tested with a panel of seven directors of special education cooperatives outside the five counties included in the

investigation. The questionnaires were changed and modified on the basis of the responses from these directors. The questionnaire was then mailed to the directors of special education cooperatives in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties. The questionnaire contained twenty-six statements, culled from recent literature and research, which reflected areas of administrative decision-making since the effective date of P.L. 94-142. The three areas of administrative decision-making were:

- a) budget
- b) performance of administrative tasks
- c) staff functions.

There were five possible responses to each statement in the questionnaire, using a Likert-type scale:

- 1 - strongly agree
- 2 - agree
- 3 - does not apply
- 4 - disagree
- 5 - strongly disagree.

A response of strongly agree [1] or agree [2] indicated that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 have affected administrative decision-making in the area questioned. A response of disagree [4] or strongly disagree [5] indicated that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 have not affected administrative decision-making in the area questioned. A response of undecided or does not apply [3] indicated that the respondent was not sure if P.L. 94-142 has affected administrative decision-

making in the area questioned, or, that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 do not apply to the area questioned.

The questionnaire also included seven questions relating to the size, wealth and educational costs of member districts and the special education cooperative, as well as four questions relating to the educational background and salary of the director and staff of the educational cooperative.

The dependent variables in the study are

- 1) budget
- 2) performance of administrative tasks
- 3) staff functions.

The independent variables in the study are

- 1) the size of the cooperative, as measured by the student population base of the member districts served by the cooperative. For statistical purposes, the size of the cooperative was grouped in the broad categories of:

small: 14,999 and less

medium: 15,000 to 19,999

large: 20,000 and more;

- 2) the wealth of the cooperative, as measured by the average assessed valuation of property per capita in the member districts served by the cooperative. For statistical purposes, the wealth of the cooperative was grouped in the broad categories of:

low: \$34,999 and less

medium: \$35,000 to \$99,999

high: \$100,000 and more.

The statistical method for analyzing the data, a one-way analysis of variance, is a "statistical technique making possible investigation of three questions in a single study."²¹ Selltiz, Wrightsman and Cook urge the use of analysis of variance as a method of estimating the influence of specific sources on variations in scores. Using the statistical technique of analysis of variance, "it is possible to assess the contribution of any one or more of the possible influences with which we are concerned to the total variation in scores."²² Using the analysis of variance, both the means and the percentages were computed for each item in the questionnaire. The questions were also grouped into the three dependent variables of budget, performance of administrative tasks, and staff functions, and each variable (group of questions relating to the same topic) was computed for both the means and the percentages. The analysis showed what proportion of the variation in the scores was due to a) the size of the district and b) the wealth of the district.

When the questionnaires were returned, the scores for each respondent were tallied. In keeping with standard statistical practice, structured interviews were scheduled for those respondents whose scores were above the mean. The mean score was sixty (60) and ten (10) respondents scored at sixty or above. These structured interviews provided an opportunity to probe, in greater depth, the kinds of budgetary problems faced by the directors of special

²¹Claire Selltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959), p. 124.

²²Claire Selltiz, Laurence S. Wrightsman, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, 3rd ed., (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 192.

education cooperatives, and the ways in which they have had to change their priorities in relation to their administrative tasks and to staff functions. Through the interview, it was possible to corroborate, refute or modify the data obtained from the questionnaire about administrative decision-making and to further investigate the demographic factors of size and wealth in relation to each special education cooperative.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The small size of the sample presented a limitation to this study. The population, although small, was chosen because the particular circumstances and problems affecting special education cooperatives in the largest metropolitan area in the state differ from those in cooperatives around the state in more rural areas and in urban areas of a lesser magnitude than the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

In the questionnaire, the items relating to demographic factors had limitations, as many of the directors of special education cooperatives did not have access to the demographic information requested about their member districts.

The current high rate of inflation made it difficult for some respondents to ascertain which increases in costs were a direct result of P.L. 94-142 and which were due to inflation. Some of the data gathered in this area were, therefore, less objective than would have been desired.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Special education:

... those instructional programs supportive services, unique materials, physical plant adjustments, and other educational facilities ... which, to meet the unique needs of exceptional children, modify, supplement, support, or are in place of the standard educational program of the public schools.²³

Special education cooperative: An organizational unit of school districts, in the same geographic locale or in neighboring geographic locales, pooling their student population base for special education services, and acting as the service agent of the participating districts.²⁴

Zero reject: No exceptional child between ages three and twenty-one may be denied a free, public education.

Nondiscriminatory evaluation: A fair assessment of each handicapped child to insure proper placement and services in the public school.

Appropriate education: an education which takes the child's handicap into consideration and is meaningful to that child.

²³Joseph M. Cronin, Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, (Springfield, Il.: State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, 1976), p.1.

²⁴Ibid., p. 2.; Corinne G. Warsawsky, "A Role Analysis of the State Approved Director of Special Education in the State of Illinois," (Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1982), p. 188.

Least restrictive placement: Educational placement which meets the child's individual educational needs and which does not inappropriately separate him from non-handicapped students.²⁵

Supportive staff: Those staff members hired for the purpose of evaluation, specialized instruction, therapy or consultation for children with:

1. Auditory, visual, physical or health impairment.
2. Speech or language impairment.
3. Deficits in the essential learning processes of perception, conceptualization, memory, attention or motor control.
4. Deficits in intellectual development and mental capacity.
5. Educational maladjustment related to social or cultural circumstances.
6. Affective disorders or adaptive behavior which restricts effective functioning.²⁶

²⁵Cronin, Rules and Regulations, p. 1.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 1-2.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Viewed within an historical perspective, the passage of P.L. 94-142 followed a decade marked by demands for civil rights, minority rights, student rights to due process, equal opportunity for all. The early 1970's saw a multitude of court decisions which had an impact on federal legislation. P.L. 94-142 appeared to synthesize the court decisions relating to special education and incorporated what Turnbull called "the five principles of special education law." These are:

1. Zero reject -- no handicapped child may be excluded from a free appropriate public education.
2. Non-discriminatory evaluation -- every handicapped child must be fairly assessed so that he may be properly placed and served in the public schools.
3. Appropriate education -- every handicapped child must be given an education that is meaningful to him, taking his handicaps into account.
4. Least restrictive placement -- a handicapped child may not be segregated inappropriately from his non-handicapped schoolmates.
5. Procedural due process -- each handicapped child has the right to protest a school's decisions about his education.²⁷

²⁷Turnbull, "Court Decisions in Special Education," p. 523.

P.L 94-142 AND SECTION 504

It was with the intent of guaranteeing "the availability of special education programming to handicapped children and youth who require it" that P.L. 94-142 was passed in 1975. Titled the Education For All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142 contained some provisions already enacted in P.L. 94-380, the Education Amendments of 1974, and included regulations in Section 504 of P.L. 93-112, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973.²⁸

In order to qualify for federal funds under P.L. 94-142, each local education agency had to comply with the following mandated goals:

- 1) the least restrictive placement;
- 2) individual education plans (IEPs);
- 3) parent involvement;
- 4) personnel development.²⁹

The effective date of P.L. 94-142 was September 1, 1978. The law "requires states to provide special education and related services to children with special education needs, to provide financial assistance to states and to Local Education Agencies to develop appropriate programs and services, and to establish and protect the substantive and procedural rights for children and their parents."³⁰ Each state is accountable to the federal government for

²⁸Ballard, 94-142 and Section 504, pp. 1-2.

²⁹Hana Simonson, "Perspectives on P.L. 94-142," Handbook of Special Education, 6th ed., (Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1980-81), pp. 161-163.

³⁰Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics," p. 244.

compliance with the law. Federal aid does not cover the additional cost of educating handicapped children, but rather supplements the additional costs of such education. Each state was responsible for planning how it was going to achieve a free and appropriate education for all handicapped students.³¹

The editor of the Edpress Newsletter, "a monthly advising the staffs of nearly 600 U.S. and Canadian education journals," characterized P.L. 94-142 by saying:

Never before has any people in any land accepted so daring a challenge. It requires a massive effort, the provision of individualized schooling for five to seven million physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped students. It also calls for expensive changes in school plants and facilities to make them accessible to all.

Federal grants to states were the inducements, and a gradual phasing in was one of the palliatives. But the pain, struggle, and red tape of meeting federal mandates on behalf of the handicapped promoted a rising volume of complaints and doubts among educators: Can "the boldest, most humane of educational ventures" be carried out effectively?³²

Section 504 represented a legislative attempt to end discrimination against the handicapped. Unlike P.L. 94-142, which applies to anyone between the ages of three and twenty-one and is funded "under specific statute," Section 504 is applicable to all handicapped citizens, regardless of age.

No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.³³

³¹Ibid., p. 244.

³²Ben Brodinsky, "Something Happened -- Education in the 70's," Kappan, Vol. 61 #4 (December 1979), p. 239.

³³Ballard, P.L. 94-142 and Section 504, p. 1.

Turnbull suggested that criteria for "appropriate education" could be determined by Section 504 regulations.

They require a school to provide the child with special education and related aids and services designed to meet his educational needs as adequately as the needs of non-handicapped children are met. This special education must be based on the least restrictive placement principle, it must consist of pre-placement evaluation and non-discriminatory testing, it must provide for annual reevaluation of the student's special education placement, and it must assure him of procedural safeguards.³⁴

A great deal of groundwork, by both educators and legislators, was laid prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. The April, 1974 issue of the Kappan was titled, "A Special Issue on Special Education," and the editorial of that issue quoted an observation that "the year 1973 brought the moment of truth about special education to the people of the United States."³⁵ In 1978, the League of Woman Voters evaluated P.L. 94-142 as "... by far the most comprehensive piece of federal educational legislation ever enacted."³⁶

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special education takes on an additional dimension when one realizes that, according to figures from the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 12% of students in the country have some kind of disability.³⁷

³⁴Kappan, Vol. LV #8 (April 1974), p. 513.

³⁵Ibid., p. 10.

³⁶League of Women Voters of Illinois, Primer on School Finance In Illinois, (Chicago: League of Women Voters, 1978), p. 7.

³⁷Barbara Varro, "Is Equal Education Law Really Special?," Sun Times, Living Section: November 16, 1980), p. 8.

The State of Illinois was an early leader in mandating education for the handicapped. Special education services were mandated long before the enactment of P.L. 94-142. The School Code of 1961 included Article XIV pertaining to the education of handicapped students. In 1965, the School Code was amended to refine and enlarge powers, roles, and duties of those involved in education of the handicapped. Special education became a state mandate in 1969. Special education programs were provided for

. . .pupils with mental or physical handicaps, learning disabilities, hearing or vision problems, speech and language impairments, education handicaps (social or cultural maladjustments) and behavior disorders.³⁸

State aid for special education was second only to categorical aid for capital development in 1978, and that year, "The major state reimbursement [was] a grant of \$6,250 for each full time professional employee in a special education program."³⁹

In Illinois, each county is served by an Educational Service Region headed by an elected superintendent. The primary function of these regional offices is to enforce state regulations and to provide services to local school districts. In Cook County, these services include educational assistance, teacher certification, placement and in-service training, school approval, contract negotiations, and a crisis support team. The assistance provided in the area of special education is multi-faceted.

³⁸State Board of Education, School Code, pp. 88-100.

³⁹League of Women Voters, Primer on School Finance, p. 5.

Special education is a mandated service which must be provided to all handicapped students between the ages of 3 and 21 who are in need of assistance other than that available in the regular classroom. Special education services in the school districts include classes for: educable mentally handicapped, trainable mentally handicapped, deaf, blind, hearing impaired, visually handicapped and those with multiple handicaps. Other services are: speech correction, social work and psychology. The ESR supervises all special education programs in Cook County and is responsible for processing and approving all special education reimbursement claims.⁴⁰

Knezevich reminded us that "as a civil subdivision of the state, the school district was developed to fulfill the state's function of education." The administration of efforts to comply with the mandated goals of P.L. 94-142 necessarily falls to the local school administrator who must be "concerned primarily with the implementation of policy."⁴¹

The following articles can be found in Rules and Regulations To Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, distributed in Illinois by the State Department of Education in 1976.

Article II, 2.01 The local school district shall be responsible for providing and maintaining appropriate and effective educational programs for all exceptional children who are resident therein.

2.02 Each local school district, independently or in cooperation with other districts shall provide a comprehensive program of special education for those exceptional children who are between the ages of three and twenty-one and who are resident in the district.

Article III 3.07 The establishment and operation of all special education programs and services shall be under the coordination and educational direction of a state approved director of special education.⁴²

⁴⁰Richard J. Martwick, The Office of Cook County Superintendent of Schools (Chicago: Educational Service Region of Cook County, undated), unpagued.

⁴¹Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, pp. 13, 207.

⁴²Cronin, Rules and Regulations, pp. 2, 4.

Orelove may well have had the State of Illinois in mind when he wrote,

Some school districts in the United States have been educating severely handicapped and other exceptional children for several years. Having weathered the initial tribulations and the aftershocks, they now handle the daily affairs routinely. Thousands more are conforming to the legal mandate. Administrators are an essential link in putting into action the spirit of the law: that every child, despite his/her physical or mental condition, can benefit from an appropriate program of education and training.⁴³

Dr. Joseph Cronin, former State Superintendent of Instruction, put education in its proper perspective in a speech made in 1979.

Illinois is a comparatively wealthy state, with a balanced tax system and comparatively frugal expenditures. . . . As they look at needs, costs and values, Illinois taxpayers should consider education in the light of these facts and keep in mind that education is not only a cost but a value -- a wise investment in youth, in the economy and in the future.⁴⁴

SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES

The organization of special education cooperatives grew in the mid 1960's. One of the impediments to their growth had been the reluctance of small districts to surrender local control of programs. An additional factor, according to Lord and Isenberg, was an "unwillingness at all levels of state systems of schools to acknowledge that the traditional local school district

⁴³Fred P. Orelove, "Administering Education for the Severely Handicapped After P.L. 94-142," Kappan, Vol. 59 # 10 (June 1978), pp. 700-701.

⁴⁴Dr. Joseph Cronin, remarks made to the Illinois State Board of Education, January 10, 1979.

approach can't do the job of expanding and extending educational service programs."⁴⁵

In 1967, Gearheart wrote, "If there is any real hope of extending special education services to smaller school districts, it is through the development of some type of cooperative, inter-district plan."⁴⁶

In some states, the reorganization of small districts into larger administrative districts was done some time ago and such organizational structures are now firmly in place. In New York State, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) were organized in 1948, as a stop-gap measure prior to the mandating of intermediate districts. These Boards worked out so well that the plan to legislate intermediate districts was dropped.⁴⁷

Although originally intended to meet the needs of students in rural school districts, there has been wide growth of BOCES programs in the suburbs around New York City. Special education services are available to mildly handicapped as well as to severely handicapped. BOCES provide "shared service to two or more member school districts which initiate the request when either is unable to provide such services economically or efficiently for itself." BOCES are organized in geographic units and "local school district administrators purchase shared services in special education because of the broad spectrum of programs which the BOCES can offer, the specialized

⁴⁵E.E. Lord and R.M. Isenberg, Cooperative Programs in Special Education, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964), p. 11.

⁴⁶Gearheart, Administration of Special Education, p. 49.

⁴⁷Gearheart, Organization and Administration, p. 82.

personnel it can provide, and the facilities and equipment it possesses under a favorable state funding formula."⁴⁸

The organizational structure of cooperatives differs from state to state as well as within states. In Illinois, the Special Education District of Lake County has some services which are provided directly by the cooperative and others that are available at the local district level. For example, speech therapy is provided by the local school district "for those students not enrolled in SEDOL classes." As for learning disabilities, "In some school districts, the provision of services for youngsters with learning disabilities is the responsibility of the local district."⁴⁹

In general, the local school district retains the responsibility over special education students who are referred to SEDOL. The services of the cooperative are at the disposal of the member districts who must refer a youngster with an official request for services, after all resources at the local level have been explored and exhausted.⁵⁰

The State of Wisconsin abolished the Office of County Superintendent of Education in 1965 and organized Cooperative Educational Service agencies as units "between the local district and the state superintendent level" for cooperative special education services.⁵¹

⁴⁸Henry V. Colella and Herbert Foster, "BOCES: A Delivery System for Special Education," Kappan, Vol. LV #8, (April, 1974), p. 544.

⁴⁹Vuillemot and Gardner, This is SEDOL, unpagued.

⁵⁰Ibid., unpagued.

⁵¹Gearheart, Organization and Administration, p. 86.

When special education became a state mandate in Illinois in 1969, school districts began to pool their resources in special education cooperatives, "recognizing that, independently, they could not meet the needs of the handicapped students in their districts."⁵²

Gearheart maintained that "mandated cooperatives or intermediate districts established to include all school districts within a state, are the most effective."⁵³ The State of Illinois does not have mandated special education cooperatives, however, in 1981, according to the Illinois Office of Education, there were approximately ninety special education cooperatives in Illinois. Most of the school districts in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties are part of special education cooperatives.

Gearheart pointed out several of the advantages of participation in a special education cooperative. These include:

- 1) having a larger student population base and therefore being able to utilize federal money for which a smaller district would otherwise be ineligible;
- 2) having greater purchasing power by combining funds with other districts;
- 3) being in a position to employ certain kinds of specialized personnel who could not feasibly be hired in smaller districts;
- 4) being the best way to serve low-incidence handicapped students.⁵⁴

⁵²Vuillemot and Gardner, This Is SEDOL, unpagued.

⁵³Gearheart, Organization and Administration, p. 113.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 83-84, 108.

Administrators should not be lulled into thinking that participation in a special education cooperative is a way to save money. The only cost saving to the local school district comes through joint purchasing. In all other areas, the function of the special education cooperative is the extension and improvement of services to handicapped students. For some administrators, the cooperative "provides a way of jointly sharing risk-capital with other districts for new and innovative ventures." In some states, where special education cooperatives were legislatively mandated, state officials did little to enforce the legislative mandate. "The existence of the cooperatives with theoretical capability allows the states to postpone doing anything significant about the problems the cooperatives were mandated to attack."⁵⁵

Weber and Rockoff suggested that the implications of the eligibility criteria in P.L. 94-142 would force the various State Departments of Education to encourage smaller districts to reorganize into larger administrative districts, such as county or intermediate districts. Since the provisions of P.L. 94-142 call for the State Education Agency to serve as a monitor, it behooves the state agencies to enable small districts, with inadequate enrollment of handicapped students, to comply with the law, and this can best be done through a new organizational structure, such as a special education cooperative.⁵⁶

The demands of P.L. 94-142 are a reality for all public school systems. Local school districts have found participation in special education cooperatives

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 112-113.

⁵⁶Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics," p. 250.

to be the best way of qualifying for money and services which might otherwise be unavailable to them, as, alone, they do not serve the minimum number of handicapped students required for eligibility under the law.

P.L. 94-142 AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Professional educational journals and the popular media alike have been filled with problems in relation to P.L. 94-142. Suits have been filed in state courts and have been appealed to the Supreme Court. Popular conjecture has been that money for special education would detract from expenditures for children in regular education programs. On the other side, special education administrators have been concerned that monies heretofore budgeted for special education would, in the future, be combined with other monies into state block grants, and therefore, there would be cuts in special education budgets which would seriously affect special education programs. The problems have arisen from all aspects of P.L. 94-142. Some problems have developed because of differing expectations and definitions of what the law is supposed to accomplish. Lamb and Burello pointed out that administrators have had to spend an inordinate amount of time in "reviewing policy, demonstrating compliance to state and federal regulations, and participating in the judicial process." They stated that administrators were "drowning in paper work."⁵⁷

⁵⁷Lamb and Burello, "The Role of CASE," pp. 43-44.

Orellove wrote,

The paradox of the legislation becomes apparent: P.L. 94-142, designed to provide an appropriate education for all children, including the severely handicapped, creates a new set of concerns and dilemmas for the public school administrator. An important first step in helping administrators is to identify those broad areas in which they will in all likelihood have to make significant adjustments in the school program.

He outlined six areas of concern.

- 1) identification;
- 2) placement;
- 3) personnel;
- 4) individual education plans;
- 5) procedural safeguards;
- 6) professional rights and responsibilities.⁵⁸

Meeting with parents is taking up more time of special education administrators, dealing with concerns on the one hand, that students are being misdiagnosed as being handicapped, and on the other hand, that those diagnosed as handicapped are receiving inadequate remedial services. There also appear to be parents in some areas who are not clear as to their rights and/or the rights of their handicapped youngsters.⁵⁹ Undoubtedly, this could have been avoided with better communication to the community on the part of special education administrators and agencies. In Ohio, in a study to examine the relative adaptation postures assumed by local school districts in relation to P.L. 94-142, Weber and Rockoff found a more positive adaptation in the districts where "the Local Education Agencies promulgated the ramifications of the law to the faculty and to the community."⁶⁰ In the Special Education District of

⁵⁸Orellove, "Severely Handicapped," pp. 700-701.

⁵⁹Varro, "Is Equal Education Special?," p. 8.

⁶⁰Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Factors," p. 247.

Lake County, Illinois, a memo was issued to parents in 1974 which spelled out the rights of parents in relation to special education services (see Appendix I). The memo was written prior to the effective date of P.L. 94-142 and the procedures spelled out were in accordance with Illinois state law at that time.

One of the major areas of parent involvement, under P.L. 94-142, is in the development of the Individual Education Plan for each handicapped student. Problems have arisen in the definition of an "appropriate education." Parents tend to equate "appropriate" with "optimal," as do special education advocates. Lamb and Burello saw a conflict between the role of the special education administrator as a "representative" of handicapped children, versus the role of the special education administrator as an "advocate" for handicapped children. Almost with tongue in cheek, the authors said, "Superintendents expect special education administrators to represent, not "advocate," but not in excess, not too often, and not with parents or other 'advocates'." In defining what is appropriate in the view of parents, Lamb and Burello stated, "The parent believes 142 and God are both on their side of the case conference and the hearing table."⁶¹ In this context, Turnbull forecasted that "Laws aimed at eliminating bias in evaluation and placement procedures are particularly fertile grounds for future litigation."⁶²

The question of "appropriate" versus "optimal" was the subject of a 1982 Supreme Court decision in relation to handicapped children and P.L. 94-142. In *Board of Education versus Rowley*, the Supreme Court was faced with

⁶¹Lamb and Burello, "The Role of CASE," pp. 43-44.

⁶²Turnbull, "Court Decisions in Special Education," p. 525.

interpreting, for the first time, the meaning of a "free, appropriate education." The parents of Amy Rowley had requested a Westchester, New York school district to provide a sign-language interpreter for their deaf, fourth grade daughter. The Court overturned the findings of two lower federal courts in New York who had interpreted P.L. 94-142 as designed to give a handicapped child "an opportunity to achieve his full potential." Amy Rowley, although deaf, was an adept lip reader, had made a good social adjustment, and was in the top half of her class academically, but she was not hearing a good deal of what was being said in school. In a 6-3 decision, the Court held that, under the law, Amy was not required to have a sign-language interpreter in the classroom, provided by the school district.

Writing for the majority today, Associate Justice William H. Rehnquist said that the intent of Congress in passing the act was "more to open the door of public education to handicapped children on appropriate terms than to guarantee any particular level of education once inside."

Congress was most concerned, he said, with the fact that many handicapped children were excluded from public school entirely or were admitted to school, but given no special help at all. Congress intended to insure that each child received a "basic floor of opportunity," he said.

In other words, Justice Rehnquist said, Congress wanted to make certain that "the education to which access is provided be sufficient to confer some educational benefit upon the handicapped child." But that standard "generates no additional requirement that the services so provided be sufficient to maximize each child's potential commensurate with the opportunities provided other children."

"Desirable though that goal may be," Justice Rehnquist concluded, "it is not the standard that Congress imposed upon states which receive funding under the act."⁶³

⁶³Linda Greenhouse, "Schools Backed on Limiting Aid to Handicapped," (New York Times: June 29, 1982), p. 1.

The outcome of this case had tremendous ramifications for school districts, which saw future possibilities of imperiled special education budgets. However, nothing is conclusive. Although Amy Rowley will not be provided a sign-language interpreter by her local school district, *Board of Education v. Rowley* was not a class action suit. It is possible, at some future time, that another deaf child, less able than Amy, could demand such a service and have it granted her through a court order. This possibility does exist, especially if Section 504 is invoked, with its regulations that "the school must provide each handicapped child with all the services he needs, not just available ones."⁶⁴

The finding of the Supreme Court in the case of *Board of Education v. Rowley* appeared to be in keeping with the cases of *Battle v. Commonwealth* and *Armstrong v. Kline* in the State of Pennsylvania, where class action suits were filed to protest the policy of the state in regard to the required number of school days each year. Claiming that handicapped children required more than the 180 days of schooling mandated by state law, on the contention that "severely and profoundly impaired by mental retardation and accompanying physical anomalies," as well as "those considered severely emotionally disturbed," required year-round schooling lest they severely regress and therefore never attain maximum self-sufficiency. The trial court did find merit for this claim but noted that P.L. 94-142 did not require the state to help children reach their maximum potential, only to become self-sufficient. The district court struck down the 180 day ruling because it additionally "violated one of P.L. 94-142's major mandates -- that all handicapped children receive

⁶⁴Turnbull, "Court Decisions in Special Education," p. 525.

specially designed instruction to meet their unique needs." The case then went to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals where, again, the limit of 180 school days per year was held invalid for handicapped students. However, "because the decision to establish particular educational objectives has a profound impact on the allocation of scarce educational and financial resources, the Appeals Court held that

... the determination of appropriate educational goals, as well as the method of best achieving these goals, are matters which are to be established in the first instance by the states.

In summing up the history of these two cases, Bersoff concluded that "all the judges concurred that P.L. 94-142 certainly did not require schools to educate all handicapped children to their maximum potential."⁶⁵

One school psychologist has seen court action in relation to special education as causing "chaos in New York City." Her interpretation was that the special education section of the New York City school system was being run by the courts and that the "judicial branch has taken over executive functions."⁶⁶

In looking ahead to possible future litigation, Turnbull conjectured that

Although the regulations under P.L. 94-142 make it clear that no school employee is to be held liable for the child's failure to achieve the progress that his IEP projects for him, it is certain that liability will be at issue if school personnel:

⁶⁵ Donald N. Bersoff, "From Courthouse to Schoolhouse: Using the Legal System to Secure the Right to an Appropriate Education," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Volume 52 #3 (July 1982), pp. 510-512.

⁶⁶ Rachel M. Lauer, "N.Y.'s Special Education Has Turned Into A Juggling Act," (Sun-Times: Living Section, p. 8, reprinted from The Humanist).

- 1) fail to furnish a handicapped child with an IEP, do not require the IEP to be developed by the required group of persons, or make no good faith efforts to involve the child's parents;
- 2) exclude a handicapped child from the IEP conference when he could contribute to the development of his IEP;
- 3) write IEPs that assure only minimum projections of short term goals and long-term objectives; or
- 4) fail to furnish or do not make good faith efforts to secure all the services necessary for the child to receive an appropriate education.⁶⁷

Price and Jenkins conducted a cost study of IEPs and found that IEPs constitute a significant investment of teacher time, to the detriment of instructional activities. Teachers had to give "a significant amount of personal time to accomplish the IEP requirement." The average cost of IEP development was between sixty-six and eighty-one dollars per student.⁶⁸ Weber and Rockoff found that more IEPs were performed where the special education faculty had more advanced training, in terms of accumulated credit hours. The author conjectured that where Local Education Agencies are committed to compliance with P.L. 94-142 there is a heavy reliance on the professionalism of the special education faculty. Possibly, they thought, those faculty members with more advanced training took a leadership role in translating the law into practice.⁶⁹

Zettel's study to assess the success of P.L. 94-142 investigated service rates from the Fall of 1976 to the Spring of 1979. Despite a trend toward a

⁶⁷Turnbull, "Court Decisions in Sepcial Education," p. 525.

⁶⁸Marianne Price and Diane S. Jenkins, "IEPs: A Cost Study," Exceptional Children, Vol. 46 #6 (March 1980), pp. 446, 451.

⁶⁹Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics," pp. 244, 247.

decline in the number of students served, he found that the level of state funding per pupil increased in all but two states. In Illinois, the same trend was indicated for pre-school incentive grants, with fewer children served and more money allocated.⁷⁰

The problems of funding P.L. 94-142 have been all pervasive. One major problem has been the funding formula on which federal aid is based. The funding formula has been tied to the average per pupil expenditure throughout the United States, which has averaged \$1,500. In urban areas the cost per pupil has averaged far more than the national average. For those states where education has been a priority and costs have been above the national average, school systems have received "proportionately less than those without education as a priority."⁷¹

The current trend in Washington has been toward reversion to state block grants, and this trend has been a great source of concern to special education administrators. Should the funding change, many of the issues remain the same as it is not anticipated that the regulations and expectations implicit in P.L. 94-142 will be changed because of changes or reductions in funding.⁷² Funding through state block grants will mean a stretching of budgets for special education.

⁷⁰Jeffrey J. Zettel, "State Funding of Special Education," Yearbook of Special Education, (Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1980-81), p. 143.

⁷¹Albert Shanker, "P.L. 94-142: Prospects and Problems," Yearbook of Special Education, (Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1980-81), p. 5.

⁷²Case Alert, p. 2.

During the school year 1980-81, there appeared to be a hiatus in planning for the expansion of special education services. The Educational and Human Services Research Center conducted a study of sixteen school districts in nine states, Illinois among them. In at least seven of these states, the study implied a feeling that "special education cannot serve everyone." Among the planned means for curtailing special education services and programs were: "placing limitations on the number of handicapped children who can be counted for reimbursement purposes, tightening eligibility criteria and dropping some special education disability categories." The study forecasted that if any special education programs have to be dropped they will be those programs for the mildly handicapped in order to maintain services for the severely handicapped.⁷³

Educators were apprehensive about federal budget cuts for the school year 1982-83. Effective July 1, 1982, the federal budget for elementary and secondary education showed a decline of almost six percent, on top of a 1981-82 decline of eight percent. The major impact was expected in large urban areas and in "some relatively wealthy districts skilled in the art of obtaining federal grants." Despite the concern about reductions in special education funds, special education escaped inclusion in the block grants to states. Rather than a decrease in funding, there was a 6.5% increase in federal support of special

⁷³Educational and Human Services Research Center, SRI International, "Local Implementation of P.L. 94-142: Third Year Report of a Longitudinal Study," Education of the Handicapped, Vol. 8 #1 (January 27, 1982), p. 9.

education for 1982-83, largely because Congress fought to preserve P.L. 94-142 from inclusion in the block grants.⁷⁴ (See Appendix II).

Knezevich viewed budgeting "as a process which describes what goals will be accomplished rather than simply as a record of things and services to be permitted next year." He saw the budget itself as a document for fiscal planning and control which helps the administrator "to decide on the division of scarce dollars among competing educational programs."⁷⁵

Costs for special education have traditionally been higher than for regular education classes. Increased individualized attention and lower pupil-teacher ratio required in special education classes accounted for much of this.

In 1982,

The National School Boards Association estimated that local school district budgets were rising twice as fast for special education (14% yearly) as for regular instructional and operating budgets (7% to 8% yearly). Moreover, the ratio of the cost of education for the handicapped to the overall cost of education is somewhere around two to one nationally.⁷⁶

Despite the mandate from the Federal government and the impending increases in aid, the greatest proportion of funds for the financing of special education comes from state governments.⁷⁷

⁷⁴Edward B. Fiske, "New Cuts in U.S. School Aid Will Be Both Deep and Wide," (New York Times, July 11, 1982), p. 1.

⁷⁵Knezevich, Administrative Technology, p. 64.

⁷⁶John G. Cober et al., "Pennsylvania Programs for the Handicapped Get Good Marks for Quality, Cost, and Effectiveness," Kappan, Vol. 60 #1 (September, 1978), p. 61.

⁷⁷Stanley F. Vasa and Frederick C. Wendel, "How School Districts Finance Special Education," Kappan, Vol. 63 #10 (June, 1982), p. 703.

In the area of special education, Lamb and Burello have indicated that administrators have changed "from developer and programmer to monitor and defender of the appropriateness of their service delivery system for handicapped children."⁷⁸

The functions of special education administrators have become more complicated with the passage of P.L. 94-142. Extensive record keeping is needed in order to report to the state. The mandates of the law demand reports, not only about the handicapped students being served in a district, but also about those who need special education and are not receiving it. Dienst contended that this kind of record keeping requires a child-tracking system to be accurate.⁷⁹

Raske conducted a study to identify those special education functions performed by general school administrators. Given a list of fifteen functions, Raske determined that 14.6% of a general school administrator's role was devoted to special education, whereas approved directors of special education spent almost 100% of their time to accomplish the same tasks.⁸⁰

⁷⁸Lamb and Burello, "The Role of CASE," p. 42.

⁷⁹Carl J. Dienst, "Program Evaluation and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act," Exceptional Children, Vol. 46 #1 (September 1979), p. 26.

⁸⁰David E. Raske, "The Role of General School Administrators Responsible for Special Education," Exceptional Children, Vol. 45 #8 (May 1979), pp. 645-646.

Marro and Kohl's study of job tasks in relation to time found that special education administrators, 7.5% of whom were directors of special education cooperatives, were involved in the following activities: "direct service to children, supervision and coordination of instruction, curriculum development, self-improvement, community work, clerical and administration."⁸¹

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION-MAKING AND SYSTEMS THEORY

Administrators are constantly faced with decisions. If they are to implement the function for which their organization is designed, they must go through a series of processes in order to achieve the goals of the institution in which they work. In the case of special education cooperatives, there is decision-making in order to meet the goals of the cooperative, the needs of the local school districts comprising the cooperative, the laws of the state, and the federal mandates in P.L. 94-142. The administration of P.L. 94-142 calls for a constant interaction between the above mentioned agencies which can be described, analyzed and comprehended through a social systems approach. A discussion of the social systems theories of Talcott Parsons stated,

⁸¹Thomas D. Marro and John W. Kohl, "Normative Study of the Administrative Position in Special Education," Exceptional Children, 39 (September 1972), pp. 5-13.

the need for close coordination (within an action system) is most clearly seen in an organization, which may be defined as a "system of cooperative relationships" capable of "continual action in concert" and having primacy or orientation to the attainment of a specific goal.⁸²

Getzels, Lipham and Campbell defined educational organizations as social systems, and administration as a social process. Getzels further defined administration as "the hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships in a social system."⁸³ The three authors cautioned that while administration "is seen as the hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships in a social system,"

... the person in the superordinate position is not always dominant and the one in the subordinate position is not inevitably submissive. In the structure of an organization there are related higher and lower, as well as parallel, positions having greater or lesser vantages for asserting influence vis-a-vis each other in the affairs of the system as a whole.⁸⁴

Knezevich reminded us, "as a civil subdivision of the state, the school district was developed to fulfill the state's function of education."⁸⁵ In his study of the activities of school superintendents, Lehman found that fiscal responsibility had become increasingly alienated from local control and initiative.⁸⁶ A study of the federal government and the public schools, conducted by the American Association of School Administrators, found that as

⁸²Harris, "The Functional Imperative," p. 111.

⁸³Getzels, Lipham and Campbell, Educational Administration, p. 49; Getzels, "Framework for the Study of Administration," pp. 235-246.

⁸⁴Getzels, Lipham and Campbell, Educational Administration, p. 52.

⁸⁵Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 207

⁸⁶Lloyd W. Lehman, "Educational Legislation in Illinois: An Analysis of the Activities of School Superintendents in Cook County," (doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1978), p. 41.

the source of money moved from the local school district to the state to the federal government, the question to be raised was, "How effectively can the local school board and administrator participate in the decision-making process?"⁸⁷ For Griffiths, the central function of administration was the direction and control of the decision-making process.⁸⁸ To Simon, authority and power to make decisions were synonymous.⁸⁹

With the State Education Agency having the responsibility of meeting the mandates of P.L. 94-142, that agency is dependent on the cooperation of the Local Education Agencies for compliance with the law. Generally, the state, in its relationships with local districts, would appear to be in a superordinate position, and the Local Education Agency would appear to be in a subordinate position. However, Weber and Rockoff contended that, even if the State Education Agency provided financial incentives, the local school district might elect not to be in compliance with the law if "the legislative mandate runs counter to the Local Education Agency's objectives." If the state wants to insure compliance from local school districts then these two agencies will have to work together to formulate policy priorities. This is essential to assure compliance from school districts, especially in those cases where local districts

⁸⁷ American Association of School Administrators, The Federal Government and the Schools, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1965), p. 32.

⁸⁸ Griffiths, "Administration as Decision-making," pp. 220-240.

⁸⁹ Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, (New York: MacMillan, 1950), p. 125.

received small amounts of federal dollars when aid was calculated on a per-pupil basis.⁹⁰

In discussing the need for all parts of an organization system to interact with each other, Johns and Morphet stated

... if decisions regarding goals and policies are made at the top level of an organization without involving the lower level subsystems in the decision-making process, the tendency toward overemphasis on the goals of the subsystem is increased.

... what is most important is the way in which the individual components are integrated into a system for the purpose of achieving a goal.⁹¹

In this instance, the goal would appear to be the provision of the best services and programs to the handicapped while meeting the mandates of federal law. It behooves state education agencies, local school districts and special education cooperatives to work together in the best interests of that goal.

⁹⁰Weber and Rockoff, "Demographic Characteristics," pp. 243-244.

⁹¹Root L. Johns and Edgar L. Morphet, The Economics and Financing of Education: A Systems Approach, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975), pp. 33, 35, 36.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The review of the related literature and current research, which was described in Chapter II, indicated that there have not been prior studies reported which investigated the impact of P.L. 94-142 on administrative functions of directors of special education cooperatives. The review of the literature did indicate that:

a) administrators of special education were concerned about the impact of P.L. 94-142 on the budgets of programs for handicapped students;

b) some changes in staff functions have developed since the implementation of P.L. 94-142, particularly in relation to the assessment and evaluation of special education students, and in relation to the Individualized Education Plans;

c) there have been some changes in the focus of administrative tasks in order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142;

d) special education administrators have become more aware of the need to be knowledgeable about all the legal aspects of P.L. 94-142, as well as about other laws relating to handicapped children.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of P.L. 94-142 on selected administrative functions of directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

The administrative functions which were selected were:

- a) budget,
- b) performance of administrative tasks,
- c) staff functions.

The Greater Chicago Metropolitan area included Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties. The information needed for the study was obtained through a mailed questionnaire which was sent to directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area, and through in-depth interviews which were conducted with selected directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area. The quantitative information yielded by the study was gathered from the responses to the mailed questionnaires. The qualitative information yielded by the study was derived from narratives obtained through the selected interviews with directors of special education cooperatives.

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The Questionnaire

The population chosen for this study was the directors of special education cooperatives in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties. In Chapter I, a special education cooperative was defined as,

An organizational unit of school districts, in the same geographic locale or in neighboring geographic locales, pooling their student population base for special education services, and acting as the service agent of the participating districts.⁹²

⁹²Cronin, Rules and Regulations, p.2; Warsawsky, Role Analysis, p. 188.

A list of special education cooperatives and the names of directors of special education cooperatives was obtained from the Illinois State Board of Education.⁹³ The list provided the names of twenty-eight directors of special education cooperatives in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties.

The Interviews

When the questionnaires were returned, the scores for each respondent were tallied. In keeping with standard statistical practice, structured interviews were scheduled for those respondents whose scores were at or above the mean. In this study of directors of special education cooperatives, the mean score was sixty. There were ten directors of special education cooperatives whose scores were at or above the mean of sixty. These ten directors of special education cooperatives whose scores were at or above the mean of sixty were selected for in-depth interviews.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

In reviewing the related literature and current research in the field of administration of special education, there was no evidence of an instrument which would yield the information needed for this study about directors of

⁹³Donald C. Gill and Donald F. Muirheid, Directory Listing of Specialized Educational Services Administrators, 1980-81, (Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, 1980), pp. 1-28.

special education cooperatives. In the process of developing a questionnaire, the following items in the literature were evident as important to this study:

- a) per pupil expenditure,
- b) budget allocation for staff,
- c) additional staff for assessment and evaluation,
- d) business office costs,
- e) cash-flow problems,
- f) state reimbursements,
- g) legal fees,
- h) inservice funds for special education staff,
- i) inservice funds for regular education staff,
- j) funds for pre-school incentive programs,
- k) funds to fulfill other mandates of P.L. 94-142,
- l) new programs and services,
- m) time for budget preparation,
- n) transportation problems,
- o) time for writing grants and proposals,
- p) time for meeting with the public,
- q) interpreting mandates of the law to the public,
- r) due process hearings,
- s) information and reports for the State,
- t) curriculum development,
- u) Individualized Education Plans,
- v) annual reviews,

- w) different ways to utilize staff,
- x) monitoring children in private facilities.

In the summer of 1981, a preliminary questionnaire which allowed for two responses, yes or no, was mailed to seven directors of special education cooperatives outside the five counties of the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area. The response from this questionnaire indicated that the choices of yes or no did not give enough latitude of response to the directors of special education cooperatives. The questionnaire was revised, using a Likert-type scale, calling for a response of strongly agree, agree, does not apply, disagree or strongly disagree. The Likert-type scale allowed for a broader scope of response from the directors of special education cooperatives. In the winter of 1982, the revised questionnaire was mailed to seven directors of special education cooperatives who were not among the group to receive the preliminary questionnaire, and whose cooperatives were outside the five counties included in the study. On the basis of the responses received from this field test, some of the statements were reworded to provide greater clarity, as several respondents noted that wording was ambiguous. The item relating to pre-school incentives was omitted as the directors in the field test indicated that pre-school programs for special education children were already developed and in place in Illinois by state mandate, prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142.

Changed and modified on the basis of the responses from the seven directors in the field test, the revised questionnaire contained twenty-six statements reflecting areas of administrative decision-making since the

effective date of P.L. 94-142 (September 8, 1978). The three areas of administrative decision-making were:

- a) budget,
- b) performance of administrative tasks,
- c) staff functions.

There were five possible responses to each statement in the mailed questionnaire, using a Likert-type scale. The five responses were:

- 1 - strongly agree
- 2 - agree
- 3 - does not apply
- 4 - disagree
- 5 - strongly disagree.

A response of (1) - strongly agree, or (2) - agree, indicated that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 had affected administrative decision-making in the area questioned. A response of (3) - does not apply, indicated that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 did not apply to the area in question. A response of (4) - disagree, or (5) - strongly disagree, indicated that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 had not affected administrative decision-making in the area questioned.

A review of the related literature and current research in the field of administration of special education indicated that certain demographic factors have had an impact on the administration of P.L. 94-142 in some school districts. The questionnaire included a section designed to yield demographic information about the special education cooperatives and about their member districts. The questionnaire included seven questions relating to the size,

wealth and educational costs of the special education cooperatives and their member districts. The questionnaire included four questions related to the educational background and salaries of the directors and staff of the special education cooperatives.

The two demographic questions that were of particular interest to the study related to the size of the special education cooperative and the wealth of the special education cooperative.

The size of the special education cooperative was measured by the student population base of the member districts served by the special education cooperative. The demographic information yielded in the field test of the mailed questionnaire indicated that the size of the special education cooperatives could be grouped, for statistical purposes, into the broad categories of:

small: 14,999 and smaller

medium: 15,000 to 19,999

large: 20,000 and larger.

The wealth of the special education cooperative was measured by the average assessed per capita valuation in the member districts served by the cooperative. The demographic information yielded in the field test of the mailed questionnaire indicated that the wealth of the special education cooperatives could be grouped, for statistical purposes, into the broad categories of:

low: \$34,999 and less

medium: \$35,000 to \$99,999

high: \$100,000 and more.

THE MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

In the spring of 1982, a questionnaire, along with a covering letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope, was mailed to twenty-eight directors of special education. These twenty-eight directors of special education were listed as directors of special education cooperatives in Cook, Lake, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties in the Illinois Directory Listing of Special Education Services Administrators.⁹⁴ In the covering letter, directors were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. In the covering letter, directors were promised a report on the results of the study when the study was completed. A month later, a second questionnaire, along with a covering letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was sent to those directors of special education cooperatives who had not responded to the first mailing.

The mailed questionnaires yielded a response of seventy-five percent (75%). This represented responses from twenty-one (21) of the twenty-eight (28) directors who had received the questionnaire. Twenty-five percent (25%), or seven (7) directors did not respond by returning a completed questionnaire. Of these seven (7) "no responses," five (5) directors did not respond at all, one (1) director responded by returning the self-addressed stamped envelope without a questionnaire, and one (1) director wrote a note saying that he could not respond as he did not care for the wording of the statements in the questionnaire.

⁹⁴Gill and Muirheid, Directory Listing, pp. 1-28.

When the twenty-one (21) returned questionnaires were examined, one response was found to be from a director of special education in a school district that had been incorrectly listed in the Directory as a special education cooperative. Another director indicated that the special education cooperative was fully funded by the federal government, and therefore, too many of the statements in the questionnaire were not applicable to this cooperative. A third director indicated that the cooperative administered services which were provided for and mandated by a law other than P.L. 94-142. The elimination of the three cooperatives described above left eighteen (18) directors of special education cooperatives in the study of the impact of P.L. 94-142 on selected administrative functions of directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area. The responses from the three directors whose responses were eliminated from the study were not studied and treated either statistically or narratively with the responses from the eighteen remaining directors in the study.

THE INTERVIEWS

When the eighteen (18) questionnaires in the study were statistically scored, the scores for each respondent were tallied. In keeping with standard statistical practice, structured interviews were scheduled for all those respondents whose scores were at or above the mean. The mean score for this study was sixty. There were ten directors of special education cooperatives in the study whose scores were sixty or above. These ten directors participated in

structured indepth interviews. The scores of the directors who were interviewed ranged from sixty to eighty-one. The structured interviews provided an opportunity to probe, in greater depth, the kinds of budgetary problems faced by directors of special education cooperatives. The interviews validated the questionnaires and provided an opportunity for the directors of special education cooperatives to discuss the ways in which they have had to change their priorities in relation to their administrative tasks. Through the structured inteviews, it was possible to find out the ways in which staff functions had changed since the enactment of P.L. 94-142. During the structured interviews, it was possible to further investigate the demographic factors of size and wealth in relation to each special education cooperative.

The structured interviews took place during the summer and fall of 1982. The interviews were held at the offices of the directors of the special education cooperatives. The interviews averaged forty-five minutes in length, varying from forty minutes to an hour and a half, depending on the extent to which the director of the special education cooperative wanted to elaborate on the information requested for the study.

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Questionnaire Results

In Chapter IV, the results of the mailed questionnaire are presented in tables in the following manner:

- A. For each item in the questionnaire, a table indicates:

1. the number of responses and the percentage of responses of (1) - strongly agree, (2) - agree, (3) - does not apply, (4) -disagree, and (5) - strongly disagree;
 2. the number of collapsed responses and the percentage of collapsed responses of (1) and (2) - agree, and (4) and (5) - disagree, along with the responses of (3) - does not apply.
- B. For each of the dependent variables of a) budget, b) performance of administrative tasks, and c) staff functions, tables indicate:
1. the number of responses and the percentage of responses of (1) - strongly agree, (2) - agree, (3) - does not apply, (4) -disagree, and (5) - strongly disagree for each statement in the group of statements making up that variable;
 2. the number of collapsed responses and the percentage of collapsed responses of (1) and (2) - agree, and (4) and (5) - disagree, along with the responses of (3) - does not apply, for each statement in the group of statements making up that variable.
- C. Each table is accompanied by a narrative description, yielded from the interviews, and an analysis of the data yielded from the mailed questionnaire. The statistical method for analysis of the data is a one-way analysis of variance which is a statistical method of analyzing three questions in one study. Following standard statistical procedure, the hypotheses are accepted or rejected at

the .05 level of significance ($p=.05$). The analysis of variance indicates the statistical significance of the independent variable of

1. the size of the special education cooperative, and
2. the wealth of the special education cooperative.

Interview Results

The interviews with the directors of special education cooperatives are reported in group fashion in Chapter IV. The group method of reporting was chosen as the best way of assuring the confidentiality and the anonymity of the directors of special education cooperatives who participated in the interviews. As the special education cooperatives in the study represented a small number (18), and the geographic locale of the study was a relatively small area (the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area), the directors of the special education cooperatives participating in the study might be easily identifiable if their responses were reported individually.

ADDENDUM

For informational purposes, in order to provide broader understanding of special education cooperatives, interviews were held with selected directors of special education cooperatives in the study whose tallied scores were below the statistical mean of sixty. In the narratives, where pertinent comments were made by directors whose scores were below the mean of sixty, it is noted that the comments were made by a director who was not among the ten directors

selected for structured interviews on the basis of their scores on the mailed questionnaire.

For informational purposes, in order to provide broader understanding of the administration of special education programs, mailed questionnaires were sent to five (5) directors of special education in districts that are not part of special education cooperatives. Interviews were held with selected directors of special education in districts that were not part of special education cooperatives. The scores of the respondents who were not directors of special education cooperatives, as well as the narratives of the interviews conducted with those directors, were kept apart from the respondents who were part of the study. The scores of the respondents whose districts were not part of special education cooperatives were not treated statistically. Any information gathered from the interviews held with directors of special education whose districts were not part of special education cooperatives are not included in the narrative section of Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study investigated the impact of Public Law 94-142 on selected administrative functions of directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area of Lake, Cook, Will, DuPage and McHenry counties. In order to study the impact of the law on directors of special education cooperatives, the data were analyzed in terms of the selected functions of a) budget, b) performance of administrative tasks, and c) staff functions. The quantitative analysis is presented in table form and was derived from the mailed questionnaire responded to by the directors of special education cooperatives. The tables show the responses in terms of a Likert-type scale of (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) does not apply, (4) disagree and (5) strongly disagree. Additional tables show the collapsed responses of (1) agree, (2) does not apply, and (3) disagree. The tables indicate the responses in terms of the number of responses as well as in terms of the percentage of responses. The analysis attempts to find out if the size and/or the wealth of the special education cooperatives is a significant factor on the impact of administrative decision-making of directors of special education cooperatives in the areas of budget, performance of administrative tasks, and staff functions. The qualitative analysis is presented in narrative form and was derived from interviews with selected directors of special education cooperatives. The

directors selected for the interviews were those ten directors of special education cooperatives whose scores on the mailed questionnaires were at or above the mean score of sixty. The qualitative information was analyzed within a social systems context, in terms of the selected administrative functions of budget, performance of administrative tasks, and staff functions. Using the statistical method of one-way analysis of variance, the hypotheses stated in Chapter I will be accepted or rejected at the .05 level of significance, based on the quantitative data derived from the responses to the mailed questionnaires.

The first hypothesis in Chapter I stated: P.L. 94-142 created budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

Table 1 shows the responses to the budget items in the mailed questionnaire.

Table 1
Budget Items in Mailed Questionnaire

ITEM #	RESPONSES					
	1	2	3	4	5	
2. My per pupil expenditure has increased.	#	9	7	1	1	0
	%	50	38.889	5.556	5.556	0
3. My total budget has increased.	#	12	5	0	1	0
	%	66.667	27.778	0	5.556	0
4. My budget allocation for staff has increased.	#	11	5	1	1	0
	%	61.111	27.778	5.556	5.556	0
5. I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	#	7	5	3	3	0
	%	38.889	27.778	16.667	16.668	0

Table 1 (continued)

ITEM #		RESPONSES				
		1	2	3	4	5
6.	The cost of running the business office has increased.	# 6 % 33.333	9 50	2 11.111	0 0	1 5.556
7.	My cash-flow problems have increased.	# 5 % 27.778	2 11.111	3 16.667	6 33.333	2 11.111
8.	I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements.	# 4 % 22.222	2 11.111	3 16.667	6 33.333	3 16.667
9.	In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# 7 % 38.889	8 44.444	0 0	1 5.556	2 11.111
10.	Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.	# 8 % 44.444	6 33.333	0 0	3 16.667	1 5.556
20.	In order to train teachers to write IEPs, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	# 4 % 22.222	2 11.111	2 11.111	8 44.444	2 11.111
22.	In order to develop other in-service training for my staff, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# 2 % 11.111	3 16.667	3 16.667	8 44.444	2 11.111

Table 1 (continued)

ITEM #		1	2	3	4	5	
23.	In order to develop inservice training for regular education teachers who will teach mainstreamed special education children, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	2 11.111	4 22.222	1 5.556	9 50	2 11.111
25.	I have services and programs I could not afford before.	# %	4 22.222	9 50	1 5.556	3 16.667	1 5.556

Table 2 shows the collapsed responses of agree, does not apply, and disagree, to the budget items in the mailed questionnaire.

Table 2

Budget

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
2.	My per pupil expenditure has increased.	# %	16 88.889	1 5.556	1 5.556
3.	My total budget has increased.	# %	17 94.445	0 0	1 5.556
4.	My budget allocation for staff has increased.	# %	16 88.889	1 5.556	1 5.556
5.	I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	# %	12 66.667	3 16.667	3 16.667

Table 2 (continued)

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
6.	The cost of running the business office has increased.	# %	15 83.333	2 11.111	1 5.556
7.	My cash flow problems have increased.	# %	7 38.889	3 16.667	8 44.444
8.	I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements.	# %	6 33.333	3 16.667	9 50
9.	In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	15 83.333	0 0	3 16.667
10.	Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.	# %	14 77.777	0 0	4 16.667
20.	In order to train teachers to write IEPs, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	6 33.333	2 11.111	10 55.555
22.	In order to develop other inservice training for my staff, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	5 27.778	3 16.667	10 55.555
23.	In order to develop inservice training for regular education teachers who will teach mainstreamed special education children, I have had to allocate funds not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	6 33.333	1 5.556	11 61.111
25.	I have services and programs I could not afford before.	# %	13 72.222	1 5.556	4 22.223

NARRATIVE

There were thirteen items relating to budget in the mailed questionnaire.

More than 75% of the directors of special education cooperatives agreed that:

- 1) per pupil expenditures had increased,
- 2) budget allocations for staff had increased,
- 3) the cost of running the business office had increased,
- 4) the total budget had increased,
- 5) to meet the mandates of the law, funds had to be allocated which were not reimbursed by the federal government,
- 6) legal fees had increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.

During the indepth interviews, the directors of special education cooperatives indicated that all of the increases in expenses since the implementation of P.L. 94-142 were not necessarily due to the law. Some of the increases in expenses were normally to be expected, such as yearly step increases for staff which would have taken place regardless of the law. Some of the increases in budget were due to the general inflation in the country. Most of the interviewed directors attributed increased budget costs to a combination of inflation and the demands of P.L. 94-142. In some districts, declining enrollment diminished dollars flowing into the cooperative, which, in turn, caused difficulty in maintaining staff at the former level. Although there were some budget cuts, the dollar amount of the budget went up in all special education cooperatives. One director indicated that there might be a problem

in perception relating to money, in that some people have assumed that because absolute expenditures went up that the cost per unit had also gone up. He thought this perception was not necessarily true. In some special education cooperatives, the teaching staff was reduced as a result of declining enrollment, but the supervisory staff had to be increased because of the demand of the law that a supervisor must be present at every IEP meeting. Directors indicated that P.L. 94-142 money coming into the districts was not always used in the classroom. In some instances, federal money from P.L. 94-142 went directly to the participating school districts, rather than to the special education cooperative. In other cases, the money went directly to the cooperative. Some cooperatives had to expand their business offices in order to better monitor the money which came into the cooperative by virtue of the law. Therefore, more personnel was needed to handle the federal dollars and all of the resulting business office expenses were never fully recouped.

Among those expenses which were not fully reimbursed by the federal government were funds spent in relation to child find, to expanded early childhood programs, to alternative programs, to computer costs, and to "up front" money which had to be spent to maximize state and federal dollars. Although federal dollars could not be spent to fully pay teachers, the special education cooperative and the participating school districts had to use "up front" money for salaries in order to get state dollar reimbursements for the following year.

The intensity of the IEP process called for increased personnel, more second opinions, more physical therapy from Easter Seals, etc. The child-find

process brought more children into special education programs, and, in 1982, those children were among the more severely handicapped. The cost of educating more severely handicapped students escalated the costs of the special education cooperatives. In most instances, the smallest part of the special education cooperative's budget came from federal funds allocated through P.L. 94-142. Federal money coming into the special education cooperatives varied from 12% to 22% of the cooperatives' budgets. All federal money was not funded through P.L. 94-142. Some federal dollars flowed from P.L. 89-313, the special education section of Title I. The only special education cooperatives having a greater percentage of their budget coming from the federal government were the regional cooperatives which educated low-incidence handicapped children only. Low-incidence handicapped children (i.e.: severe orthopedically handicapped, visually handicapped and the hearing impaired) require extensive supportive services and an extremely low pupil-teacher ratio. Some directors of special education cooperatives indicated that, although much of the director's time was devoted to monitoring the mandates of P.L. 94-142, no part of the director's salary was funded through the law.

Legal fees were a large part of funds spent by special education cooperatives. Legal fees are not reimbursed by the federal government. All directors agreed that, by the time a situation had to go to a due process hearing, all avenues of recourse had been exhausted. Legal counsel was often required in trying to determine what was an appropriate placement, what was or wasn't a related service, what was appropriate before and after school hours every day of the year, not only when school was in session. The Illinois special

education mandate permitted private placement of special education students prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. One director thought that P.L. 94-142 had exacerbated a situation where parents had interpreted private placements as a voucher system which allowed parents to place a child in a private school paid for by the cooperative if the parent felt that the district could not provide the most appropriate education. Although not stated in terms of appropriate placement versus maximum services, many of the due process hearings amounted to parental requests for maximum services. The Supreme Court ruling of July, 1982, in *Board of Education v. Rowley*,⁹² found that the school district was not required to provide an in-class sign language interpreter for a hearing impaired student who was performing adequately in school. *Board of Education v. Rowley* may result in fewer due process hearings related to optimal versus appropriate services for handicapped youngsters.

Legal fees were incurred by special education cooperatives for purposes other than due process hearings as cooperatives utilized attorneys in different ways and for different reasons. One cooperative, finding that phone calls to attorneys had become too costly, arranged for staff sessions where lawyers could discuss legal issues and where staff could ask questions, both in a group and individually. Lawyers were consulted to clarify the rights of teachers in relation to P.L. 94-142. Directors depended on legal advice to define "appropriate placement," no longer relying solely on their administrative judgment and evaluation. As one director stated, "Policies must be finite. They can no longer be broad or general." Lawyers were consulted before a

⁹²Greenhouse, "Limiting Aid to Handicapped," p. 1.

special education student was suspended. In wealthier districts, parents were bringing their own attorneys to the schools. School personnel felt, therefore, that they, too, must be represented by legal counsel. "Keeping out of court takes lawyers' fees," was the way it was expressed by one director of a special education cooperative.

More than 50% but fewer than 75% of the respondents agreed that:

- 1) services and programs existed in 1982 that the cooperative could not afford prior to P.L. 94-142,
- 2) additional staff had been hired for the purpose of evaluation and assessment.

Among the new services provided since the passage of P.L. 94-142 were outside evaluations for psychiatric and neurological problems, a day school for emotionally disturbed students, speech and language services, increased social work services, a learning disability resource teacher for non-public school students, diagnostic centers, self-contained learning disability classrooms, and a program for severe and profound mentally retarded students returning to the public schools from private day school placements.

Fewer than 30% of the respondents disagreed that new services and programs were affordable since P.L. 94-142. During the interviews, some of these disagreeing directors indicated that their cooperatives include wealthy school districts which had all programs in place prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. After the law took effect, some of these wealthy school districts merely increased the support systems. One director conjectured that the state resource equalizer had prevented local school districts from using their own

wealth. Some of the directors who were interviewed and who disagreed about hiring additional staff for evaluation and assessment since the passage of P.L. 94-142 were directors of cooperatives where the evaluation and assessment was done at the local school districts rather than through the services of the cooperative.

The greatest area of disagreement related to those budget items which were not reimbursed by the federal government. The items included payment for inservice programs, for the writing of IEPs, for additional inservice for special education staff, and for inservice for regular education staff working with mainstreamed special education students. Those interviewed directors who disagreed with the items relating to budgeting for inservice were directors who found that the federal funds specifically earmarked for inservice training (10% of the funded grant for the first year of the law's implementation and 5% in all subsequent years) were adequate for the inservice needs of their cooperatives. Some states may undoubtedly have needed more money for inservice training, but inservice for special education had started with the Illinois mandate which preceded P.L. 94-142. Those interviewed directors for whom the budget items about inservice training did not apply, were directors of special education cooperatives who did not supply the inservice training for their participating school districts, and where such training was supplied at the local school district level. Among those directors who did agree that they were spending non-reimbursable money for inservice training, there was a general feeling that the expenditure of federal dollars for inservice stimulated the need for more inservice, which was then not funded by P.L. 94-142. Some directors

indicated that, after federal funds were spent for inservice, there was a need for outside personnel to come in for inservice training, at which point there was no money funded through P.L. 94-142 to pay for this outside personnel.

Half of the eighteen respondents disagreed with item 8: "I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements since the passage of P.L. 94-142." Only one of the interviewed directors indicated that the state was late in payment of reimbursable funds.

The remaining budget item, #7, stated, "My cash-flow problems have increased since the passage of P.L. 94-142." Over 44% of the respondents disagreed with this item. More than 16% of the respondents indicated "did not apply" to both item 7 and item 8. Those who responded "did not apply" were directors of cooperatives which do not directly receive state reimbursements but which receive money from the state indirectly through their local participating school districts. Only two of the interviewed directors indicated that they have had to wait longer for state reimbursements since the passage of P.L. 94-142. These two directors also indicated that their cash-flow problems have increased since the law went into effect. During the discussion of cash reimbursements with the directors who were interviewed, what emerged was, not concern about the wait for state reimbursements, but rather, the amount of money coming into the cooperative as state reimbursements, which, in turn added to the problem of cash-flow. In 1978, the state of Illinois had agreed to pay "a grant of \$6,250 for each full-time professional employee in a special education program."⁹³ The directors who were interviewed indicated that this

⁹³League of Women Voters, Primer on School Finance, p. 5.

grant has not increased since 1978. In 1982, the state had pro-rated the amount of \$6,250 to 80% of \$6,250. In 1982, special education cooperatives received only \$5,000 for each full-time professional employee in a special education program, despite a period of high inflation and ever-rising costs. Only one of the interviewed directors indicated that the cooperative's cash-flow problems were a direct result of a long wait for state reimbursements. Some of the regional cooperatives have been more affected by the longer wait for state reimbursements as they have to get their money from participating cooperatives, who in turn have to get state money from the participating local school districts.

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the size of the cooperative had an impact on the budget decisions of the directors of special education cooperatives. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was little variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium and large cooperatives. The means of the three groups (indicated in Table 3) hovered together without a sizable variation in the scores.

Table 3

Impact of Size of Cooperative on Budget Decisions

# in population	size	mean scores
5	small	31.80
1	medium	34.
12	large	30.17

The level of significance was .18, which was higher than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter III as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$). The validity of using the selected sizes of the cooperatives can be questioned since it resulted in only one medium sized cooperative and an inordinate number of large cooperatives. In relation to the variable, size of the special education cooperative, the numbers used to determine the designations of small, medium, and large, had been determined by the responses to the mailed questionnaire from directors of special education cooperatives outside the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area. As there was so little variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium, and large special education cooperatives among the respondents in the study, it is possible that the numbers used to designate small, medium, and large cooperatives may not necessarily have been valid for the larger and more urban Metropolitan area. Had the cooperatives been grouped differently in relation to size, the results might have had greater meaning, although there was little difference between the mean scores of the large cooperatives and the mean scores of the small cooperatives.

The information needed to determine the wealth of the special education cooperative was the average assessed valuation of property in the participating local school districts of each cooperative. The average assessed valuation of the participating school districts was supplied by only one of the directors responding to the mailed questionnaire. Therefore, another indicator of wealth had to be determined. The cost of educating a special education student was selected as the indicator of the wealth of the cooperatives. Thirteen of the eighteen respondents supplied the information needed about the cost of

educating a special education student. During the selected interviews, two of the respondents who had not supplied the needed information about the cost of educating a special education student indicated that no dollar figure could be put on that cost as the costs varied according to the extent of the disability or handicap, with the least severely handicapped programs costing less and the programs for the most severely handicapped costing more. The remaining respondents who did not respond to the cost of educating a handicapped student indicated that the costs were covered by the individual school districts rather than by the cooperative.

The statistical test of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the wealth of the cooperative, as measured by the cost of educating a special education student, had an impact on the budget decisions of the directors of special education cooperatives.

Table 4

Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on Budget Decisions

# in population	size	mean scores
5	low	31.40
5	medium	34.60
3	high	25.67

(5 directors did not respond to this item in the mailed questionnaire.)

The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was little variation in the mean scores of the directors of low wealth and medium wealth cooperatives. The mean score for the directors of high wealth cooperatives was

lower than for the other two, however, the figure only represented three directors. This lower mean score correlated with the statements of directors of high wealth cooperatives that all programs had been in place in their cooperatives prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. The analysis of variance showed the level of significance to be 1.96, which was higher than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter I as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$).

The dependent variable of Budget was statistically dependent on the independent variables of size of the cooperative and wealth of the cooperative. Hypothesis 1 stated: **P.L. 94-142 created budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.** Since the level of significance for both size of the cooperative and wealth of the cooperative was not significant at the .05 level, **the hypothesis must be rejected.** The investigation failed to show evidence of statistical differences among the special education cooperatives. Although the statistical evidence did not show a cause and effect relationship between P.L. 94-142 and budgetary problems of directors of special education cooperatives, more than 75% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire did agree that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) the total budget of the cooperative increased,
- b) per-pupil expenditure increased,
- c) budget allocation for staff increased,
- d) the cost of running the business office increased,

- e) in order to fulfill the mandates of the law, funds had to be allocated which the federal government did not reimburse,
- f) legal fees increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.

During the interviews with selected directors of special education cooperatives, fewer than 30% of the directors indicated that P.L. 94-142 did not provide them with new services and programs as their cooperatives included wealthy local school districts which had all programs in place prior to P.L. 94-142. Thus, wealthier school districts were not adversely affected by the passage of P.L. 94-142. Some of the wealthier districts increased their financial support systems to the special education cooperative. Therefore, it appears that the wealth of the cooperative did have some impact on the cooperative although the wealth of the special education cooperative was not a statistically significant variable.

The second hypothesis in Chapter I stated: In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to the performance of administrative tasks.

Table 5 shows the responses to the items in the mailed questionnaire related to the performance of administrative tasks.

Table 5
Performance of Administrative Tasks

ITEM #		RESPONSES				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	I spend more time in budget preparation.	# 8 % 44.444	4 22.222	2 11.111	3 16.667	1 5.556
11.	I spend more time dealing with transportation problems.	# 1 % 5.556	2 11.111	3 16.667	11 61.111	1 5.556
12.	I spend more time writing grants and proposals.	# 9 % 50	6 33.333	1 5.556	1 5.556	1 5.556
13.	I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public.	# 9 % 50	8 44.444	0 0	1 5.556	0 0
14.	I spend more time meeting with parents.	# 4 % 22.222	10 55.556	0 0	4 22.222	0 0
15.	I spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings.	# 3 % 16.667	9 50	1 5.556	4 22.222	1 5.556
16.	I spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the state.	# 6 % 33.333	8 44.444	2 11.111	2 11.111	0 0
18.	I spend more time in relation to IEPs.	# 5 % 27.778	5 27.778	3 16.667	5 27.778	0 0
26.	I spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.	# 6 % 33.333	5 27.778	1 5.556	5 27.778	1 5.556

Table 6 shows the collapsed responses of agree, does not apply, and

disagree to the questions in the mailed questionnaire pertaining to the performance of administrative tasks.

Table 6

Performance of Administrative Tasks

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
1.	I spend more time in budget preparation.	# %	12 66.666	2 11.111	4 22.223
11.	I spend more time dealing with transportation problems.	# %	3 16.667	3 16.667	12 66.667
12.	I spend more time writing grants and proposals.	# %	15 83.333	1 5.556	2 11.111
13.	I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public.	# %	17 94.444	0 0	1 5.556
14.	I spend more time meeting with parents.	# %	14 77.778	0 0	4 22.222
15.	I spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings.	# %	12 66.667	1 5.556	5 27.778
16.	I spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the state.	# %	14 77.777	2 11.111	2 11.111
18.	I spend more time in relation to IEPs.	# %	10 55.556	3 16.667	5 27.778
26.	I spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.	# %	11 61.111	1 5.556	6 33.333

NARRATIVE

There were nine items relating to the performance of administrative tasks in the mailed questionnaire. More than 75% of the directors of special education cooperatives who responded to the questionnaire agreed that,

- 1) more time is spent in writing grants and proposals,
- 2) more time is spent interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public,
- 3) more time is spent meeting with parents,
- 4) more time is spent gathering information and writing reports to the state.

In talking with directors of special education cooperatives, it was determined that the reason for the high percentage of agreement to item 12, "I spend more time writing grants and proposals," was that it is necessary to write a grant application in order to receive the federal funds dispensed under P.L. 94-142. The majority of directors who were interviewed indicated that much more of their time was needed for preparing and writing the grant proposals for P.L. 94-142. In part, the time required for writing the P.L. 94-142 grant proposals explained the 66.666% agreement to item 1 in the mailed questionnaire, "I spend more time in budget preparation," as the budget preparation and the writing of the grant proposal are closely tied in to each other. The directors who were interviewed said that, prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142, grant-writing had been low on their list of priorities, but, after the passage of P.L. 94-142, grant-writing had taken on a higher priority.

Only one director who responded to the mailed questionnaire disagreed with item 13, "I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public." The remaining seventeen directors all agreed that this interpretation required more of their time. During the interviews, some of the directors stated that they had interpreted item 13 to include parents as part of the public. Directors indicated that they had used the following means to interpret legal mandates and ramifications of the law:

- 1) newsletters,
- 2) parent handbooks,
- 3) newspaper articles in relation to parental rights,
- 4) newspaper feature stories,
- 5) pamphlets,
- 6) P.T.A. meetings,
- 7) public invitations to meet with legislators in order to explain the impact of proposed legislation regarding special education,
- 8) formal meetings where staff could discuss special education with the public.

One director stated that the cooperative did not have an active public relations program as the participating local school districts arranged their own public relations. All directors who were interviewed indicated that they participated in community meetings where they gave speeches or helped present programs about special education to groups such as the Lions, Rotary, etc. One cooperative had a handbook which was distributed to hospitals,

pediatricians and real estate agents as a way of publicizing the program of the special education cooperative to the wider community.

Over 75% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire agreed that they spend more time meeting with parents. Directors who were interviewed all agreed that they had always spent a lot of time meeting with parents, prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. What became evident during the course of the interviews was that the quality of the time that the directors spent with parents had changed. Prior to P.L. 94-142, the time spent with parents had been essentially educational, in terms of educating parents about the nature of programs offered to handicapped students. In 1982, it was indicated by the directors who were interviewed that, since P.L. 94-142, the time had become process-oriented rather than program-oriented. Directors have been meeting with parents to help them to better understand the federal law, giving parents what the directors see as "correct" information about the law. Some directors said that parents had received information about P.L. 94-142 from child advocates who, in the opinion of many of the interviewed directors, did not always give parents the most accurate information regarding the law. In 1982, directors were meeting with parents in regard to evaluation of the student's handicaps, especially in those cases where parents had been resistant to the evaluation given by other professionals. Directors were meeting with parents in cases where the parents did not particularly like a child's teacher, or when a parent thought that a student was spending too much time on the bus which took the child to and from the program of the special education cooperative. When parents have been in disagreement with a decision

about a special education child which was made at the level of the local school district, the parent has frequently seen the director of the special education cooperative as an impartial person who could serve as an advocate for the child in a disagreement between the parent and the school district.

Directors have been meeting with parents about new programs offered by the cooperative in order to explain fully what the new programs are about. Parent meetings have been called when special education cooperatives have taken on programs that were formerly run by the regional cooperatives. One director suggested that when parent meetings are not held, rumors often spread, and that parent meetings offer the cooperative a good opportunity to answer parents' questions.

One director has asked for parental advice about the P.L. 94-142 grant application. That same director has asked for parental feedback about programs for the handicapped and has tried to involve parents in all aspects of the cooperative's programs. Additional issues that parents and directors of special education cooperatives have been meeting about have been class size, case loads of supervisory staff, and legislative efforts of the cooperatives. Directors have been meeting with parents to help resolve differences which, if not positively resolved, could lead to due process hearings.

All special education cooperatives have had some kind of parent handbook to inform both parents and students of their rights under P.L. 94-142. The handbooks have usually been distributed through the local school districts. There are some directors of cooperatives who have met with parents of handicapped students at the start of the referral process, at the placement

conference, and again at the writing of the IEPs. To these directors, meeting with parents is viewed as a continual and on-going process. One director stated that the cooperative's long-range educational program with parents had resulted in an excellent rapport with parents. This parental support had been a significant factor in the cooperative's doubling of both their professional and para-professional staffs between 1968 and 1982. Another director noted that some of the cooperative's programs had come into being as a result of the demands of P.L. 94-142 for the least restrictive environment. This director indicated that he had held meetings with parents when parents had misconstrued the meaning of "appropriate placement" to mean the very best placement and wanted to seek maximum services rather than an appropriate placement.

In those instances where directors indicated that they were not spending more time meeting with parents it was because the directors had delegated meeting with parents to coordinators and other supervisory staff.

Over 75% of the directors responding to the mailed questionnaire reported that, since the passage of P.L. 94-142, they spend more time gathering information and writing reports for the state. During the interviews, the directors complained about the reports to the state. One complaint heard from many directors was that all of the reports asked for by the state are not always necessary as Springfield already has much of the information which is requested from the cooperatives. Another recurrent complaint was that nobody in Springfield is reading the reports which are requested. Directors complained that heads of different departments do not communicate with each other, and

that each department wants the same information but in a different format. Directors acknowledged that the state needs to know the priorities of the cooperatives and that information needs to be validated. In 1982, there appeared to be a redundancy in the requests for information because the different departments of the State Office of Education were not putting the information together. Many directors suggested that the state should use a more comprehensive plan of gathering information and that reporting could be improved through the use of a more efficient computer system. One director suggested that, "The state needs to write more appropriate computer programs rather than ask the cooperatives to regurgitate information report after report." Another director suggested that if there was less paper work demanded by the state, the cooperative could reduce its staff by one administrative position, freeing that person for a program which would directly service students. Still another director complained that after the state has gathered information it frequently sends out computer printouts containing incorrect information. This director maintained that the correct information was already in Springfield but no one had fed it into the computer. Fewer than 23% of the respondents disagreed with the item about reports to the state. Among those directors interviewed, one director did state that the director of the cooperative does not spend more time reporting to the state since the passage of P.L. 94-142 but that other staff personnel are now performing that administrative function. One director stated that there are not more reports to write to the state since P.L. 94-142 but there are more copies of the reports to

be sent to Springfield. One director said, "I've always had to write reports to the state. I've spent most of my life writing reports to the state!"

The discussion with the interviewed directors about the reports to the state opened the discussion to the relationship between the special education cooperatives and the state, specifically the relationship with the state Office of Education, as the agency recognized by the federal government to monitor the federal dollars distributed through P.L. 94-142. Of the directors who were interviewed, those who found the state to be helpful to the cooperative in terms of the administration of P.L. 94-142 indicated that help was available in the following ways:

- 1 - There was someone in the state office who could be called to clarify questions related to reimbursement. (This director indicated that other than this clarification the help was superficial.)
- 2 - The state disseminates necessary federal information to the special education cooperative. The cooperative is able to refer parents to the state for interpretation of the federal law in the mediation process or in relation to the placement of a special education student.
- 3 - When state mandates in relation to education are enforced locally, cooperatives can promote pressure for special education programs in the local school districts.
- 4 - The state serves as a source of information to conveniently find out what other cooperatives are doing without each director having

to make individual contact with other special education cooperatives.

- 5 - When the state acts in its capacity as a monitoring system for the federal government, "It is like having another person who does not work for you look at your work. This is excellent. Schools could not pay for that."
- 6 - The state acts as a good middle person when it is helpful in mediating between parents and the special education cooperative.
- 7 - The state is helpful in the legislature in interpreting proposed legislation regarding special education to elected officials.
- 8 - The state can provide cooperatives with a list of approved private placements.
- 9 - The state wants to help the director of special education administer the P.L. 94-142 grant in ways that will be helpful to the cooperative. It is helpful in providing technical assistance. There is a well-delineated system of working together with knowledgeable people in the state office at the same administrative level as those in the cooperative who need state help.

There were directors who were interviewed who thought that the state was not helpful to the special education cooperatives. Four of the directors who were interviewed stated that the state stood in the way of the goals and objectives of the special education cooperatives. One director who found the state not to be helpful stated that the focus of the state had changed from that

of experts in the field to need processors or management consultants, because of the importance of monitoring, accounting and reporting in order to obtain federal funds. Another director stated that what should be a monitoring process had turned into a programmatic process. Those directors who found that the state is not helpful to the special education cooperatives indicated their frustration in their relationship with the state, i.e.: "I understand the state's limitations, but it's frustrating." "Dealing with the state is disheartening."

One director bemoaned the lack of inter-agency communication between the state Office of Education, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Children and Family Services, and the schools. One director who characterized the state as a monetary and regulatory system found that he could not call the state and receive direct help.

The directors did have some ideas about what the state should be doing. One director said that the state is no longer a goal-setting, leadership agency, with a system for setting state-wide goals. He viewed the goals of the state as having been set by broad social trends and consensus. He declared that the state should be an agent for providing leadership, and should identify problems and do something to help solve problems instead of being a passive reactor. One director who had previously stated that the state was only superficially helpful to him as a director of a special education cooperative, asserted that the goals of the cooperative and the goals of the state are no longer the same. He did concede that the state was trying to do an honest job, and the state was being realistic in suggesting budget cuts before the federal government would

demand those cuts because of the unavailability of federal money in the future. Another director who stated that the state and the cooperative did not have the same objectives, complained that the state operated as though the federal money was its own and tended to forget that the aim of P.L. 94-142 was to help handicapped youngsters.

Two directors claimed that the distance between Springfield and the cooperatives made it almost impossible for the state to make correct decisions in relation to handicapped children.

Two hundred miles away, they can't make a judgment about an appropriate referral. That is the responsibility of the director of special education. . . . The state doesn't realize we have a contract to honor, that costs are higher in the Chicago Metropolitan area than in Centralia or some similar place. The state tries to put each district in the state in the same kind of framework. Our needs are different from the southern part of the state or from a rural area. The state can't assess our needs in relation to theirs. They're not here. They can't know our needs. The state is not fully aware of what programs the cooperatives have in place.

A director who found the state to be helpful stated that the state could justify all interference with the cooperative because the state has federal guidelines which must be followed. Another director who found the state to be helpful saw the goals of the state and the cooperative to be the same.

I'm a strong supporter of the State Department of Education and wanting to link with them. Some directors aren't. They are more confrontational. I argue and I try to influence. Once a decision is made I go with it. After all, the state is liable for education.

Several directors who agreed that the state and the cooperatives have the same goals indicated that the state may have ways of meeting these goals which are different from the ways of the special education cooperative. "Sometimes there are different policies and perceptions which stand in the way. Ultimately, it's a good partnership." In discussing the different ways of meeting

these same goals, one director gave, as an illustration, the state wanting local school districts to provide good programs at home in the district rather than sending a handicapped child away to a private school. In actuality, it might be cheaper for the cooperative to send those few children who need such placement away to private placements rather than expend the money, energy, and manpower for too few students.

The directors who were interviewed were questioned about the ways in which the state might interfere with or might affect the decision-making powers of the directors of special education cooperatives. The majority of the directors who were interviewed indicated that the state does not interfere much in relation to the decision-making powers of the directors of special education cooperatives. Even those directors who had disagreements with the state agreed that the state did not interfere with their decision-making powers.

Director A - "Aside from general reporting and specific amounts for inservice, we have complete freedom to do what we want."

Director B - "The state doesn't stand in my way. There are no limits on my decisions. Usually, I tell the state what I'm going to do. I've never been refused."

Director C - "The state places some limits on decisions. It's improved. Restrictions of P.L. 94-142 haven't limited us in relation to creativity." This director had disagreed with the state's insistence on a set percentage of funds being used for inservice training. The staff of that cooperative had been having ongoing inservice for many years and the director thought that the staff did not require the kind of intensive inservice demanded by the state.

Director D - "I can make my decisions within their guidelines. Their decisions are already made. Some decisions are made for you."

Director E - "In some areas, I tell the state what I'm going to do."

Director F - "What I wish the state's policy was isn't the state's policy -- and I haven't convinced them. The state doesn't have preconceived ideas of where they want you to put the dollars. Maybe that should be a state priority. When there are differences between what they tell me to do and what I tell them I'm going to do, we compromise. We're colleagues."

Director G - "Why doesn't the state just give us the money and let us do our job?"

Director H - "There's freedom to make my own decisions. The state tells us the different kinds of candy we can buy and then we can choose freely from the state's list!"

Director I - "Dealing with the state is disheartening. You've generated the funds. You know what is needed. Then the state says you can't spend this much money on this particular item."

Director J - "There's quite a bit of freedom in decision-making."

There was a general consensus among the directors interviewed that the people in the field were more knowledgeable in the area of special education than the people working in the state office who were monitoring their special education programs. "The state has to recognize the knowledgeability of the people in the field."

"The state should pay people twice as much and hire only half as many. They don't pay well enough to maintain quality at the state level. The field has

surpassed them in expertise. The state should be leading, should hire and maintain the best possible staff."

"The state should cut out unnecessary people -- those not giving direct service to kids."

The following statements were made by directors whose scores on the mailed questionnaire were below the mean score but who were interviewed in order to give additional scope to the study.

Director X - "Both the state and the cooperatives want quality programs. Who can insure leadership in insuring quality? Quality cannot be insured from Springfield. The further you remove the desk of authority from the child, the poorer the service. For example, the cooperative can't do as good a job as the local school district. Springfield believes that they can control the quality from 200 miles away."

In relation to decision-making, this director stated, "There is no total freedom. Local effort can't be supplanted with federal funds. The combination of federal rules and regulations plus state rules and regulations -- all this controls your freedom. If you take money, the agency giving the money has some control. The state has some rights in insuring quality when they give funds to districts. Perhaps some day, superintendents will become sophisticated enough so they won't accept mandates without funding. They should be saying, 'When I get the dollars I'll implement the mandate.' The great lesson of P.L. 94-142 is that Congress promised what it would not fully fund. The same is true of the state mandate."

Director Y - "The state gives us freedom within the federal guidelines. Without the guidelines, the local school districts might not give handicapped children what they deserve. Generally, the state tells us what we must do. If they didn't, money might go into the general fund without any increase in service." Discussing the goals of the state and the cooperative, this director stated, "The cooperative's goals are oriented to children. In Springfield, in some cases they are oriented to maintaining the system and the bureaucracy."

Only three directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire (16.667%) agreed that they spent more time in dealing with transportation problems. In most of the cooperatives, transportation arrangements are not the administrative responsibility of the director of the cooperative. The responsibility for transportation is either at the level of the participating school districts, or there is another staff member in the cooperative who is assigned to deal with transportation. P.L. 94-142 has not changed any administrative responsibility for transportation.

More than 50% but fewer than 70% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire indicated that they spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings. The possibility exists that there might have been a misinterpretation of this question as, prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142, there were no due process hearings. One of the directors who was interviewed did state that he had indicated "disagree" with item 15 because there had been no due process hearings prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142. However, twelve of the eighteen respondents did indicate agreement on the item of attending due process hearings. When the directors were interviewed, some directors

indicated that part of the time related to due process hearings was spent in trying to avoid the hearing, in trying to ameliorate an existing situation or to mediate between a parent and a local school district. All the directors agreed that by the time a case was ready for a due process hearing, everything possible had been done to avoid the hearing, and the hearing was a last step for all involved. As one director stated, "We have exhausted the potential for compromise by the time a case reaches a due process hearing." Most of the appeals which go to a due process hearing are related to placement of a handicapped youngster or disagreements over labels. Several directors stated that in wealthier communities, parents resisted a diagnosis of EMH, educable mentally handicapped. In other cases, directors indicated that parents would prefer a label of "retarded" rather than a label of "behaviorally disturbed." Some cases center around private placements. The director of the cooperative may believe that a child can be served appropriately in the public school setting but the parent wants a private placement, or, the local school district feels that a child in a private placement is ready to return to the district program but the parent wants the child to remain in a private placement.

More than 60% of the directors replying to the mailed questionnaire agreed that they have to spend more time monitoring children in private facilities. The directors who disagreed with this item and who were interviewed indicated that the local school districts were responsible for monitoring children in private facilities, or that there were coordinators on the staff of the cooperative who were responsible for monitoring children in private facilities. All interviewed directors who agreed with this item said that only a

small percentage of their students were placed in private facilities, from one half of one percent to three percent. Those students in private facilities, however, represent the more severely handicapped of the cooperative's student body, i.e.: multiply handicapped, severe behavior disorders, severe and profoundly handicapped, non-ambulatory students, suicidal students, those youngsters needing twenty-four hour a day supervision, and students whose family situation requires their absence from the family setting because of the family's inability to deal with the child's handicaps. Students are placed in private facilities when all of the possibilities have been exhausted at the local school district and at the cooperative level. It is a question of the most appropriate placement. Students are placed in residential facilities when the cooperative cannot provide the intensity of program required for that student. One director indicated that private residential placements were down twenty percent a year since the implementation of P.L. 94-142 because of the least restrictive placement clause in the law. This director said that there had been students in segregated facilities who were being brought back to new programs in the local schools in order to meet the requirements of the least restrictive placement. Another director thought that it was more cost effective to send severely handicapped students to private facilities than to build new public facilities for these students, especially when those students requiring private placements represented less than one-half of one percent of the handicapped population.

More than 50% but fewer than 56% of the directors responding to the mailed questionnaire indicated that they spent more time in relation to IEPs.

The Individual Education Plan was instituted with the passage of P.L. 94-142 and did not exist as such prior to the passage of the law. In the state of Illinois, however, because of its early mandate and commitment to special education, there were behavioral objectives written for special education students, as well as progress reports for the parents of special education students. These objectives and reports may have been interpreted as IEPs by some of the directors responding to the mailed questionnaire. Most of the directors who were interviewed indicated that they were involved only peripherally in the IEP process. The directors were called in when there was a problem that could not be handled by others on the staff of the cooperative or when there was a strong difference of opinion between the professional staff and the parents involved. One director stated that he did spend ten percent of his time in monitoring the IEPs in his cooperative. Another director was called into the process only when there was a "touchy situation." A third director was only occasionally involved in the IEP process, and that was in complicated cases which, because of strong differences of opinion, seemed likely to go to a due process hearing. In one cooperative, the coordinators of the various programs for handicapped students were more involved with the IEPs, but the director was not. Still another director was available as a resource person, making sure that the consultants on his staff had all the data needed for the IEPs.

The directors who were interviewed were asked to ascertain if their administrative tasks had taken on different priorities since the passage of P.L. 94-142, and if any of their administrative tasks had to be sacrificed in order to complete those tasks relative to P.L. 94-142. Three of the interviewed

directors indicated that there had been no change in their priorities relating to administrative tasks, that the same basic needs had to be met after the law as before the law. One of these interviewed directors indicated that his philosophy had remained unchanged, and that was to provide the best possible program for the children he was serving, and that was his number one priority. Grant writing took on a higher priority for many directors, although some of the directors stated that grant writing was not a personal priority but rather had become a necessary priority in order to generate the P.L. 94-142 funds. Two directors stated that more time and thought has had to go into civil rights and due process procedures since the passage of P.L. 94-142. One of these directors spent a good deal of his time writing a massive handbook which spelled out procedures, necessary consent forms, notices which should be sent to parents relating to their rights under the law, etc. Due process hearings became a number one priority for another director. Several directors indicated their need to be more knowledgeable about national practices, to find out what was happening nationally, and had to radically reorganize their time in order to accomplish this. Two directors named paper shuffling as a priority because of the many reports which have to be sent into the state. One director stated that the law has made tremendous demands on him, and he has had to do more himself rather than delegate some tasks. "I put in more hours and I do some things less well."

Some directors spend more time reviewing court cases and looking at what other states are doing in the field of special education. Directors are spending more time in revising policies and checking them out with legal

counsel. "Creative budgeting" has become a priority for directors of special education cooperatives as they "try to figure out what purposes to use federal funds for, and how to plug in the local funds from the districts." Generally, the greatest priorities appear to be writing reports, generating funds, writing grants, due process hearings and greater public relations efforts. Those administrative tasks that, of necessity, are taking on lower priority, are classroom visitations or building visits, staff development, and program evaluation. One director said that his change of priorities was not caused by P.L. 94-142 but by the growth of special education. This director was not able to indicate how the growth of special education could be separated from P.L. 94-142, but he maintained that the old state mandates were more restrictive on his time and decisions than the restrictions placed on him by P.L. 94-142.

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the size of the cooperative had an impact on the performance of administrative tasks of directors of special education cooperatives since the implementation of P.L. 94-142. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was little variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium and large cooperatives. The means of the three groups (as indicated in Table 7) hovered together without a sizable variation in the scores.

Table 7

Impact of Size of Cooperative
on Performance of Administrative Tasks

# in population	size	mean scores
5	small	17.60
1	medium	17.00
12	large	22.33

The level of significance was 1.70, which was higher than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter III as the accepted level of significance ($p = .05$). Again, as in the area of budget, there was only one cooperative which could be characterized as medium-sized and there was not a sizable variation in the mean scores of the large cooperatives and the small cooperatives.

The statistical test of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the wealth of the cooperative (as measured by the cost of educating a special education child) had an impact on the performance of administrative tasks of the directors of special education cooperatives, since the implementation of P.L. 94-142. The one-way analysis of variance, as indicated in Table 8, indicated only minute differences in the mean scores of the directors of low wealth, high wealth, and medium wealth special education cooperatives. The means of the three groups hovered very closely together, with only a small variation in the scores.

Table 8

Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on
Performance of Administrative Tasks

# in population	size	mean scores
5	low	21.80
5	medium	21.80
3	high	21.00

(Five directors of special education cooperatives did not respond to this item in the mailed questionnaire.)

The one-way analysis of variation indicated only minute differences in the mean scores of the directors of low-wealth, high-wealth and medium-wealth special education cooperatives. The level of significance was .02, which was lower than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter I as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$).

The dependent variable of **Performance of Administrative Tasks** was statistically dependent on the independent variables of size of the cooperative and wealth of the cooperative. **Hypothesis 2 stated: "In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to the performance of administrative tasks."** Since the level of significance for the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative were not significant at the .05 level, **Hypothesis 2 must be rejected.** The investigation has failed to show statistical evidence of differences among the special education cooperatives. However, the level of significance for the impact of the wealth of the cooperative on the performance of administrative tasks was extremely close to the level of significance. Although the statistical

evidence does not show a cause and effect relationship between P.L. 94-142 and a change in priorities among directors of special education cooperatives, more than 75% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire did agree that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) they spend more time writing grants and proposals,
- b) they spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public,
- c) they spend more time meeting with parents,
- d) they spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the state.

In response to the mailed questionnaire, more than 55% but fewer than 67% of the directors agreed that:

- a) they spend more time in budget preparation,
- b) they spend more time in relation to IEPs,
- c) they spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.

Therefore, although lacking statistical significance that the variables of size and wealth of the cooperative are a factor, it can be inferred, based on the high percentage of positive responses, that in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area, P.L. 94-142 has had some impact on the priorities of directors of special education cooperatives in the performance of their administrative tasks.

In Chapter I, **Hypothesis 3** stated, "In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to staff

functions." Table 9 shows the responses of 1) strongly agree, 2) agree, 3) does not apply, 4) disagree, and 5) strongly disagree, to the staff function items in the mailed questionnaire.

Table 9
Staff Functions

ITEM #		RESPONSES					
		1	2	3	4	5	
5.	I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	#	7	5	3	3	0
		%	38.889	27.778	16.667	16.667	0
17.	My staff spends more time in curriculum development.	#	2	4	6	6	0
		%	11.111	22.222	33.333	33.333	0
19.	My staff spends more time in relation to IEPs.	#	12	4	1	1	0
		%	66.667	22.222	5.556	5.556	0
21.	My staff spends more time in annual reviews.	#	8	6	2	2	0
		%	44.444	33.333	11.111	11.111	0
24.	I am using my staff in different ways.	#	3	11	1	3	0
		%	16.667	61.111	5.556	16.667	0

Table 10 shows the collapsed responses of agree, does not apply, and disagree, to the staff function items in the mailed questionnaire.

Table 10
Staff Functions

ITEM #		#	AGREE	RESPONSES	
				DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
5.	I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	# %	12 66.667	3 16.667	3 16.667
17.	My staff spends more time in curriculum development.	# %	6 33.333	6 33.333	6 33.333
19.	My staff spends more time in relation to IEPs.	# %	16 77.777	1 11.111	1 11.111
21.	My staff spends more time in annual reviews.	# %	14 77.777	2 11.111	2 11.111
24.	I am using my staff in different ways.	# %	14 77.778	1 5.556	3 16.667

NARRATIVE

The mailed questionnaire contained only five items relating to staff functions. Item five, "I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment," was included in the analysis of staff functions as well as in the analysis of budget, as evaluation and assessment are an integral part of staff functions in a special education cooperative. Those directors who agreed with item five (more than 66% of those who responded to the mailed questionnaire) indicated that there was increased need for supportive services which included evaluation and assessment. These supportive services involved social workers,

psychologists, occupational and physical therapists. The increased need for evaluation and assessment services was tied in to the case studies which are mandated, not only by P.L. 94-142, but also by the state guidelines. Psychological and social work assessments are components of the case study. Additionally, the mandate for ongoing needs assessment leads to ongoing need for evaluation and assessment of students as well as ongoing need for evaluation and assessment of programs designed for students. As the child-find process has led to discovering more students in need of services, there is a parallel need for evaluation and assessment services. One director who was interviewed emphatically stated that the increase in support staff which supplies evaluation and assessment is parallel to the increases in enrollment of special education students. The guidelines for P.L. 94-142 call for more carefully documented statements of student needs than was previously required. The law requires detailed plans for how these needs will be met. Support staff involved in evaluation and assessment must provide a good deal of the documentation relative to the statement of and the meeting of student needs.

For those interviewed directors who indicated that item five did not apply to their cooperative, the evaluation and assessment of student needs was done at the district level rather than through the special education cooperative.

Of the 16.667% who disagreed with item five about additional staff for evaluation and assessment, the directors who were interviewed indicated that it was cheaper for them to contract outside the cooperative for evaluation and assessment services than to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment. One director stated that it was not the guidelines of P.L. 94-142 which led to

additional need for evaluation and assessment services, but rather the identification of more handicapped children. He maintained that this ongoing identification would have taken place because of the state mandate whether or not P.L. 94-142 had been enacted. He maintained that whether or not P.L. 94-142 had existed, his cooperative would have served 12% of the student population who had special education needs. Another director who had disagreed with item five indicated that declining enrollment in the school districts served by his cooperative had led to a decline in the need for psychological services, which in turn led him to use contractual services for evaluation and assessment rather than hire staff for these purposes.

Item seventeen stated, "My staff spends more time in curriculum development." On this item, there was an even division between and among the directors who agreed, disagreed, and to whom the item did not apply. For the 33.334% for whom the item did not apply, the directors who were interviewed indicated that curriculum development was the province of the local districts rather than the educational cooperatives.

Of the 33.334% who agreed with this item about more time spent in curriculum development, the directors who were interviewed indicated that as needs assessment had made them look more carefully at the needs of individual children, the staff had started to look more carefully at the ways in which the existing programs were meeting the needs of individual students. In some districts, the whole curriculum was revised as the staff looked at behavior, social and life skills regardless of the label of the handicap and as they evaluated the function of the curriculum for those students.

Of the 33.334% who disagreed with item 17 about staff time involved in curriculum development, the directors who were interviewed indicated that their staffs had always been involved in curriculum development. P.L. 94-142 had not changed staff involvement in curriculum development. Whether agreeing or disagreeing with item seventeen, directors saw staff involvement in curriculum development as integral to the functioning of the special education cooperative.

Item nineteen stated, "My staff spends more time in relation to IEPs." It could be expected that there would be overwhelming agreement with this item since Individual Education Plans per se did not exist prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142. Only two of the directors responding to the mailed questionnaire did not agree with this item. One disagreed and one stated that it did not apply. The director for whom item nineteen did not apply was among the interviewed directors. He pointed out that the IEP process took place at the level of the local school district rather than at the special education cooperative he served.

88.889% of the directors did agree with item nineteen that their staffs spend more time in relation to IEPs. Prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142, five or six behavioral objectives for each child were expected each school year. This procedure was nowhere as time-consuming as the demands of the IEPs. One director said that it was not possible for teachers to complete IEPs for each child during regular school hours. In that cooperative, the director estimated that it took about one and a half hours to generate an IEP for each child, and another hour to polish it up so that it was presentable at a

professional conference. In this cooperative, teachers had two days a year in addition to one and a half hours of planning time each week which could be used for writing IEPs and the reports involved in annual reviews. The director thought that teachers were "reasonable and responsible" in using their own personal time for working on IEPs since it was not "humanly possible to complete all the work required during the work time." This director indicated that as more paper work was required of teachers, less time was spent on service to children. Another director stated that the demands of P.L. 94-142 caused an average of seven people to be involved in the writing of IEPs. He ventured a guess that it was not necessary for all these seven people to be present at the IEP conference, and that their opinions could be asked for prior to the case conference, with a subsequent saving of professional hours which could then be devoted to more direct service to children.

One director who was interviewed thought that the time involved in IEPs which was demanded by P.L. 94-142 was counter-productive and has actually been an impediment to service for children. This director saw the demands of the law to be so legalistic that staff had become wary in what they were willing to write down in an IEP lest they be held legally liable and vulnerable to lawsuits if the child did not reach the goals set by the IEP. This director predicted that some change must come about in the legalistic wording demanded by P.L. 94-142 so that staff can be held accountable and can still be protected from lawsuits. Most of the directors who were interviewed agreed that a minimum of one hour per year is needed for the actual writing of the IEPs, with additional time necessary for thinking through the process and

consulting with other professionals. The average time was one and a half hours per year per student. Some directors indicated that two hours per child were spent each year in writing IEPs in their cooperatives. Additional time is spent in preparation for and meetings in the annual reviews, which will be dealt with in subsequent pages.

Directors stated that since the enactment of P.L. 94-142 there were more children being served in each category of handicaps as well as more categories of handicaps being served in the public schools. This aspect of P.L. 94-142 alone has demanded more staff time spent in planning for children, whether the plans are called IEPs or by some other name.

Item twenty-one stated, "My staff spends more time in annual reviews." Over 75% of the respondents agreed to this item. According to the directors who were interviewed, more staff time is involved in the annual review than is needed for the IEPs. Time for the annual review includes preparation for the annual review and staff meetings of several professionals and the parent or parents involved in the annual review. As with the IEPs, there were no state-mandated annual reviews prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142. Some special education cooperatives did have parent meetings prior to any change of placement for a special education student, when only the state mandate was in effect. All interviewed directors who agreed with item twenty-one agreed that the preparation time for the annual review was far lengthier than the annual review itself, which usually takes about half an hour. The preparation time for the annual review varied. Staff time required for annual reviews varied from half an hour to two and a half hours per student.

The 22.222% of respondents who either did not agree with item twenty-one or to whom the item did not apply were in cooperatives where the annual review takes place at the local school district level rather than at the level of the special education cooperative.

Item twenty-four stated, "I am using my staff in different ways." Over 77%, or fourteen of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire agreed with this item. The directors who were interviewed indicated the differing ways in which they were using their staffs since the enactment of P.L. 94-12.

In a decentralized cooperative, one director was using supervisory staff for functions other than supervision. Supervisors, rather than giving direct supervision, were involved in in-service activities, were giving technical aid to regular education teachers in the local schools, and were helping staff at the district offices.

Another director complained that the coordinators in that district were more involved in paper work than before. As IEPs were being developed, coordinators were working with teachers in writing recommendations in such a way that the recommendations would be more specific. Coordinators were helping teachers to be more aware of the law so that teachers could be accountable for the recommendations they were writing. This director indicated that there was a high degree of staff "burn-out" because of the intensity of special education. In that district, staff had become more supportive of each other since the enactment of P.L. 94-142. Coordinators had become "salesmen for mainstreaming," had become more cognizant of regular

education programs, and were working more closely with regular education teachers. Psychologists and social workers had become more cautious and circumspect in their statements to parents and had become more involved with in-service training for teachers.

In most cooperatives, support staff was involved in in-service training and in parent meetings. Previously, support staff had been involved in parent conferences only when a child was being re-evaluated. With the new law, support staff began to be present at all meetings involving parents.

In another cooperative, the director indicated that there was more brainstorming between and among staff members than previously, as staff members began thinking about varieties of options open to them in dealing with handicapped students. There were more instances of staff helping staff, with the support staff of the cooperative more available to all districts who are members of that cooperative.

All directors who were interviewed indicated that there had been an increase in the numbers of support staff hired since the enactment of P.L. 94-142. This additional staff included supervisors, coordinators, physical therapists, occupational therapists, consulting psychologists, social workers, nurses, and speech therapists. Support staff had changed their focus to giving direct service to individuals rather than to working as consultants.

One director indicated that his supervisory staff had started to function more as consultants to teachers in the areas of materials and behavior management, as well as in the area of pupil progress. Supervisors had become case managers and were becoming more oriented to supervision and

administration. In this cooperative, 60% of supervisors' work time was spent in carrying out the mandates of P.L. 94-142. This director maintained that the demands of the law forced directors to change the way in which they utilized their staff. "Job descriptions are almost written as functions of the law."

Directors indicated frustration because they no longer had the discretion of choosing the priorities of how staff was to be used. Several directors stated that they had to change their concept of supervision to a middle-management concept, using supervisors as categorical consultants who have had to spend more time in the districts than in the cooperative. This middle-management concept of supervision was most true in the decentralized cooperatives.

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the size of the cooperative had an impact on staff functions in the special education cooperative. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was little variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium and large cooperatives. The means of the three groups hovered together without a sizable variation in the scores. Although Table 11 indicates a higher mean score for medium cooperatives, it should be noted that this score is that of only one medium-sized cooperative, as compared to five small cooperatives and twelve large cooperatives.

Table 11

Impact of Size of Cooperative
on Staff Functions

# in population	size	mean scores
5	small	6.50
1	medium	10.00
12	large	9.17

The level of significance for the impact of the size of the cooperative on staff functions was 1.94, which was higher than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter III as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$). Once again, there is the possibility that the numbers used to designate small, medium and large cooperatives may not necessarily have been valid for the larger Metropolitan area. Had the cooperatives been grouped differently in relation to size, the results might have had greater meaning, although there was only a small difference between the mean scores of the large cooperatives and the mean scores of the small cooperatives.

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the wealth of the cooperative (as measured by the cost of educating a special education child) had an impact on staff functions in the special education cooperative. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there were minute variations in the mean scores of the directors of low-wealth, medium-wealth and high-wealth cooperatives. The means of the three groups, as indicated in Table 12, hovered very closely together without a sizable variation in the scores.

Table 12

Impact of Wealth of Cooperative on
Staff Functions

# in population	size	mean scores
5	low	7.00
5	medium	8.80
3	high	9.67

(Five directors of special education cooperatives did not respond to this item in the mailed questionnaire.)

The one-way analysis of variance indicated only tiny differences in the mean scores of the directors of low-wealth, medium-wealth, and high-wealth special education cooperatives. The level of significance for impact of the wealth of the cooperative on staff functions was 1.10 which was higher than the .05 level of significance determined in Chapter I as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$).

The dependent variable of **Staff Functions** was statistically dependent on the independent variables of size of the cooperative and wealth of the cooperative. **Hypothesis 3 stated: "In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to staff functions."** Since the level of significance for both the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative was not significant at the .05 level, **Hypothesis 3 must be rejected.** The evidence has failed to show statistical evidence of differences among the special education cooperatives. Although the statistical evidence does not show a cause and effect relationship between P.L. 94-142 and a change in priorities related to staff functions on the part of

directors of special education cooperatives, more than 77% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire did agree that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) their staff spends more time in relation to IEPs,
- b) their staff spends more time in relation to annual reviews,
- c) they are using their staff in different ways.

More than 66% of the directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire agreed that they have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.

Therefore, although lacking statistical significance that the variables of size and wealth of the cooperative are a factor, it can be inferred, based on the high percentage of positive responses, that in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area, P.L. 94-142 has had some impact on the priorities of directors of special education cooperatives in relation to staff functions. According to the interviews with the selected directors of special education cooperatives, it appears that both state guidelines and federal mandate have affected the decision-making of directors in relation to staff function as they attempt to follow the letter of the law.

The thrust of the mailed questionnaire was to ascertain the impact of P.L. 94-142 on administrative decision-making of directors of special education cooperatives. Although the three hypotheses to be investigated in this study have been statistically rejected, a look at the total responses to the mailed questionnaire may help provide an over-all view of the questions raised in

Chapter I. The total responses, as shown in Table 13, will be referred to as Administrative Decision-Making.

Table 13

Administrative Decision-Making

ITEM #			RESPONSES				
			1	2	3	4	5
1.	I spend more time in budget preparation.	#	8	4	2	3	1
		%	44.44	22.22	11.111	16.667	5.556
2.	My per pupil expenditure has increased.	#	9	7	1	1	0
		%	50.00	38.889	5.556	5.556	0
3.	My total budet has increased.	#	12	5	0	1	0
		%	66.667	27.778	0	5.556	0
4.	My budget allocation for staff has increased.	#	11	5	1	1	0
		%	61.111	27.778	5.556	5.556	0
5.	I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	#	7	5	3	3	0
		%	38.889	27.778	16.667	16.667	0
6.	The cost of running the business office has increased.	#	6	9	2	0	1
		%	33.333	50.00	11.111	0	5.556
7.	My cash-flow problems have increased.	#	5	2	3	6	2
		%	27.778	11.111	16.667	33.333	11.111
8.	I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements.	#	4	2	3	6	3
		%	22.222	11.111	16.667	33.333	16.667
9.	In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	#	7	8	0	1	2
		%	38.889	44.444	0	5.556	11.111
10.	Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.	#	8	6	0	3	1
		%	44.444	33.333	0	16.667	5.556

Table 13 (continued)

ITEM #		RESPONSES					
		1	2	3	4	5	
11.	I spend more time dealing with transportation problems.	#	1	2	3	11	1
		%	5.556	11.111	1.667	61.111	5.556
12.	I spend more time writing grants and proposals.	#	9	6	1	1	1
		%	50.00	33.333	5.556	5.556	5.556
13.	I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public.	#	9	8	0	1	0
		%	50.00	44.444	0	5.556	0
14.	I spend more time meeting with parents.	#	4	10	0	4	0
		%	22.222	55.556	0	22.222	0
15.	I spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings.	#	3	9	1	4	1
		%	16.667	50.00	5.556	22.222	5.556
16.	I spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the State.	#	6	8	2	2	0
		%	33.333	44.444	11.111	11.111	0
17.	My staff spends more time in curriculum development.	#	2	4	6	6	0
		%	11.111	22.222	33.333	33.333	0
18.	I spend more time in relation to IEPs.	#	5	5	3	5	0
		%	27.778	27.778	16.667	27.778	0
19.	My staff spends more time in relation to IEPs.	#	12	4	1	1	0
		%	66.667	22.222	5.556	5.556	0
20.	In order to train teachers to write IEPs I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	#	4	2	2	8	2
		%	22.222	11.111	11.111	44.444	11.111

Table 13 (continued)

ITEM #		RESPONSES					
		1	2	3	4	5	
21.	My staff spends more time in annual reviews.	#	8	6	2	2	0
		%	44.444	33.333	11.111	11.111	0
22.	In order to develop other inservice training for my staff, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	#	2	3	3	8	2
		%	11.111	16.667	16.667	44.444	11.111
23.	In order to develop inservice training for regular education teachers who will teach mainstreamed special education children, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	#	2	4	1	9	2
		%	11.111	22.222	5.556	50.00	11.111
24.	I am using my staff in different ways.	#	3	11	1	3	0
		%	16.667	61.111	5.556	16.667	0
25.	I have services and programs I could not afford before.	#	4	9	1	3	1
		%	22.222	50.00	5.556	16.667	5.556
26.	I have to spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.	#	6	5	1	5	1
		%	33.333	27.778	5.556	27.778	5.556

Table 14 shows the collapsed responses of agree, does not apply, and disagree, to the total questionnaire. The total responses to the mailed

questionnaire refer to the impact of P.L. 94-142 on administrative decision-making.

Table 14

Administrative Decision-Making

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
1.	I spend more time in budget preparation.	#	12	2	4
		%	66.667	11.111	22.222
2.	My per pupil expenditure has increased.	#	16	1	1
		%	88.889	5.556	5.556
3.	My total budget has increased.	#	17	0	1
		%	94.444	0	5.556
4.	My budget allocation for staff has increased.	#	16	1	1
		%	88.889	5.556	5.556
5.	I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.	#	12	3	3
		%	66.667	16.667	16.667
6.	The cost of running the business office has increased.	#	15	2	1
		%	83.333	11.111	5.556
7.	My cash-flow problems have increased.	#	7	3	8
		%	38.889	16.667	44.444
8.	I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements.	#	6	3	9
		%	33.333	16.667	50.00
9.	In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	#	15	0	3
		%	83.333	0	16.667
10.	Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.	#	14	0	4
		%	77.778	0	22.222

Table 14 (continued)

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
11.	I spend more time dealing with transportation problems.	# %	3 16.667	3 16.667	12 66.666
12.	I spend more time writing grants and proposals.	# %	15 83.333	1 5.556	2 11.111
13.	I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public.	# %	17 94.444	0 0	1 5.556
14.	I spend more time meeting with parents.	# %	14 77.778	0 0	4 22.222
15.	I spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings.	# %	12 66.667	1 5.556	5 27.778
16.	I spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the State.	# %	14 77.777	2 11.111	2 11.111
17.	My staff spends more time in curriculum development.	# %	6 33.333	6 33.333	6 33.333
18.	I spend more time in relation to IEPs.	# %	10 55.555	3 16.667	5 27.778
19.	My staff spends more time in relation to IEPs.	# %	16 88.888	1 5.556	1 5.556
20.	In order to train teachers to write IEPs, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	6 33.333	2 11.111	10 55.555
21.	My staff spends more time in annual reviews.	# %	14 77.778	2 11.111	2 11.111

Table 14 (continued)

ITEM #			RESPONSES		
			AGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	DISAGREE
22.	In order to develop other inservice training for my staff, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	5 27.778	3 16.667	10 55.555
23.	In order to develop inservice training for regular education teachers who will teach mainstreamed special education children, I have had to allocate funds which are not reimbursed by the federal government.	# %	6 33.333	1 5.556	11 61.111
24.	I am using my staff in different ways.	# %	14 77.777	1 5.556	3 16.667
25.	I have services and programs I could not afford before.	# %	13 72.222	1 5.556	4 22.222
26.	I have to spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.	# %	11 61.111	1 5.556	6 33.333

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the size of the cooperative had an impact on administrative decision-making of the directors of the special education cooperatives. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was little variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium and large

cooperatives. The means of the three groups, as indicated in Table 15, hovered together without a sizable variation in the scores.

Table 15

Impact of Size of Cooperative
On Administrative Decision-Making

# in population	size	mean scores
5	small	56.00
1	medium	61.00
12	large	61.57

The level of significance was .35, which was higher than the level of significance determined in Chapter I as the accepted level of significance ($p = .05$). Although the total response to the questionnaire as an indication of administrative decision-making was not one of the hypotheses in Chapter I, it can be seen that the size of the special education cooperative was not a significant factor in administrative decision-making among directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

The statistical tool of a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the wealth of the cooperative had an impact on administrative decision-making of directors of special education cooperatives. The one-way analysis of variance indicated some small variation in the mean scores of the directors of small, medium, and large cooperatives, with the highest variation between the high wealth cooperatives and the medium wealth cooperatives. The means of the three groups can be seen in Table 16, with the

wealth of the cooperative determined by the cost of educating a special education child.

Table 16

Impact of Wealth of Cooperative
on Administrative Decision-Making

# in population	size	mean scores
5	low	60.20
5	medium	65.20
3	high	56.33

(5 directors did not respond to this item in the mailed questionnaire.)

The level of significance was .66, which was higher than the level of significance determined in Chapter I as the accepted level of significance ($p=.05$). The wealth of the cooperative, as determined by the cost of educating a special education child, was not a statistically significant factor in administrative decision-making. The lower mean of the high wealth cooperatives might be attributed to the prior existence of special education programs in the wealthier cooperatives, as indicated by some of the directors who were interviewed.

Many of the directors who were interviewed indicated that the administrative problems were the same for all cooperatives, whether they were small or large, rich or poor. The directors saw that the wealthier districts tended to serve more students, but the students in their cooperatives tended to have milder handicaps. This situation might be attributed to wealthier parents having the financial wherewithal to utilize facilities other than the public schools. The director of a cooperative serving poorer school districts said that

the state office had been surprised at the number of social workers employed in that district as poorer districts tended to have fewer support staff as well as fewer related services. One director stated that poorer districts tended to have students with more problems, a statement that several other directors stated in different ways. One director gauged the turnover rate in some poor districts as 40%. The overall opinion of the interviewed directors was that the more money a cooperative had, the more options it had in providing services to handicapped youngsters.

Among the interviewed directors, some directors attributed the financial problems of poorer districts to a decline in industry in the area, with a resultant shrinking of the tax base. Other directors found that tax bases were consistent, but education referendums had not passed, resulting in cutbacks. Larger districts have not felt the pinch of declining enrollments as much as have smaller districts. Larger districts, with larger population bases, have been able to provide more programs to low-incidence students than have smaller districts with fewer numbers of students. Declining enrollment in one cooperative led to consolidation of some programs and to closing of others. The director said, "It is easier to grow and expand programs than it is to collapse them." As some cooperatives were experiencing a declining population base, other cooperatives in newer and/or growing suburbs were experiencing a rise in student population. This led one director to foresee a possible change in the organizational structure and delivery service system for special education. He predicted that in some cases, the special education cooperative may have to replace the services offered in the local school districts, and in other cases, the regional cooperatives may have to replace the local cooperatives.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The review of current research and related literature, along with the preliminary field test, yielded a revised questionnaire of twenty-six statements. The directors of special education cooperatives were asked to respond to each statement, using a Likert-type scale of 1) strongly agree; 2) agree; 3) does not apply; 4) disagree; 5) strongly disagree. The items in the questionnaire covered the areas of a) budget; b) performance of administrative tasks; and c) staff functions. Although the hypotheses were statistically rejected, both the questionnaire and the interviews conducted with selected directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area did indicate that P.L. 94-142 did have some impact on administrative decision-making of the directors.

It was apparent that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-42, there had been budget increases in:

- a) the total budget,
- b) per-pupil expenditure,
- c) staff salaries,
- d) the cost of running the business office.

These increases, however, could not be attributed fully to P.L. 94-142. The effective date of P.L. 94-142 was September 1, 1978. The investigation

took place between 1981 and 1982. That period was a time of both rising inflation and rising costs. Although some additional staff had been hired to implement the law, there were also cutbacks in staff in some cooperatives. Yearly step increases in staff salaries would have taken place regardless of the law. Therefore, there was no cause and effect relationship between the aforementioned budget increases and P.L. 94-142.

In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, directors of special education cooperatives did have to allocate from their budgets funds which were not reimbursed by the federal government. The mandates of the law did cause an increase in legal fees due to more frequent need for legal assistance, as, prior to the passage of P.L. 94-142, there had been no due-process hearings. The federal law has made directors of special education cooperatives more cognizant of legalities and more dependent on legal consultation.

More than half of the respondents agreed that their cooperatives had services and programs that they could not afford prior to P.L. 94-142, even though the interviewed directors indicated that the bulk of their funding did not flow from P.L. 94-142 monies. The interviewed directors indicated that they were combining their funds from P.L. 94-142 with federal money funded through other laws, along with state and local funds, to use in new ways.

More than half the respondents have had to hire additional staff for the purposes of assessment and evaluation in order to fulfill the mandates of the law in relation to IEPs and annual reviews. In some cases where additional staff for evaluation and review were not hired by the cooperative, they were hired for the same purpose at the local school district.

In relation to administrative tasks, more than 75% of the respondents agreed that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142, more of their time has been spent in:

- 1) writing grants and proposals,
- 2) interpreting legal mandates and ramifications of the law to the public,
- 3) meeting with parents,
- 4) gathering information and writing reports to the state.

In order to fulfill the mandates of the law, directors indicated that they have had to change their priorities away from direct service to children and more to grant-writing and record-keeping, although previous to the law, grant-writing had not been high on their list of personal priorities.

More than 50% of the respondents agreed that they now spend more time:

- 1) in budget preparation,
- 2) in relation to IEPs,
- 3) in monitoring children in private facilities.

The additional time in budget preparation is a result of the provision of the law which stipulates that each year a grant application must be filed for P.L. 94-142 funds, resulting in increased time needed for overall budget preparation. The directors may have responded to the statement regarding IEPs affirmatively, as, prior to the passage of the federal law, there were no IEPs required. Directors are spending more time monitoring children in private facilities because those children usually represent the most severely disabled

and handicapped students in the cooperative. These placements must be constantly monitored to assure that they are the most appropriate for the student.

In relation to staff functions, over 77% of the respondents agreed that:

- a) their staff spends more time in relation to IEPs,
- b) their staff spends more time in relation to annual reviews,
- c) they are using their staff in different ways.

The most significant of these findings is that staff is being used in different ways, as, prior to P.L. 94-142, there were no IEPs and there were no annual reviews. Staff functions are very much geared to the mandates of the law. As one director said, "Job descriptions are almost written as functions of the law." Supervisors are now involved in giving more direct technical assistance to teachers. Coordinators are helping teachers keep to the letter of the law. Support staff has become more involved with in-service training for teachers and in parent meetings.

Over 66% of the respondents agreed that they have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment because of the mandates of the law in relation to IEPs and annual reviews.

Conclusions

Each of the dependent variables of 1) budget, 2) performance of administrative tasks, and 3) staff functions, were dependent on the independent variables of a) the size of the cooperative and b) the wealth of the cooperative. Therefore, the statistical analysis determined the significance of each of the

dependent variables solely in terms of how they were affected by the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative.

Hypothesis 1 stated: P.L. 94-142 has created budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area. Since the level of significance for both the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative did not prove to be significant at the .05 level of significance, **Hypothesis 1 must be rejected.** The investigation has failed to show evidence of statistical differences among the special education cooperatives.

However, over 75% of the respondents to the mailed questionnaire did agree that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) the total budget of the cooperative increased,
- b) per-pupil expenditure increased,
- c) budget allocation for staff increased,
- d) the cost of running the business office increased,
- e) in order to fulfill the mandates of the law, funds had to be allocated which the federal government did not reimburse,
- f) legal fees increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.

From the analysis of the quantitative data and the information gathered from the in-depth interviews, it can be concluded that:

- 1) P.L. 94-142 has created some budgetary problems for directors of special education cooperatives.

- 2) Legal fees, which are not reimbursed by the federal government, must now be considered a crucial part of the cooperative's budget.
- 3) Special education cooperatives with wealthier school districts tended to have most of their programs in place by the time P.L. 94-142 went into effect. The money from P.L. 94-142 was then used to enhance existing programs and to provide some new and desirable programs.
- 4) Larger districts, with larger population bases, have been able to provide more programs to students with low-incidence handicaps.
- 5) Declining enrollments have hit smaller districts harder than larger districts, leaving the larger districts with wider options.

Hypothesis 2 stated: In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to the performance of administrative tasks. Since the level of significance for both the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative did not prove to be significant at the .05 level of significance, **Hypothesis 2 must be rejected.** The investigation has failed to show evidence of statistical differences among the special education cooperatives.

However, more than 75% of the respondents to the mailed questionnaire did agree that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) they spend more time writing grants and proposals,

- b) they spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public,
- c) they spend more time meeting with parents,
- d) they spend more time gathering information and writing reports to the state.

Directors of special education cooperatives have had to become more knowledgeable about civil rights and due process procedures, nationally as well as locally, in order to avoid costly litigation. They have had to assess their priorities in terms of this need in order to allot time for reviewing court cases, for revising policies, and for utilizing legal counsel. The director who said, "Policies must be finite. They can no longer be general," was indicating the on-going need for legal consultation.

From the analysis of the quantitative data and the information gathered from the in-depth interviews, it can be concluded that:

1. The mandates of P.L. 94-142 have changed the priorities of the directors of special education cooperatives.

Although all of the interviewed directors agreed that their first priority has always been and still is the provision of good services to handicapped students, directors are using their time differently.

2. Directors are spending more time keeping abreast of legal matters in relation to P.L. 94-142.
3. Directors are spending more time trying to keep cases out of court.
4. Directors are spending more time in relation to the state, in writing grants and proposals, in gathering information and in writing reports.

Hypothesis 3 stated: In order to fulfill the mandates of P.L. 94-142, directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area have had to change their priorities in relation to staff functions. Since the level of significance for both the size of the cooperative and the wealth of the cooperative did not prove to be significant at the .05 level of significance, Hypothesis 3 must be rejected. The investigation has failed to show evidence of statistical differences among the special education cooperatives.

However, more than 77% of the respondents to the mailed questionnaire agreed that, since the effective date of P.L. 94-142:

- a) their staff spends more time in relation to IEPs,
- b) their staff spends more time in relation to annual reviews,
- c) they are using their staff in different ways.

It must be remembered, that prior to the effective date of P.L. 94-142, neither IEPs nor annual reviews were mandated.

From the analysis of the quantitative data and the information gathered from the in-depth interviews, it can be concluded that:

1. Staff is being utilized in different ways in order to meet the mandates of P.L. 94-142 in relation to the development and utilization of IEPs and in relation to annual reviews.

The statistical evidence does not show a cause and effect relationship between P.L. 94-142 and administrative decision-making among directors of special education cooperatives in the Greater Chicago Metropolitan area.

Recommendations

An important aspect of the administration of P.L. 94-142 is the relationship between the special education cooperatives and the State Office of Education, the agency recognized by the federal government to monitor the federal dollars distributed through P.L. 94-142. Directors of special education cooperatives generally agreed that the state has not recruited the most knowledgeable people in the field of special education to work in the Illinois Office of Education. The geographic distance between Springfield and the cooperatives becomes wider when state-wide decisions do not reflect local needs or local problems. An example of this is a decision that severely handicapped students should be served in new public facilities which have to be built at tremendous cost, rather than continuing to serve them in existing private facilities. That state-wide decision is being made too far from the seat of the problem, especially when the students involved represent less than one-half of one percent of the handicapped population.

By and large, the goals of the state in enforcing P.L. 94-142, and the goals of the special education cooperatives are the same -- the provision of a good education for handicapped students. As a result of bureaucracy and the bureaucratic process, there are times that directors feel that Springfield has overlooked that common goal, giving rise to statements such as:

"The cooperative's goals are oriented to children. In Springfield, in some cases, they are oriented to maintaining the system and the bureaucracy." (Statement of a director whose score on the mailed questionnaire was below the mean.)

"The focus of the state has changed from that of experts in the field to need processors or management consultants."

"The state is a monetary and regulatory system."

"The goals of the state are now being set by broad social trends and consensus."

The study indicates that the following recommendations are in order:

1. The State should restore the full grant of \$6,250 for each full-time professional employee in a special education program.
2. The State should increase Springfield salaries in order to attract and recruit the most knowledgeable professionals in special education to the Illinois Office of Education.
3. Those employed at the state level should spend less time in Springfield and more time in the field so as to become more knowledgeable about local conditions, such as local costs and union contracts.
4. A better system of communication should be developed between and among those state agencies dealing with handicapped youngsters, both in and out of the school setting.
5. A better system of communication should be developed between the department heads of the Illinois Office of Education, along with an improved computer system, so that better utilization is made of the reports submitted by the directors of special education cooperatives, and so that the same information is not requested by different department heads.

6. A better system of feedback from Springfield should be developed so that the directors of special education cooperatives will know that their reports have been read.
7. The grant application for funding under P.L. 94-142 should be simplified.
8. The State should simplify the process and number of reports required of directors of special education cooperatives.
9. If directors of special education cooperatives feel that the federal guidelines regarding dollars spent for inservice is too limiting for their needs, the State office should exert pressure in Washington to change the mandated percentages and allow for greater flexibility in the use of inservice funds.
10. The state guidelines for the presence of supervisory and support staff at IEP meetings and annual reviews should be revised. If supervisory staff meet with teachers during the preparation of the IEP, their presence should not be required at the IEP conference with parents. Similarly, if teachers and support staff meet together in preparation of the annual review, all support staff members should not be needed at the annual review, and could be freed to give direct service to children.

Implications for Further Study

It should be remembered that the participants in this study were a small number (18). Additionally, Illinois was far ahead of other states in the country in the field of special education at the time P.L. 94-142 was put into effect.

1. A state-wide study could indicate whether or not directors of special education cooperatives in more rural areas of Illinois are faced with the same problems as the directors in the more urban Chicago Metropolitan area.
2. The study might produce very different results if undertaken in another state which had no special education mandate prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142.
3. A study of the function and role of the departments within the Illinois Office of Education in relation to P.L. 94-142 and administrative decision-making might yield information which could be helpful to both the State and the special education cooperatives.
4. A study of how special education cooperatives in the State of Illinois are planning, in light of decreasing funding, declining enrollment, and increasingly larger numbers of handicapped students being identified, might help in developing a more comprehensive state-wide approach to the solution of these problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Black, Max, ed. The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons: A Critical Examination. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Cronin, Joseph M. and Witkowski, Jack. The School Code of Illinois. Springfield: West Publishing Co., 1979.
- Frey, Sherman H. and Getshman, Keith R. School Administration -- Selected Readings. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1963.
- Gearheart, B.R. Administration of Special Education. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- _____. Organization and Administration of Educational Programs for Exceptional Children. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.
- Getzels, Jacob W., Lipham, James M. and Campbell, Roald. Educational Administration As A Social Process. New York: Hayes and Row, 1968.
- Grieder, Calvin, Pierce, Truman M., and Fabis, Jordan. Public School Administration. New York: Ronald Press, 1969.
- Handbook of Special Education, 6th edition. Chicago: Marquis Academic Media: 1980-81.
- Johns, Roe L. and Morphet, Edgar L. The Economics and Financing of Education: A Systems Approach. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Knezevitch, Stephen J. Administrative Technology and the School Executive. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.
- _____. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Lord, E.E. and Isenberg, R.M. Cooperative Programs in Special Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Selltiz, Claire, Wrightsman, Laurence S. and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Simon, Herbert. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1950.

Articles

Bersoff, Donald N. "From Courthouse to Schoolhouse: Using the Legal System to Secure the Right to an Appropriate Education." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 52 #3 (July 1982): 510-512.

Brodinsky, Ben. "Something Happened -- Education in the 70's." Kappan 61 #4 (December 1979): 238-241.

Cober, John G. et al. "Pennsylvania Programs for the Handicapped Get Good Marks for Quality, Cost and Effectiveness." Kappan 60 #1 (September 1978): 160-161.

Colella, Henry V. and Foster, Herbert. "BOCES -- A Delivery System for Special Education." Kappan LV #8 (April 1974): 544-545.

Dienst, Carl J. "Program Evaluation and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act." Exceptional Children 45 #8 (May 1978): 645-646.

Educational and Human Services Research Center, SRI International. "Local Implementation of P.L. 94-142: 3rd Year Report of a Longitudinal Study." Education of the Handicapped 8 #1 (January 27, 1982): 9-12.

Getzels, Jacob W. "A Psycho-Sociology Framework for the Study of Educational Administration." Harvard Educational Review 22 (Fall 1952): 235-246.

Lamb, Jack and Burello, Leonard. "The Role of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE)." Exceptional Children 41 #1 (September 1979): 42-48.

Marro, Thomas D. and Kohl, John W. "Normative Study of the Administrative Position in Special Education." Exceptional Children 39 #1 (September 1972): 5-13.

Orelove, Fred P. "Administering Education for the Severely Handicapped After P.L. 94-142." Kappan 59 #10 (June 1978): 699-702.

Price, Marianne and Jenkins, Diane S. "IEPs: A Cost Study." Exceptional Children 46 #6 (March 1980): 446-451.

- Raske, David E. "The Role of General School Administrators Responsible for Special Education Programs." Exceptional Children 45 #8 (May 1979): 645-646.
- Turnbull, H. Rutherford III. "The Past and Future Impact of Court Decisions in Special Education." Kappan 59 #8 (April 1978): 523-527.
- Vasa, Stanley F. and Wendel, Frederick C. "How School Districts Finance Special Education." Kappan 63 #10 (June 1982): 703-704.
- Weber, Donald B. and Rackoff, Howard S. "The Relationship Between Demographic Characteristics of Local Education Agencies and Compliance with P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 94-142." Journal of Special Education 14 #2 (Summer 1980): 243-251.

Publications

- American Association of School Administrators. The Federal Government and the Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1965.
- Ballard, Joseph. 94-142 and Section 504 -- Understanding What They Are and Are Not. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- CASE Alert. Washington, D.C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1981.
- Cronin, Joseph M. Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education. Springfield: State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, 1976.
- League of Women Voters. Primer on School Finance in Illinois. Chicago: League of Women Voters, 1978.
- Martwick, Richard J. The Office of Cook County Superintendent of Schools. Chicago: Educational Service Region of Cook County, undated.
- Vuillemot, L.D. and Gardner, Charles H. This Is SEDOL. Gurnee, Ill.: Special Education District of Lake County, undated.

Newspaper Articles

- Fiske, Edward B. "New Cuts in U.S. School Aid Will Be Both Deep and Wide." New York Times: July 11, 1982: 1
- Greenhouse, Linda. "Schools Backed on Limited Aid to Handicapped." New York Times: June 29, 1982: 1.

Lauer, Rachel M. "New York's Special Education Has Turned Into a Juggling Act." Chicago Sun-Times, Living Section, November 16, 1980: 8.

Varro, Barbara. "Is Equal Education Law Really Special?" Chicago Sun-Times, Living Section: November 16, 1980: 8.

Unpublished

Lehman, Lloyd W. "Educational Legislation in Illinois: An Analysis of the Activities of School Superintendents in Cook County." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1978.

Warsawsky, Corinne G. "A Role Analysis of the State Approved Director of Special Education in the State of Illinois." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1982.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

SPECIAL EDUCATION DISTRICT OF LAKE COUNTY
4440 West Grand Avenue
Gurnee, Illinois 60031

L. D. Vuillemot, Director
M. V. Brown,
Business Administrator

Phone: 312-623-0021

MEMO TO: Parents

FROM: Your School District and Special Education District of Lake County

SUBJECT: When you have serious questions: Your rights under the law

In relation to the provision of Special Education Services as parents you have certain "rights" under the law. The rights are founded on two major points; 1) your view of your child's needs and 2) meeting with school staff who evaluated your child to determine your child's needs. The school staff will present their finding and recommendations. You have the right to agree to recommendations, or to disagree that your child does or does not need provision of special education services.

If you disagree with the recommended plan the following steps are established by law for mutual rights to all:

1. You may request, from your Superintendent, a hearing. This written request must be made within three days of the first conference.
2. You may provide, at your own expense, your own expert to testify that your child is eligible or is not eligible for special education services at the second conference. Parents may request a professional worker of their choice and at their expense (including legal counsel) to meet with the appropriate school personnel and review the records.
3. The hearing shall occur within (15) calendar days of your request.
4. As required by law, for review by State Superintendent's Office, an official recording will be made of the second conference.
5. Within (4) four calendar days after the second conference, your school district will notify you, by certified mail, of their decision.
6. If you still disagree with your district's recommendations, you have the right to review of the decision by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. If you request such a review, you must submit your request in writing within five (5) days of receipt of your district's recommendations. All placement is postponed until review and decision of the State Superintendent is provided.

SR-2.31542
Form #3
9/9/74 ky

APPENDIX II

**Congressional Appropriations
For Elementary and Secondary Education**
Amounts set aside for major Federal programs in each school year

	1981-82	1982-83	Percent Change
Programs for disadvantaged students	\$ 3.1 billion	\$ 2.9 billion	- 7.0%
Block grants	535.0 million	484.0 million	-10.0
Special education	874.5 million	931.0 million	+ 6.5
Bilingual education	157.5 million	131.4 million	-14.6
Vocational education	681.6 million	653.3 million	- 4.0
Indian education	82.0 million	78.0million	- 5.0

Source: Department of Education

APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES -

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION:

1 - strongly agree; 2 - agree; 3 - undecided or does not apply;
4 - disagree; 5 - strongly disagree.

Since the effective date of P.L. 91-142 in September, 1978:

1. I spend more time in budget preparation.
1 2 3 4 5
2. My per pupil expenditure has increased.
1 2 3 4 5
3. My total budget has increased.
1 2 3 4 5
4. My budget allocation for staff has increased.
1 2 3 4 5
5. I have had to hire additional staff for evaluation and assessment.
1 2 3 4 5
6. The cost of running the business office has increased.
1 2 3 4 5
7. My cash-flow problems have increased.
1 2 3 4 5.
8. I have had to wait longer for state reimbursements.
1 2 3 4 5
9. I have had to allocate non-reimbursable funds to fulfill the mandates of the law.
1 2 3 4 5
10. Legal fees have increased due to more frequent need for legal assistance.
1 2 3 4 5
11. I spend more time dealing with transportation problems.
1 2 3 4 5
12. I spend more time writing grants and proposals.
1 2 3 4 5
13. I spend more time interpreting legal mandates and ramifications to the public.
1 2 3 4 5
14. I spend more time meeting with parents.
1 2 3 4 5

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES

PAGE 2

15. I spend more time preparing for and attending due process hearings.
1 2 3 4 5
16. I spend more time gathering information for and writing reports to the State.
1 2 3 4 5
17. My staff spends more time in curriculum development.
1 2 3 4 5
18. I spend more time in relation to IEPs.
1 2 3 4 5
19. My teachers spend more time in relation to IEPs.
1 2 3 4 5
20. My staff spends more time in annual reviews.
1 2 3 4 5
21. I have had to allocate non-reimbursable funds for training teachers to write IEPs.
1 2 3 4 5
22. I have had to allocate non-reimbursable funds to develop other inservice training for my staff.
1 2 3 4 5
23. I have had to allocate non-reimbursable funds to develop inservice training for regular education teachers who will teach mainstreamed special education children.
1 2 3 4 5
24. I am using my staff in different ways.
1 2 3 4 5
25. I have had to develop a pre-school program.
1 2 3 4 5
26. I have other services and programs I could not afford before.
1 2 3 4 5
27. I have to spend more time monitoring children in private facilities.
1 2 3 4 5

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES

PAGE 3

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. What is the combined number of regular education and special education students in the area served by your cooperative? _____
2. What is the total number of special education children served by your cooperative? _____
3. What is the average per capita cost of educating a child in the regular education programs of your member districts? _____
4. What is the per capita cost of educating a special education child in your cooperative? _____
5. What was the per capita cost of educating a special education child in your district prior to P.L. 94-142? _____
6. What is the average assessed valuation of property in your member districts? _____
7. What is the average income in your member districts? _____
8. What is the average salary of your teaching staff? _____
9. What percentage of your teaching staff has credits beyond the B.A.? _____; M.A. degree? _____; credits beyond the M.A.? _____; doctorate? _____
10. What is your educational background? M.A. degree? _____; credits beyond the M.A.? _____; doctorate? _____
11. What is your salary? below \$25,000? _____; \$25,000 - \$34,999? _____; \$35,000 - \$44,999? _____; \$45,500 and above? _____

Appendix V

INTERVIEW WITH SELECTED DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES

1. Please number these administrative tasks in order of priority, from 1 (high) to 16 (low):

<input type="checkbox"/> Grant writing	<input type="checkbox"/> IEPs
<input type="checkbox"/> reviewing purchase orders	<input type="checkbox"/> Preparation for legal hearings
<input type="checkbox"/> preparing budget	<input type="checkbox"/> attending legal hearings
<input type="checkbox"/> arranging transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> developing new programs
<input type="checkbox"/> public relations	<input type="checkbox"/> observing & evaluating programs
<input type="checkbox"/> meeting with parents	<input type="checkbox"/> staff development - special ed.
<input type="checkbox"/> preparing state reports	<input type="checkbox"/> staff development - regular ed.
<input type="checkbox"/> writing state reports	<input type="checkbox"/> interviewing prospective staff
<input type="checkbox"/> other (indicate)	

2. Which tasks, if any, had higher priority prior to P.L. 94-142 that have had to take lower priority?
3. Which, if any, of your administrative tasks have been sacrificed in order to complete those relative to P.L. 94-142?
4. How much teacher time is devoted to developing and writing IEPs?
5. How much time is spent in annual reviews? - administrative time, teacher time, support staff time.
6. How much has your budget increased? In what areas? Source of money? Have there been budget cuts? In what areas?
7. How are monies allocated to you from your member districts?
8. How much more have you had to allocate for staff?
9. How much of your budget is reimbursable from the State?
10. How many additional staff members have you had to hire? For what areas? Teachers? Psychologists? Social workers? Nurses? Speech therapists? Others?
11. How long do you have to wait for State special ed. payments? What problems does this cause? How do you handle it?
12. How much have administrative costs increased? Computer costs? Costs of running the business office?
13. What other cash-flow problems do you have? How do you handle it?
14. How much have legal fees increased? Reasons?
15. In what ways are you using teachers differently? Supportive staff?

INTERVIEW WITH SELECTED DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES

PAGE 2

16. How much of non-reimbursable budget is devoted to a) search and find? _____; b) housing? _____; c) physical alterations in buildings? _____; d) staff development for special ed. staff? _____; e) staff development for regular ed. staff? _____
17. What is the size of the pre-school program? How much of non-reimbursable budget allocated for this?
18. What other services do you have that you could not afford before?
19. Are more children mainstreamed? What percentage of children are mainstreamed? Compare this with pre-P.L. 91-142.
20. How has the size of your student population base affected your Coop? How does that compare to co-ops larger than yours? Smaller than yours?
21. How has the wealth of your district affected your co-op? How does that compare with co-ops wealthier than yours? Less wealthy?

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Eugenie R. Mirelowitz has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Director
Professor, Department of Administration and
Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Phillip M. Carlin
Associate Professor and Chairman
Department of Administration and Supervision,
Loyola

Dr. Max A. Bailey
Associate Professor, Department of Administration
and Supervision, Loyola

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.

December 5, 1984
Date



Director's Signature