

## Special Education: Challenges for Rural School Systems

A. James Artesani and David W. Brown

*University of Maine*

*This article describes how one rural school system facing perceived increasing costs for special education, a concern for the impact special education programs have on staff and general education programs, and limited federal, state, and local resources, completed an in-depth analysis of its special education services. The review process used, the data gathered, and the lessons learned may serve as a guide for other educators and school districts facing this or similar issues.*

Special education has big problems, not least of which is that it must redefine its relationship with general education. Now is the time to learn from inventive pragmatists, not extremists on the right or the left. Now is the time for leadership that recognizes the need for change; appreciates the importance of consensus building; looks at general education with a sense of what is possible; respects special education's traditions and values and the law that grids them; and seeks to strengthen the mainstream, as well as other educational options that can provide more intense services, to enhance the learning and lives of all children (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994, p. 305).

Since the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act in 1975, educators have struggled to incorporate special education services into the overall mission and policies that serve as operational guidelines for their school systems (Kauffman, 1995; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986). In too many cases, however, special education continues to operate as a set of educational services separate or parallel to those of "general" education (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Lipsky, & Gartner, 1997; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1996). To address this problem, some school systems have included specific language to ensure that their mission statements and policy manuals reflect the intent to make high quality educational services available to "all students." Despite these efforts many school systems still operate under mission statements and policies that provide minimal guidance for the development of well coordinated educational services that integrate the needs of special and general education students. It is not surprising then, that the provision for and costs of special education services have come under increasing scrutiny in recent years.

Many educators, parents, and concerned community members are questioning the burgeoning number of stu-

dents receiving special education (Briand, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 1996) and the concomitant rise in costs associated with such services (Allis, 1996; Casey & Dozier, 1994). Indeed, there is a national trend toward increased numbers of students receiving such services (Briand, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 1996). However, a number of highly plausible explanations have been posited to at least partially account for these increases. First, as improved medical and psychological care provide greater life expectancies for children with disabilities, more students come to school with associated learning problems. Second, developments in psycho-educational assessment have both increased and improved methods for identifying students with disabilities which adversely affect their learning. Finally, improved methods of instruction and overall service delivery for students with disabilities have increased the demand for services from teachers, parents and advocates.

Poverty is an additional factor often associated with increased numbers of students requiring special education. It is important to recognize that most families who experience poverty strive to provide warm and supportive home environments for their children. Despite this, poverty has been linked to children's educational performance in terms of lower school attendance due to ill health, the likelihood of falling behind in school, and being identified for special education (Sherman, Wright Edelman, & Solow, 1994). Moreover, there is an increased likelihood that students who live in poverty will experience emotional and behavioral problems (Korenman, Miller, & Sjaastad, 1995; McLeod & Shanahan, 1993). Family poverty has also been linked to high levels of stress, depression, and substance abuse. These factors also increase the risk of children in poor families experiencing abuse and/or neglect (Korenman, Miller, & Sjaastad, 1995).

Despite these identifiable contributors to increases in the number of students receiving special education, many people don't understand the problem or resent the increased costs associated with providing these services to students. For example, Rothstein and Miles (1995) reported data from

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to A. James Artesani, College of Education & Human Development, University of Maine, 5766 Shibles Hall, Orono, ME 04469-5766. (jim.artesani@umit.maine.edu)

nine public school districts showing that district expenditures going to regular education had dropped from 80% to 59% of total district expenditures from 1967 and 1991, while the dollars going to special education increased from 4% to 17% (Rothstein & Miles, 1995). This study both illustrates the concern of policymakers and educators that special education services are being provided at the cost of adequate programs for general education students and that these costs may be beyond the control of local educational policy boards.

This article utilizes a case study approach to demonstrate how the school board of one rural Maine system sought to respond to these issues by conducting a review of their special education programs in the context of providing appropriate education services to all students in the system.

In Maine, as in many states throughout the country, a growing number of communities and school systems are lamenting the rising costs of special education and the perceived related loss of resources for regular education programs. One concerned school board member from a rural consolidated school system posed a number of questions to fellow board members during an annual budget development workshop. The focus of the questioning was: Do you feel we are informed enough tonight to make decisions regarding special education services? If not, do you feel that in the limited time we have to allot to this issue we will be adequately prepared to make decisions concerning financial, staffing, and resource requests for the coming year? Do you feel that the costs for special education services inhibit our ability to support other new program requests during the budget process? Do you believe there is an understanding in our community of the need for special education services and majority support for providing those services? As a result of this line of questioning, the board as a whole, through its administrators, decided to obtain the services of external consultants to provide the data and analysis it felt it needed to proceed.

#### *The Review Team*

A four-member review team was contracted. One member was a former superintendent of schools in Maine and Commissioner of Administration in the Governor's cabinet. He is a specialist in school business management and school finance. The second member is a specialist in special education and a university faculty member in special education. The third member was a former superintendent of schools, Associate Commissioner of Education, and expert in school leadership, educational law, and finance. The fourth member had expertise in design and survey methods. Collectively they developed a plan consisting of eight elements: (a) review of relevant research, (b) review of the policy manual of the district for related relevant material,

(c) interviews with all administrators and special education teachers in the district, (d) surveys of all regular classroom teachers about their opinions of the special education program, its adequacy and impact on their students and classrooms, (e) review and analysis of 10 years of records of the system and state special education data, (f) review of expenditure patterns in the district for 10 years, (g) review of 10 years of school board minutes for related actions and attention of the board, and (h) interviews with knowledgeable state department special education personnel.

#### *The School System*

The system under discussion serves approximately 3,135 students in grades K-12 from four Maine communities in eight schools (see Table 1). The Central Office has a professional staff consisting of a superintendent, assistant superintendent, and director of special services.

Based on this analysis, the following challenges to the board of education concerning special education services in this school system were identified: a lack of accurate information, an absence of policy necessary to guide decision making, the rising number of students receiving special education and the cost of these services, and the absence of community involvement and support.

#### Data Collection and Results

##### *Mission Statement/Policy Audit*

The first step was to review the system's written mission statement and district policies regarding both general and special education services. A mission statement had been adopted in 1994 which articulated beliefs about student learning, instructional techniques, and accountability for the education community including certified personnel, administrators, the board of directors, parents/guardians, students, and the communities in the system. The mission statement addressed all students, and did not make a distinction between groups of students in the system. There were no items specifically addressing students with special needs and/or beliefs held by the system relating to them. It appeared that no clear mission statement at all had been in place prior to the 1994 adoption.

In the review of district policies, 19 were identified which made reference to special education. Two were noteworthy: Programs for Handicapped Students and Procedures on Parent Involvement. These had been reviewed in 1994, revised, and adopted, but had not actually been placed in the policy manual. This was corrected during the review. This oversight, however, did suggest that day-to-day decisions had been taking place without the guidance of an appropriate written policy.

Table 1  
*School Demographics*

School	Total Pupils	Special Education Pupils	Administration
K-6	35	2	Teaching Principal
K-6	235	29	Principal
K-2	200	32	Shared Principal
K-3	500	82	Principal
3-6	275	33	Shared Principal
4-6	400	64	Principal
7-8	490	85	Principal
9-12	1000	84	Principal & Asst. Principal

*Note.* The middle and high schools serve students from all four communities.

One other district policy was found that greatly impacted program delivery. Educational technicians were hired to work, usually with one or two students at a time, to assist teachers in implementing students' educational programs. They most often work directly in regular classrooms. However, the identified policy prohibited the hiring of educational technicians on a full-time basis. While it appeared that the policy resulted in savings for the district in that these part-time employees received no benefits, unanticipated negative outcomes for students and teachers were identified. First, turnover in many of the positions had been extremely high. For example, during the past 5 years, 91 different Educational Technician IIs had been hired in the system. One position had five different employees in the first 6 months of the year. Second, all teachers reported that morale among educational technicians was low. They reportedly did not feel they were adequately compensated and that their work was appreciated. Further, teachers who supervise these high turnover positions report spending valuable potential instructional time interviewing, supervising, and training new educational technicians.

The district policy manual in place at the time of the review might best be described as "generic." Only procedures and the minimum required by special education regulations had been adopted. There were no policies providing direction to parents, students, teachers and administrators concerning the system's mission for special education or to guide routine decisions related to students receiving special education. For example, it was unclear what model or philosophy guided how special education services were provided, or whether the schools followed an inclusive model or one based on the least restrictive environment. This lack of specific direction led to confusion for both parents and educators. From the interviews with the teachers and administrators, it was found that decisions of this type were made at the building level with no uniformity throughout the system. Leaving these decisions to be made

at the building level has created an inclusive model at one school while students receive services through a resource or pullout model at another.

#### *Minutes of Board of Directors Meetings*

The actual work of the school board was examined by reviewing the minutes of all board meetings for the past 10 years. Issues addressed, decisions, or actions taken and the implications for special education services were recorded. It was clear from reviewing 10 years of minutes that special education services had been receiving an increased amount of attention from the board (see Table 2).

#### *Interviews*

Individual interviews were held with the seven principals, assistant superintendent, superintendent, and the special education director to provide the reviewers with an in-depth view of the special education services currently provided and how the provision had evolved. Individual and group interviews were conducted with all special education teachers and some of the educational technicians and related service personnel ( $N = 26$ ). All interviews were semi-structured (Patton, 1980) and consisted both of predetermined questions and opportunities for individuals to express personal views.

An analysis of interviews with the 10 administrators identified serious gaps in program implementation. To a person, each expressed the concern that there was little or no direct supervision or coordination from the central office. Principals were responsible for leading student identification and placement processes within each school. The director of special education and/or assistant superintendent only became involved when a student placement recommendation might create an out-of-district placement, or the Individual Education Plan delivery might become ex-

Table 2  
*Percentage of Board Actions Related to Special Education*

Year	Board Actions Related to Special Education
1989-1992	1.13%
1992-1995	2.93%
1995-1997	4.45%

ceptionally costly. Principals decided for themselves what level of supervision or leadership they would provide their special education teachers. As a consequence, principal involvement varied substantially from school to school.

Special education teachers also reported that the lack of supervision from central office administrators was a significant detriment to providing quality special education services. While some building administrators had assumed this responsibility to some extent, special education staff members felt that their principals, although willing, often did not have the time or expertise to assist them with many of their problems. This was particularly true regarding curricular needs of students with severe emotional or developmental disabilities. The lack of input from the central office also inhibited the development of a consistent philosophy, mission, policies, and practice to guide the provision of special education services. Although the caseload numbers of the special education director were deemed reasonable, the size of this system, the number of schools served, and the distances between these rural schools made travel and access a problem.

Teachers identified three specific problems resulting from the lack of coordination at the central office level. They include: little or no supervision of staff, no common professional development activities, and no consistent program delivery, especially in regard to the use of educational technicians. This was particularly evident at the points of transition between schools (i.e., between elementary and middle school, and between middle and high school). Teachers both at the middle and elementary schools felt that transition planning for students moving between elementary schools and between the elementary schools and the middle school was inadequate. Teachers at the elementary level reported that, in some cases, they would simply be told that a special education student would be transferring to their classroom. Teachers at the middle school reported that they seldom had the opportunity to work with their elementary peers to develop transition plans for students moving to the middle school.

In each school, the teachers' and principals' perspectives of the principals' leadership were similar. In all but one school, teachers interviewed felt they received adequate to outstanding support from their building administrator.

However, in one school, teachers were unanimous in believing that the principal did not adequately support the special education program. In this school, it was common practice for classroom teachers to send students to the special education classroom at unexpected times. They also reported that the regular teachers in this school did not follow through with previously agreed modifications to instructional programs in their classrooms. Without consistent leadership from the building principal, the special education staff found itself in an uncomfortable position and tension had been created between special and regular educators.

Further investigation through interviews with teachers and the special education director also revealed significant inconsistencies in the overall prereferral process. Problems with the prereferral process were most evident as to the role of Student Assistance Teams (SAT) in the identification process, a practice required under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The actual involvement of the SATs varied greatly from school to school. The evaluators found that in two schools the SATs played significant roles in the prereferral process, while in others it had virtually no meaningful involvement.

Teachers and administrators in these schools reported that fewer prereferrals became formal referrals to special education and related service personnel when the SAT was involved. This resulted in fewer evaluations conducted by special educators to determine eligibility for special education services. The higher numbers of referrals in some schools led to the following identifiable negative effects on instructional services as reported by teachers and administrators: (a) an inordinate amount of time was devoted to conducting evaluations and writing reports rather than providing instruction; (b) more substitutes had to be hired to cover classes while teachers were conducting evaluations; (c) workloads during nonwork hours (e.g., evenings and weekends) increased for scoring evaluations and writing reports; and (d) the school social worker was found to be spending increased time conducting evaluations of students referred for severe emotional disturbance rather than providing direct services to students and families. Administrators, special educators, and the social worker concurred that pressure from regular educators to identify students with challenging behaviors as eligible for special education services, inadequate prereferral processes, and inadequate evaluation methods in the behavior impairments category all contributed to the burgeoning numbers of students receiving special education services.

Additional concerns related to the inefficient use of instructional time were identified through interviews with principals and special education teachers. These problems revolved around efforts to communicate with central office staff and parents, and Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) meetings and the development of Individualized Education Plans (IEP). Special education teachers consistently ex-

Table 3  
*Mail Surveys (N = 139)*

Teachers Agreed Item	K-6	7-8	9-12
Special education students needs being served	51.3%	42.9%	71.4%
Regular education students being served	38.5%	47.6%	58.6%
Adequate access to special education consultants	71.8%	40.0%	79.3%
Special education consultants are helpful	68.4%	40.0%	75.9%
The special education students in my class take away from the learning of regular education students	82.1%	81.0%	34.5%

pressed frustration with trying to communicate with the central office staff about scheduling PET/IEP meetings, and such general programmatic needs as requesting materials or obtaining guidance on program related decisions. Specifically, teachers complained that the time of day when they were most able to make phone calls, around noon-time, was also the time when central office staff simultaneously took lunch breaks. Thus, teacher's phone calls went unanswered until later, when they were typically unavailable to receive calls due to teaching responsibilities. In addition, special education teachers also reported losing valuable instructional time as they searched for telephones in private locations so that they could make confidential phone calls to parents, for finding private locations for PET meetings, and for typing PET minutes and IEPs from handwritten notes.

A related problem concerned the sheer amount of time special education teachers were spending writing, editing, and typing assessment reports, minutes from PET and IEP meetings, and developing the IEPs themselves. While elements of this concern could be addressed through strengthening the prereferral and identification process, significant amounts of potential instructional time were lost to these tasks. Teachers unanimously felt these responsibilities could be accomplished more efficiently, resulting in increased time spent on activities more directly related to instruction by increased availability of technology, such as laptop computers, and the reservation of private places for confidential phone calls to parents to be available at predetermined periods of each day.

### *Surveys*

Mail surveys were sent to all general education teachers ( $N = 139$ ) in the district to obtain their perspectives on special education services in their district and the impact

of special education students in their respective classrooms (see Table 3).

Teacher opinions varied by school level with regard to special education issues. For example, at the high school 71.4% reported that special education students' needs were being served, while that number decreased to 42.9% at the middle school and 51.3% for elementary teachers. When asked about regular students, 58.6% of the high school teachers believe their needs are being served compared with 47.6% of the middle school teachers and 38.5% of the elementary teachers.

All but the middle school teachers reported having adequate access to special education consultants and that the consultants were helpful. All levels agreed that educational technicians are helpful, and most elementary and middle school teachers desire greater access to educational technicians to work with special education students in their classrooms.

Teachers at all levels do not agree that special education students have a positive impact on the education of regular students. Eighty-two percent of elementary teachers, 81% of middle school teachers, and 34.5% of high school teachers reported that special education students take time away from regular students. Specifically, 68.6% of the teachers reported spending more than 2 hours a week modifying lessons, 45.7% reported spending more than 2 hours consulting for behavior management issues, and 37.1% reported spending more than 2 hours consulting on instructional issues. During follow-up discussions, general education teachers reported that this question was not answered in the context of their current classroom situation. Also, general education teachers reported they have inadequate support from special education teachers and educational technicians, and that is why modifications for special education teachers are so time consuming. Lack of support was also cited as the reason many educators did not agree

Table 4  
*Selected Summary of 10-Year Comparison with State*

Item	System Compared with State Percentage
Percentage of students identified	Greater
Percentage of behavior impairment	Greater
Percentage of learning disability	Less
Percentage mainstreamed	Greater
Percentage exiting to regular education	Equal

that having students from special education in their classroom has a positive impact on the education of students without disabilities.

#### *State and Local Program Data*

The review team analyzed annual state and local reports related to how students had been identified (e.g., exceptionality classification), where they had been placed, and the success of programs in terms of the percentage of students who had graduated and/or exited special education programs for the general education program. This process provided the review team with both a comprehensive picture of current practices and the history of how those practices developed in this district and the state as a whole.

During the last 10 years, the number of students identified as having special needs statewide has increased by 24.98%, as compared to 39.4% for this district. Over the last 3 years, the district's increase was 16.45% compared to 11.84% for the state. For each of the past 10 years, the percentage of students identified in the behavior impairment category was greater than the state average while the percentage of those identified as having a learning disability was less (see Table 4).

A greater percentage of district students were "mainstreamed" compared to the number of students mainstreamed statewide, while those exiting to regular education were consistent with state averages.

#### *Regional Economic Conditions*

Interviews with administrators and a review of the student count data by disability category revealed a significant increase in the number of students receiving special education services in this system. When asked why this was occurring, school and central office administrators, teachers, and the school social worker reported a drastic change in the economic conditions and demographics within their district. The interviewees described a decade long flight of industry and well paying jobs from the rural towns

which made up this school system. This was accompanied by a rise in poverty as demonstrated by the increase in subsidized housing and meal programs at the schools (see Tables 5 and 6).

A number of interview respondents also expressed concern that substance abuse by parents and the abuse/neglect of children had increased in this school system. Interviewees consistently suggested that these conditions were contributing to the higher number of students requiring some kind of specialized assistance to be successful in school. In addition, the interviews and student count data indicated that some students who were not achieving as expected or exhibited problem behaviors, but did not have disabilities, were being identified for special education services.

While proving a direct link between lowered economic conditions in this region and rising special education costs was not the purpose of this investigation, the evaluators, school personnel, and board members felt the impact of poverty on the education of students and the well being of the community at-large was a concern that warranted further examination by the school system and local human service agencies.

#### *Financial Data*

Ten years of district expenditure patterns were reviewed and documented. Items examined included state and local general purpose aid, instructional costs for special education and regular education programs, and administrative costs. These data were compared with state data as well as with six similar school districts in the state.

Initially, the review team compared special education costs in this district to state averages. Statewide, General Purpose Aid (state aid) from 1986 to 1994 increased by 69% while local support (primarily from property taxes) increased by 98% for an overall increase of 83%. The increase in expenditures for instructional costs for general education was 62%. (This does not include administration, operation of plant, transportation, and debt service.) State special education costs during this same time span increased by 116%.

The pattern within the district studied is consistent with the state as a whole except that in each category the district increase has been less than the state average. Also, the cost figures cannot be analyzed in isolation. One must consider at the same time the number of students identified and served and the number of programs and services available to students. Here we find that for the state, overall expenditures increased at 116% compared with 98% in the district, while students serviced increased in the district by 39.4% compared with only 24.98% statewide.

Table 5  
*Free and Reduced School Lunch Data 1992-1996*

Year	Enrollment	Number	
		Free & Reduced	Percentage
1992	3,108	899	28.9
1993	3,125	895	28.6
1994	3,074	987	32.0
1995	3,020	977	32.4
1996	2,992	976	32.7

#### Recommendations to the District

The reviewers made 13 recommendations to the Board of Directors.

#### *Mission/policy*

1. Revise the present mission statement and adopt new policies that provide appropriate guidance for the development of integrated services for all students.

#### *National Trends*

2. Develop strategies to inform school board members, administrators, teachers, and the community at-large of (a) local, state, and national trends in public school enrollments of more children with disabilities, and (b) the legislative reasons for these recent trends. In addition, improved evaluation methods are increasing the likelihood that students with specific learning and behavioral impairments will be identified and found eligible for special education services.

#### *Changing Economic Conditions*

3. Create a task force with representation from local human service agencies and the school department to examine the changing economic conditions in the community and how they may be affecting children. Specific focus should be given to how these economic needs impact school planning and the allocation of resources. The task-force should investigate models of coordination between rural school and community-based human service providers, often referred to as wrap-around services (Eder, Nelson, & Miles, 1997). Such services have been shown to be

particularly effective in meeting the complex needs of students with developmental disabilities and mental health issues.

#### *Identification Practices*

4. Sponsor inservice training for general education teachers concerning the definitions of various disability categories and eligibility guidelines for special education services. Emphasis should be given to the categories of learning disabilities and severe emotional disturbance because these are two of the most frequently occurring disability types, and their definitions are often misunderstood by school personnel.
5. Develop a prereferral process that includes a review of each case by a Student Assistance Teams to increase the likelihood of effectively addressing the needs of students prereferral process who do not have disabilities that would qualify them for special education services.
6. After incorporating a more complete prereferral process, reexamine the system's possible need for a second full-time evaluator.
7. Conduct regular reviews of the prereferral process and evaluation methods used by teachers, related service personnel, and the current district-wide evaluator. This can be done by a team that includes the special education director and representative members of the staff who conduct evaluations.

#### *Use of Instructional Time*

8. To save teacher time, use technology such as laptop computers to ease the extensive paperwork that is typically associated with special education. One laptop computer at each school would save teachers a great deal of time when typing and editing PET minutes and assessment reports.
9. Identify a private place that will be available at predetermined periods of each day for teachers to conduct confidential phone calls.
10. Develop a rotating lunch schedule that ensures that at least one central office staff member

Table 6  
County Data: Percentage Above State Average

Item	Percentage
School children receiving free lunch	19.9
Children aged 0-17 participating in medicaid	15.8
Child deaths; rate per 10,00 children aged 1-14	51.8
Child suicides rate per 10,00 age 10-19	73.8
Low birth-weight infants	14.0
Arrests of children aged 10-17	14.6

is available to answer phones during the noon hour when teachers are most likely to call.

11. Special education teachers should not be viewed as having "ownership" of the students for whom they provide special education services. Students who receive special education should be the responsibility of all teachers.
12. General and special education should not be seen as two separate service delivery systems. Problems or concerns with special education services should be viewed as a system issues, not solely a special education concern.

#### *Supervision from Central Office Staff*

13. Given the large, rural geographic region served by this school system, the responsibility for the supervision and support of special education teachers should be examined in the following ways: Review the responsibilities of the special education director to ascertain the capacity for effective supervision and support; consider assigning part of the supervisory responsibility to the assistant superintendent or other appropriate central office staff; and consider developing a mentor program whereby experienced teachers provide feedback and support to new faculty members.

#### Summary

To the leaders of rural schools, a major challenge has been issued. They are responsible for the provision of services designed to keep all students in school, to maximize their potential and aspirations, and to make reports as to the success they have received to local, state, and federal constituencies. The values, beliefs, and assumptions that drive these new schools will be different from those of traditional schools; here is a commitment to make a difference in learning for all students and for all members of the school community. Educational leaders in rural schools must demonstrate leadership ability. (Brown & McIntire, 1995, p. 17)

In this time of challenges for rural school systems, it is clear that processes must be in place to ensure that decision makers at all levels have accurate information. This article describes the concerns of a school board that questioned the legitimacy of the decisions they were being asked to make regarding special education services. As the review process unfolded, it became clear that decisions at all levels were being made without adequate information or clearly defined guiding policies and procedures.

In effective school systems, services are designed to reflect the mission and goals of that system. The first step in this analysis is to identify clearly the mission and goals followed by the development of policies and procedures to achieve the desired outcomes. The services provided by the system being evaluated must be in concert with the mission and/or purpose statements established by the system. The consistency between a system's mission and goals and its guiding policies and procedures is one of the benchmarks used to measure the integrity of the educational services provided, and forms a rational basis for the decision-making processes.

It is important that input from all levels be valued by decision makers. In this case study, the data received from the classroom teachers, related service providers, building level and central office administrators, and consultants provided valuable input to school board members. Districts should also evaluate their services according to standards derived from outside the system. In this case study, student placement data and expenses were compared to comparable school systems and/or the state averages. Although all school systems are different, these program analysis methods provide an opportunity to assess whether the services provided are in the best interest of students and consistent with the system's mission.

The areas reviewed and the specific challenges outlined in this article provide insight into how one rural school system gained a better understanding of its special education services, and how these services related to the overall

mission of the system. With accurate information, controversy is minimized and community support is improved. Given recent trends in special education, these are important issues rural school board members should consider in their quest to make informed decisions and to anticipate the challenges they will face in the future.

#### References

- Allis, S. (1996, November 4). The struggle to pay for special ed. *TIME*, 148(21), 82-83.
- Briand, X. (1995). Disabled students numbers rising at record pace. *Special Education Report*, 21(1), 3.
- Brown, D. W., & McIntire, W. (1995). Leadership in rural special education. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 17-24.
- Casey, C. M., & Dozier, P. W. (1994). Cutting costs in special ed. *The American School Journal*, 181(10), 27-30.
- Eder, L., Nelson, C. M., & Miles, P. (1997). School-based wrap-around for students with emotional and behavioral challenges. *Exceptional Children*, 63(4), 539-555.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. *Exceptional Children*, 60, 294-309.
- Kauffman, J. M. (1995). Why we must celebrate a diversity of restrictive environments. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practices*, 10, 225-232.
- Korenman, S., Miller, J. E., & Sjaastad, J. E. (1995). Long-term poverty and child development in the United States: Results from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 17, 127-151.
- Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- McLeod, J. D., & Shanahan, M. J. (1993). Poverty, parenting and children's mental health. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 351-366. Packard Foundation, 1997.
- Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 391-398.
- Rothstein, A. S., & Miles, K. (1995). *Where's the money gone? Changes in the level and composition of education spending* (Clearinghouse No. EA027656). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Sherman, A., Wright Edelman, M., & Solow, R. M. (1994). *Wasting America's future: The children's defense fund report on the costs of child poverty*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 102-111.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (Eds.). (1996). *Inclusion: A guide for educators*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1996). The eighteenth annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Rethinking special education. *Educational Leadership*, 44, 26-31.