

Linking General Education and Special Education

A Position Paper Of the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee CSEAC - July 2001

2000-2001 CSEAC Members

Marcia Tewell 2000-2001 Co-Chair
Leeanne Seaver 2000-2001 Co-Chair

Leeanne Seaver Linkages
AdHoc Committee Chair

Diane	Bassett	Roger	Piwowarski
Robin	Bolduc	Katherine	Poseley
Nancy	Carlson	Brett	Prilik
Cindy	Dascher	Alan	Rasmussen
Debra	Farmer	Stella	Sanfratello
Vivien	Hagler	Nancy	Sarchet
Laney	Heath	Cynthia	Smetak
Elizabeth	Hesse	Ed	Steinberg
Maryanne	Keller	Stephen	Stryssar
Bertha	Kondrotis	Jane	Toothaker
DeDe	Landry	Jim	Typer
Antoinette	Libby-Clare	Jon	Vigne
Gary J.	Lovato	Renee	Walbert
Stephanie	Lynch		
Patty M.	Meek	Lorrie	Harkness- Director of Special Education
Laura	Merrill	Faye	Gibson - CDE Liaison to committee
		Romie	Tobin - CDE Liaison to committee
		Karen	McCaleb – Linkages committee AdHoc Member
			Doctoral Student – University of Northern Colorado

LINKING GENERAL EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
Position/Policy Statement of the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee
January, 2002

The Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) has taken the following position on the issue of creating a more effective system blending General Education and Special Education:

I. Statement of Values

WHEREAS the education of all students in General and Special Education is the shared responsibility of every educator, family member and student.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1997(IDEA '97), Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1414 (d)(3)(C)

Colorado Department of Education - State Improvement Plan for Special Education (CDE-SIP), 2001

WHEREAS all students are required to have access to a standards-based curriculum that provides opportunities for attainment of appropriate progressive learning outcomes.

IDEA '97, Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1412 (a)(2)

CDE-SIP, 2001

WHEREAS all students have the right to participate in standardized state and district assessments of learning.

IDEA '97, Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1412 (a)(17)(A)

CDE-SIP, 2001

WHEREAS the achievement of progressive learning outcomes requires well-trained and competent educators, as well as supports and services that are appropriate to the unique needs of each student with an Individual Education Plan.

IDEA '97, Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1412 (a)(15)

IDEA '97, Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1412 (a)(4)

CDE-SIP, 2001

WHEREAS the best learning outcomes are the result of active collaboration between educators and families in a student's school life from the homework level to the systems-development level.

IDEA '97, Part A, 20 U.S.C. Section 1400 (c)(5)(B)

WHEREAS the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act emphasizes the opportunity to learn in the Least Restrictive Environment with access to the general curriculum, with appropriate individualized supports.

IDEA '97, Part B, 20 U.S.C. Sections 1412 (a)(5)(A)

WHEREAS a continuum of services and/or a variety of placement options will continue to be appropriate for all students with disabilities based on their individual needs.

IDEA '97, Sections 300-550-553

II. It is the opinion of The Colorado State Special Education Advisory Committee that appropriate services for students with exceptional learning needs are severely compromised by the following challenges:

A. Personnel Issues:

- 1.Lack of sufficient training to meet the needs of diverse learners
- 2.Lack of knowledge and tools on collaborative techniques
- 3.Shortage of qualified staff
- 4.Large caseloads and the diversity of need for each
- 5.Overwhelming amount of paperwork
- 6.Insufficient supports for eligible students
- 7.Decreased time for direct services to students
- 8.Fewer college students going into the field of special education

B. Funding Issues:

- 1.Insufficient funding for general education
- 2.Insufficient funding for students with exceptional learning needs

C. Philosophical Issues:

- 1.Lowered expectations for students with exceptional learning needs
- 2.Lack of administrative support at the district and building level
- 3.Lack of acceptance of students with special needs within the school community
- 4.Unintended consequences of high stakes

III. THEREFORE, efforts to improve existing systems and create new and better programs must be a committed priority for both Special and General Education in these areas:

A. Personnel & Financial Issues

There will be an adequate supply of qualified personnel to meet the identified needs of children and youth with disabilities and to provide equal access to quality education. (Colorado State Improvement Plan for Special Education, 2001)

1. Training:
 - a. General education awareness of Special Education law/adaptations
 - b. Requirements for all educators, paraprofessionals and administrators to receive staff development on all related topics
2. Awareness and Support for Adaptations in General Classroom Settings:
 - a. Accommodations, modifications, specialized instruction
 - b. Fiscal resources
 - c. Physical space and equipment
 - d. Time for planning and instruction
 - e. Human resource/caseloads needs
3. Fiscal Constraints:
 - a. Underpaid staff and salary issues
 - b. Inadequate professional development funding
 - c. Lack of funds for equipment, materials and other resources

B. Philosophical Issues

The number of General and Special Education professionals and paraprofessionals trained in research-based effective practices and possessing the knowledge and skills to improve educational results for children with disabilities will increase. (Colorado State Improvement Plan for Special Education, 2001)

1. Shared Responsibility for Teaching:
 - a. Positive, accepting attitudes in a supportive school climate
 - b. Teaching and learning outcomes are addressed
 - c. The role and responsibility of the General Educator and the Special Educator in the collaborative process are clearly understood
2. Collaboration Between General and Special Education:
 - a. Team teaching
 - b. Administrative support
 - c. Supporting mechanisms (i.e., prep time) in place
 - d. Philosophical harmony
 - e. Leadership and administrative support for training
 - f. Ownership of students and teacher accountability

IV. BE IT RESOLVED that the CSEAC recommends the following policies be adopted:

- A. All program and initiatives funded by the Colorado Department of Education Sliver Grants will be prioritized by their reflection of

General and Special Education collaborative values as stated in this policy.

- B. A representative from General Education will serve on the CSEAC and act as a liaison with groups and or organizations for General Educators. *CDE-SIP, 2001*
- C. In future reviews of Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)/ Teacher Education/Staff Development programs for General Education majors, policies resulting from such reviews should endorse a basic understanding of Special Education regulations and collaboration values and strategies. *CDE-SIP, 2001*
- D. IHE teacher education programs will infuse extensive training in Special Education laws, adaptations, and methodologies throughout pre-service teacher and administrator preparation programs.
- E. Special Education training will be made available to General Educators and families.
- F. School principals will give General Educators a copy of all Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for students receiving services and supports in their classroom at the beginning of each academic year. Further, a checklist of accommodations and or modifications shall be developed in collaboration with general educators for each student. *CDE-SIP, 2001*
- G. Increased supports for collaboration for General and Special Educators, will be provided and maintained, (e.g., includes time to collaborate and funding).
- H. Increased training and awareness for building administrators on issues of responsible inclusion of all students will be provided to assure access to the General Education curriculum.

LINKING GENERAL EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
Position/Policy Statement of the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee

Review of Research

Foundations for collaborative teaching: Research supporting the viability of linking general and special education

The purpose of this position paper by the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) is to emphasize and substantiate the legal viability, the necessity, and the effectiveness of General Education and Special Education collaboration. This committee believes that collaboration between these two entities will benefit all children, with and without disabilities. This Committee also believes that Colorado policy decisions should support and encourage collaboration practices in our schools.

CSEAC acknowledges that a variety of educational settings need to be available to students of all ages in Colorado to ensure that all students have a meaningful learning environment that meets and supports their diverse needs and learning styles. Among these environments is the General Education classroom. As students with disabilities are increasingly being educated in the General Education classroom, the need for a collaborative partnership between General and Special Education is imperative for student success. Collaboration, denoted as “a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal” (Friend & Cook, 2000, p.6), joins two historically separate disciplines. It is no longer appropriate for these two entities to work in isolation. Former Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Judith E. Heumann stated,

Historically, we have had two education systems, one for students with disabilities and one for everyone else. We are working to create one education system that values all students. The regular classroom in the neighborhood school should be the first option for students with disabilities. Administrators and teachers must receive the training and the help they need to make that the best option as well. (U.S. Department of Education, 1997).

In order to meet the needs of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, effective collaboration between General and Special Education is essential. The growing amount of literature and research contends that collaboration is beneficial not only for students with disabilities, but for ALL students as well as educators. Despite these data, many schools do not develop and practice effective collaboration.

Understanding the need for general and special education collaboration

The traditional roles and responsibilities of General and Special educators continue to shift in today's schools. As more and more children with disabilities are educated in the regular classroom, the need for effective collaboration between the two disciplines is becoming increasingly important in providing a successful learning environment for all children.

Over 5 million children in the United States, approximately 1 out of 10 students, receive Special Education services. Most these students spend the majority of their school day in General Education classes (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). However, the National Center on Education Statistics reports that 78% of teachers who have students with disabilities in their classrooms feel unprepared to address students' educational needs (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). As a result, many students are unable to be successful in the general education classroom without necessary supports.

Collaboration is credited with providing positive outcomes for students with disabilities, students without disabilities, and teaching professionals. Friend and Cook (2000) state that collaboration fosters a sense of community that leads to increased student success as well as teacher satisfaction. Nowacek's 1992 study of teachers identified education benefits, affective benefits, and professional benefits of collaboration. One study participant noted five instructional advantages:

1. Collaboration provides an additional level of service between resource services and monitor status in which the resource teacher consults with the General educator but does not provide direct services to students.
2. It provides more services to students who need it. Students may be in one or more collaborative classes and receive a pull-out or resource class as well.
3. It allows some students to be mainstreamed who would not be able to be successful in the general classroom unless a Special Educator was also present.
4. It provides services to students who have not been found eligible for Special Education but who need additional help.
5. Most of the Special Education students and many of the General Education students think this arrangement is helpful to them.

Recent literature, research, and best-practice studies support the need as well as the effectiveness of General and Special Education collaboration. Although the importance of collaboration is well documented, many schools do not provide staff development and training programs in this area.

Barriers to Collaboration

Despite the substantial research and literature base that supports collaboration as "best practice", there continues to be many barriers that interfere with collaboration. These barriers can be classified into three distinct categories: personnel issues, philosophical issues, and financial issues.

Challenge A: Personnel issues. Perhaps the most common problem is the lack of trained personnel. This lack of training may be due to inadequate teacher preparation programs and/or to the nationwide teacher shortage. Villa, Thousand, and Chapple (2000) summarize the following statistics provided by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future:

- More than 30% of beginning teachers leave the field in the first five years.
- In the 1990s, more than 50,000 people who lacked the training required for their jobs entered teaching annually on emergency or substandard licenses, and 27% of new teachers had not completed license requirements in their main teaching areas.
- In schools with the highest minority enrollments, students have less than a 50% chance of getting a science or mathematics teacher who holds a license and a degree in the field in which he or she teaches.
- More than 2 million new teachers will be needed by 2007; stated otherwise, more than half the teachers who will be teaching in 2007 will be trained between 2000-2007. (p. 531-532)

In addition to adequately trained personnel shortages, other issues exist. The roles and responsibilities for Special Educators have continued to steadily increase. Between 1977 and 1995, the number of students receiving Special Education services has increased by 47% compared with a 2% decrease in General Education enrollment (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). These expanding caseloads have led to an increase in meetings and paperwork. During the 1998-99 school year, 87% of Special Educators reported that they did not have enough time to spend with each individual student (The Council for Exceptional Children, 1998).

Another natural consequence of the increased responsibilities is lack of time to plan with General educators. Idol and West (1987) note that the lack of time for planning and evaluation greatly impacts the collaboration process.

Colorado, specifically, is facing a critical teacher shortage. This shortage of licensed teachers is due in part to an increase in population growth, enforcement of smaller class sizes, and the fact that up to a third of Colorado's teachers are within retirement age. However, an additional factor involves teacher salaries. With an average starting salary for teachers in Colorado of \$24,867 versus \$41,136 as the average starting salary of college graduates in general, many prospective teachers select other, more lucrative fields.

Challenge B: Funding Issues. A second barrier to effective collaboration involves funding issues. Federal as well as state funding continues to be a topic of concern. Although federal and state mandates frequently place increased requirements and responsibilities on school districts, these mandates do not provide full funding. The financial responsibility falls primarily on individual districts, which is frequently a cause of conflict between General and Special Education as both entities require money from the districts' general funds. Despite the call for educational reform, federal and state funding policies do not fully support such measures.

In contrast to the state's educational funding difficulties, Colorado's overall growth and development has resulted in prosperity as well as low unemployment rates.

Within the past eight years, Colorado has added an estimated 600,000 jobs (Demographics Daily, 2000) and was ranked 5th in the country for economic growth between 1992-1998 (U.S. Commerce Department, 2000). Colorado has also been awarded an “A” in economic performance, business vitality, and development capacity for the seventh year in a row (Expansion Management Magazine, 2001). With this population and economic growth, school enrollment has also increased. However, in spite of these economic facts, Colorado has earned a grade of “D” in its adequacy in funding resources. In a report issued by Quality Counts 2000, several categories indicative of high-quality education systems were evaluated for each state. According to this measure, Colorado ranked 46th out of the 50 states. This information is compounded by the fact that Colorado did not receive the State Improvement Plan grant from the U.S. Department of Education for the years 2000 and 2001, resulting in further shortages of resources.

The Colorado state legislature recently mandated that a study be conducted to explore educational funding issues for students with disabilities. In October 2000, the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) submitted the study’s research findings to the Colorado State Board of Education.

Federal, state, and local school districts’ general funds are the three primary sources of special education funding. According to the MPRRC 2000 report, federal funds are provided through grants from the (1) IDEA Part B, (2) IDEA Preschool Services, (3) IDEA Part H Infant and Toddler Services, (4) Transition Services, (5) School-to-Work Alliance Program (SWAP), (6) Vocational Education, (7) Vocational Rehabilitation, (8) Systems Change, and (9) Carl Perkins Grants to the States. State funds are generated through (1) the Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA) and (2) the Per Pupil Operating Revenue for 3 and 4 year old children with disabilities. During the 1996-97 school year, Colorado’s combined total of federal and state funding accounted for only 27.8% of total special education funds. Of this amount, federal funds comprised 8.9%, while state funds accounted for 18.9% of the total revenues. These restricted amounts caused local school districts to fund approximately 69.3%, or two-thirds, of the total funding for special education.

This limited federal and state financial support places a substantial financial responsibility on Colorado’s 176 school districts. This local burden of 69.3% is far greater than the national average of 32%. Federal and state limited funding for special education impacts personnel issues, training and development issues, as well as General and Special Education relationship issues.

Challenge C: Philosophical Issues. In addition to personnel training and availability, teacher attitude also influence the effectiveness of collaboration. Karge, McCure, and Patton (1995) state that teachers’ lack of training in teamwork and a negative attitude toward its implementation are interrelated barriers to collaboration. In order for collaboration to be effective, General and Special Education teachers must be committed to its success.

One philosophical obstacle of collaboration is that teaching practices have historically been conducted in isolation. Although many schools have attempted to develop feelings of community, teachers are often autonomous in their classrooms.

Teachers have been trained to work independently of each other and often have not received collaboration training or experience.

Finally, teachers may be hesitant to work with a child who has disabilities. General educators often feel unprepared and insecure to meet a child's specific needs in addition to meeting the needs of the rest of the class. This may be due to a lack of information, training, or Special Education support.

Resolutions

Despite many of the barriers facing collaboration, numerous schools have discovered solutions to these barriers and have benefited from their efforts. An example of this is illustrated by the state of Vermont. Vermont was able to overcome difficult personnel, funding, and philosophical issues through its commitment to develop active collaboration within its schools.

Vermont's Act 230 (1990) dedicated 1% of the total state Special Education budget to training teachers and administrators effective collaboration strategies to support students in General Education and community environments. The documented effects of Act 230 are reflected in the following statistics:

- In contrast to the situation in other states, the number of students identified as eligible for Special Education decreased by 18.4% from 1990-1995 in Vermont.
- Students' performance, rule-following behavior, and social engagement had not diminished.
- Every school in Vermont has some variation of an instruction support team that, overall, has been judged effective in supporting teachers to avoid Special Education referrals through the development of the collaborative problem-solving skills of staff.
- Many schools have restructured to integrate Special Education and other remedial services into the General Education classroom. This effort has increased educators' flexibility to collaborate, to use team teaching, cooperative learning, and integrated curriculum approaches. As a consequence, an additional 22,000 students who are at risk of school failure but are not technically eligible for Special Education have access to Special Education supports and expertise.
- Every school has used state funds to expand professional development for all staff in areas such as collaboration, technology, integrated curriculum, discipline systems that teach responsibility, and crisis prevention and management. (Villa & Thousand, 2000, p. 18)

Personnel Issues. Through collaboration, General and Special educators work together for the benefit of their students. Members of collaborative teams have stated that their job satisfaction is much higher than when they worked in isolation. Teachers are able to share resources, knowledge, expertise, materials as well as emotional support. This sharing leads to a stronger sense of community and collegiality.

Financial Issues. Financial support is necessary to enact and support systems change. Limited financial support influences districts' funding priorities. Funding that

could be used for training in collaboration development is often used for other purposes. Approximately 55% of all Special Education funding is used for identification, testing, administration, and other non-instruction services (Rothstein & Miles, 1995). Although districts report that inclusive education programs are no more expensive to maintain than traditional segregated models (“Does inclusion cost more?” 1994), the initial financial cost for collaboration planning, training, and professional development may be substantial. General and Special Education collaboration is often not a funding priority for districts that are already overburdened with Special Education expenses.

The October 2000 MPRCC report specifically recommends that Colorado increase state ECEA funding from the approximate 18.9% closer to the national average of 32%. This report further suggests that this increase could be implemented over a five-year period. An increase in state funding would lessen the funding demands at the local level and positively impact several factors such as obtaining/retaining qualified personnel as well as resolving financial conflicts between General and Special Education.

Philosophical Issues. Teacher attitudes and expectations can greatly impact the student-teacher relationship. This relationship “influences the students’ own attitudes, expectations, and behaviors” (Colarusso & O’Rourke, 1999, p.7). As students are being taught in general education classrooms, it is imperative that a trusting relationship based on mutual respect and high expectations be developed between the classroom teacher and students.

Through collaboration, teachers can receive the information, training, and support they require to feel competent in working with all their students. Staff development issues in the area of collaboration can have long lasting, positive, school-wide results. Friend and Cook (2000) outline the following list of staff development outcomes:

1. *Knowledge or awareness* - understanding educational practices, curriculum, concepts, academic content to be taught, educational theories, and legal or procedural requirements.
2. *Attitude change* - one’s disposition toward one’s self (confidence, role changes), others (colleagues, parents, students), academic content (math, English as a Second Language), or new requirements (teaming, paperwork, inclusion).
3. *Skill development* - to the acquisition and refinement of discrete proficiencies and strategies.
4. *Adoption* refers - embracing the innovation that is the basis for the staff development and consistently using it, including transferring the training to appropriate use in the learning environment. (p.112)

The ability to collaborate effectively is a necessity in today’s schools, not a luxury. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s future states that the ability to collaborate with other teachers is critical to be an effective teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Teachers also need to possess the skills required to teach students with diverse backgrounds and characteristics; collaborative practices can augment these skills. (Darling-Hammond, 1997).

Programs that have made the commitment to General and Special Education collaboration have benefited in a variety of ways. The primary goal of supporting

students with disabilities in the General Education classroom is only one of the positive outcomes. The commitment to overcoming the barriers of successful collaboration leads to a more cohesive school community in which all students are valued. “When collaborative efforts result in higher levels of trust and respect among colleagues, and working together results in more positive outcomes for both students and professionals, the risks seem minor compared to the rewards” (Friend & Cook, 2000, p. 13).

Summary

As educational reform continues to be a prevalent issue in today’s society, more effective methods of meeting the needs of all students will remain a topic of discussion. The fields of General and Special Education are in a state of change in which the previous roles and responsibilities in each field are constantly shifting and emerging. These fields must continue to evolve to meet the ever-changing needs of today’s students. As students learn to work together to attain a common goal, so must their teachers. However, change cannot happen without tangible support.

General and Special Education collaboration is one of the changes that must occur in order for all students to learn and grow in today’s schools. In 1998, the International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development met to discuss the “implications and ramifications of including students with disabilities within systemic education reform initiatives on pre-service and ongoing professional development” (Smith, 2000, p. 115). This symposium generated a list of “Common Understandings” for future discussion (Smith, Doll, & Gengel, in press):

- a) Better prepared teachers who are more adept at teaching all students will also be adept at including students with disabilities in the General curriculum.
- b) Impending changes in schooling require that General and Special Education teachers be prepared to teach in cooperative/collaborative teams whose collective instructional competence is the synergistic combination of each members’ unique and complimentary skills.
- c) Demands on General and Special Education teachers are shifting rapidly and dramatically. The struggle to accommodate this change contributes to teacher distress and limits their participation in school reform.
- d) Professional development to support the inclusive education of students with disabilities must include both pre-service preparation of beginning teachers and ongoing professional development of teachers who are already working in schools.
- e) General Education teachers often feel unprepared, ill-equipped, and unsupported to include children with disabilities in their classrooms, either because of limitations that they identify in their own skills; the increased complexity of classroom needs; or the limited resources they have to accomplish the additional demands presented by the children. Their hesitance is magnified by historical tendencies for classroom teachers to work in isolation and for schools to assign complex instructional tasks to “experts” from outside classrooms.

- f) Students with disabilities and their families must become full and equal partners in decisions related to schooling. Teacher preparation programs similarly require more and better communication with people with disabilities and their families.
- g) Educational systems and services for students with disabilities must be coordinated with systems and services provided by other professionals and community agencies, particularly medical and mental health services.
- h) School - University partnerships hold the promise of simultaneous renewal by grounding university teacher preparation programs in the practice of schooling and by providing schools with opportunities to become part of the scholarship and research of university faculty and students.
- i) School - University partnerships hold the potential to shift our thinking by requiring encounters among persons with different roles and perspectives. (p. 115).

General Education and Special Education collaboration is a prevalent theme in the United States as well as other countries. As shown through the research, effective collaboration can yield positive outcomes for all students and even the professionals involved. It is for these reasons, that the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee endorses the practice of collaboration in Colorado schools and supports efforts by individuals and schools to develop collaborative programs and relationships that benefit all of Colorado's children, and is specifically recommending policies as stated in section IV of the attached position paper.

References

- Colarusso, R., & O'Rourke, C. (1999). Special education for all teachers. Dubuque, IO: Kendall / Hunt Publishing Company.
- The Council for Exceptional Children. (1998, February). CEC launches initiative on special education teaching conditions. CEC Today Online.
- Demographics daily. (2000). Demographics Daily Online.
- Does inclusion cost more? (1994). Inclusive Education Programs, 1(5), 4-5.
- Education Week on the Web (2000). Quality Counts 2000: Who should teach. [On-line] www.teachermagazine.org/sreports.
- Expansion Management Magazine Online. (2001). 2000 Development Report Card. [On-line] <http://devel.newhope.com/public/edd>.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2000). Interactions. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Idol, L., Nevin, A., & Paolucci-Whitcomb, P. (2000). Collaborative consultation. Austin, TX: Pro-ed, Inc.
- Idol, L. & West, J.F. (1987). Consultation in special education. Part II: Training and practice. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 474-493.
- Karge, B.D., McClure, M., & Patton, P.L. (1995). The success of collaboration resource programs for students with disabilities in grades 6 through 8. Remedial and Special Education, 16(2), 79-89.
- Meyen, E.L., Vergason, G.A., & Whelan, R.J. (1996). Strategies for teaching exceptional children in inclusive settings. Denver: Love Publishing Company.
- Mostert, M.P. (1998). Interprofessional collaboration in schools. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center Spectrum Consulting, L.L.C. (2000). Special Education Funding in Colorado.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). The condition of education, education of students with disabilities. [On-line]
- Rainforth, B., & York-Barr, J. (1997). Collaborative teams for students with severe disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.

Rothstein, R., & Miles, K.H. (1995). Where's the money gone? Changes in the level and composition of educational spending. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Smith, A. (2000). Challenges facing institutions of higher education preparing inclusive educators. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 25, 113-115.

Smith, A., Doll, J., & Gengel, K. (in press). Common understandings. OSERS/OECD international symposium on inclusion and professional development. Denver: University of Colorado at Denver.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2000). Gross state product 1992-1998 high-tech manufacturing and business success boost growth in western states. [On-line]

U.S. Department of Education. (1997). 17th Annual Report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). 21st Annual Report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, DC: Author.

Vermont State Department of Education. (1990). Report on the Special Commission on Special Education, State of Vermont. Montpelier: Author.

Vermont State Department of Education. (1993). Vermont's Act 230 three years later: A report on the impact of Act 230. Montpelier: Author.

Vermont State Department of Education. (1994). Act 230 evaluation: 1993-1994 preliminary results. Montpelier: Author.

Vermont State Department of Education. (1995). Vermont's Act 230 and special education funding and cost study. Montpelier: Author.

Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J.S. (2000). Restructuring for caring and effective education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Expansion Management Magazine Online. (2001). 2000 Development Report Card. [On-line] <http://devel.newhope.com/public/edd>.