
Devolution, School/Community/Family Partnerships, and Inclusive Education

Wayne Sailor

The purpose of this chapter is to take a close look at the implications of the “devolution revolution” for a particular aspect of public assistance, namely, progress toward inclusive education as federal policy. The term “devolution revolution” refers to the recent shift in federal policy to increasingly turn fiscal resources and responsibilities over to the states for the administration of human services programs. The chapter begins with an examination of inclusion as a policy reform agenda, its origins in special education, and its present focus in general education. Next, the chapter examines the implications of the devolution revolution. It then reviews school/community partnership models and how these models affect, and in turn are affected by, devolution policies. The chapter then examines current issues in school reform and educational reform in general, in terms of how these policy changes interact with devolution, and considers how these various policy reform agendas come together to form the beginnings of a new framework for the provision of child and family assistance and support. Finally, the role of, and implications for, inclusive education in these transformational policy reform efforts are considered, including the future of university-based, special education and other professional training programs.

The concept of inclusion in education has its origins in efforts that began in about 1973 to integrate education of students with severe disabilities within a broader context of general education (Sontag, Burke, & York, 1973). Efforts to create inclusive programs began with a values-based premise; the belief that students with disabilities should not be segregated for their education but should have access to friendships and interactive relationships with nondisabled peers—a civil rights argument (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). When the civil rights/values-based argument came up against the reality of public schools, professionals and parents aligned themselves with disability-rights lawyers and exercised due process as al-

lowed for in the amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act, now known as the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Hearings often escalated into litigation (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1997), and several landmark decisions resulted at the level of appellate courts and the Supreme Court (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). In one case, *Holland vs. Sacramento USD*, a school district spent over a million dollars to prevent a single little girl, Rachel Holland, who had moderate disabilities, from being included in a general education classroom. The district lost, and, in fact, the tenor of virtually all of the significant court cases on the topic have seemed to impel the principle of inclusive education.

Meanwhile, impressive amounts of published research have appeared in the literature of special education, funded through federal policy expressed by the IDEA discretionary grants program. Virtually all of these studies supported further progress toward inclusive education (Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor et al., 1989; Sailor, Gee, & Karasoff, 1993). After nearly two decades of special education efforts at policy reform in the direction of inclusive education, the corner has finally been turned and the question has shifted from “should we do it?” to “how do we do it?” Thus the history of inclusion passed through three distinct phases: (a) the civil rights argument; (b) enforcement litigation; and (c) federal, research-driven policy implementation.

The fourth major phase in the history of inclusion, which is now in its inception and promises to be a key element in implementation of the reauthorized IDEA (Egnor, 1996), is best characterized as school-driven (as opposed to driven by family/professional, legal, and scientific forces, in that order). It is the central thesis of this chapter and, ultimately, this book that this change of circumstances reflects the growing emergence of localized, democratic processes in the allocation and distribution of tax-supported resources in the human services systems (Sailor & Skrtic, 1996; Skrtic, Sailor, & Gee, 1996). Also, these processes are augmented, if not accelerated, by the devolution policies of the New Federalist political agenda. Although special education, as a field, drove policy reform in the first three phases, general education and, to some extent, health and social services systems are now in the driver’s seat. Inclusion is now viewed as part of the broader agenda to unify school resources and integrate programs in ways that benefit all students (Miles & Darling-Hammond, 1998). The reauthorized version of IDEA contains language on “incidental benefits” that, for the first time, places this perspective into the special education statute (Egnor, 1996). The language on incidental benefits refers to the intent of Congress to direct IDEA funds to children in special education for whom Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) have been developed. If, however, under circumstances of inclusive education, general education students receive some “incidental” benefits from the application of special education supports and services, so much the better (Egnor, 2000). Finally, the challenges of implementing inclusive educational programs are driving as well as benefiting from the emergence of collaborative partnership arrangements of the school, the community, and the family.

THE DEVOLUTION REVOLUTION

Not since the time of John Randolph, John C. Calhoun, and Andrew Jackson (c. 1820) has federal policy so clearly advanced an agenda favoring the rights and powers of the individual states. As with “Jacksonian democracy,” the rhetoric of the New Federalism implies a ringing endorsement of the principles of democracy and, in particular, the idea that the best government is local government. Thus we have, at the end of the 20th century, “devolution: the delegation or surrender of powers formerly held by a central government to regional or local authorities” (*Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*, 1986, p. 620).

In 1960, states raised, altogether, less than half of the sum of taxation revenue raised by the federal government. By 1993 states collectively raised 95 cents to every federal tax dollar, and today the lines have crossed for the first time in two centuries; the states now tax more than does the central government. A century of centralized welfare state ended in 1997 with the signature of President Clinton, thus ending the open-ended policy of federal guaranteed income support for needy children and their families. Now, through block grants from the federal government, the states are coming to have the authority and the responsibility to transform welfare into something more like a temporary transitional support to job training and work (Broder, 1997).

These changes in federal and corresponding state policy are very significant in terms of their implications for children and families who need special assistance and support. The Individuals With Disabilities Act (IDEA) of 1990 (P.L. 101–476) is a case in point. Congress has regularly reauthorized this cornerstone of federal education legislation since its inception in 1975 as P.L. 94–142 and has provided incremental increases in levels of support to the states for its administration—that is, until the 104th Congress took up debate on its renewal in 1995 and 1996, and failed to pass its reauthorization. IDEA was finally reauthorized by the 105th Congress after extended and rancorous debate in 1997 and signed by President Clinton. The principal stumbling blocks that had to be overcome by skillful political maneuvering were disciplinary suspension and expulsion, and lawyers’ fees. Both issues are targets of concern of the National Governors’ Association and are primarily general education—rather than special education—issues.

As the federal government devolves funding and responsibility to the states consistent with New Federalism, so do the states, in turn, scramble to seek ways to further devolve responsibilities to regional and local authorities, as depicted in Figure 1.1. As much as states have sought to get the federal government off of their backs with calls for ending “unfunded mandates,” and so on, so do these same states find themselves ill-prepared to administer large, centralized support programs (Council of Governors’ Policy Advisors, 1996; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995). All of this strain is, of course, greatly exacerbated by passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This welfare reform blockbuster, coupled with devolution policy, will over the next few years

Figure 1.1. "Pass-It-Along Politics", © 1997 by Herblock in *The Washington Post*. Used with permission.

quite substantially alter the landscape of how supports and services, including education, are provided to children and families who require special assistance (Chapter 4).

The term “devolution revolution” began to appear in policy literature in 1995 and described much of the agenda being advanced by the activist, Republican-dominated 104th Congress. Although New Federalism had its origins in the Nixon administration and was a cornerstone in the rhetoric of the Reagan–Bush administrations, it took a decade before new federalist policies began to take form and to be implemented in earnest at the state level. The period from 1995 to the present has witnessed an acceleration of new federalist policies, partly in response to the approach of the second millennium marker on the Christian calendar (i.e., Goals 2000, Healthy Children 2000, etc.) and partly in reaction to the passage of the welfare reform legislation. As Gerry (Chapter 4) points out, the welfare reform act significantly devolves welfare responsibility to the states through the block-grant mechanism. In addition to the Child Care and Development Block Grant, after cuts at the federal level representing a transfer of about \$16 billion, states now anticipate a near-term transfer of up to \$90 billion for Medicaid and about \$7 billion for employment and training programs (Stanfield, 1995).

States are reacting to the accelerated neofederalist policy in two principal ways: first, with significant efforts to restructure state government through consolidation and realignment of programs to fit the immediate and anticipated block-grant authorities; and second, with attempts to strengthen the capacity of local communities to implement a more coordinated and decentralized array of programs. Massachusetts, Idaho, Minnesota, Michigan, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Nebraska, for example, have instituted major state restructuring initiatives to consolidate programs and integrate services (Council of Governors’ Policy Advisors, 1996). New York is preparing to launch a system of block grants from the state to local communities. Kansas has recently begun large-scale efforts to privatize much of its child–family public welfare support system, and this effort has run into trouble (Legislative Post-Audit Committee, State of Kansas, November, 1998). Florida has begun a program of organizing and establishing community management boards. Iowa has created nine separate “clusters” at the state level, each organized to respond to a real or potential federal block-grant program. These Iowa clusters meet regularly to create a state and local capacity to decategorize funds (Council of Governors’ Policy Advisors, 1996).

For educators, the new federalist policies of devolution offer a mixed bag of news: good in the form of new opportunities to combine formerly disparate and isolated programs, and bad in the form of fewer funds in most cases with which to administer existing programs. Opportunities to link schools and communities together in common planning and resource management efforts are coming about at a rapid pace. How schools and community services systems respond to these opportunities will depend on their capacities and desires to create new ways of doing things.

Some of the emerging models of school restructuring and school-linked services integration (SLSI) that respond to these challenges are examined in the following sections of this chapter. First, however, let us examine the issue of “inclusion” and where it fits into the broader picture of systems change to accommodate new federalist policies.

INCLUSION

Defining Inclusion

As a field, special education experienced its “great leap forward” in 1975, with passage of P.L. 94–142, the Education of the Handicapped Amendments. With this passage, all children with disabilities who met certain eligibility requirements were enfranchised for a free, public education. The real beneficiaries were those with the most severe disabilities, most of whom had been previously excluded from public education. Since 1975, the dominant theme of policy reform in special education has been concerned with the nature of special education efforts and the extent of their proximity to general education practices. Viewed conversely, special education reform has been concerned with the extent to which students are isolated, grouped, and otherwise “segregated” for the purposes of meeting their educational requirements.

The policy reform thrust in this area, which continues today, has generally dealt with three issues: mainstreaming, integration, and, most recently, inclusion. Each of these three concepts refers to a discrete set of assumptions and practices and each has had its cluster of local policy guidelines for implementation, fair hearing findings, court cases, instructional practices, curricular recommendations, and assessment procedures. Each of the three has its own history and differs in many ways from the other two. For these reasons, it is important to distinguish among them and not to use the terms interchangeably.

Mainstreaming is the older of the three concepts and has been primarily concerned with the amount of time and specific circumstances under which students with mild or moderate disabilities would simply be in a general education classroom (Filler, 1996; Sailor, Kleinhammer-Tramill, Skrtic, & Oas, 1996). Where mainstreaming referred to the specific times that a child with an IEP would not be pulled out for specialized supports and services—for example, to participate in a resource room—the other two concepts are more focused on the extent to which specialized supports and services would be provided in immediate proximity to same-age, general education peers.

Integration as a term grew out of published research findings beginning about 1980 that drew attention to the growing extent to which students with severe disabilities were clustered for their educational day in environments such as special schools, development centers, institutions, and other placement situations far re-

moved from contact with general education peers. As a policy reform effort, integration dominated much of the research, teaching, and policy literature of special education that applied to severe disability for most of the decade of the 1980s (Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor et al., 1989). The primary thrust of the integration movement in reform policy was to educate students with severe disabilities in proximity to their general education peers with opportunities to interact with them, share experiences, and so on. No assumptions were made concerning placement in general education classrooms under the rubric of integration. For the most part, placement in special classes located in regular public schools with time together at lunch, recess, and special occasions were desired outcomes of integrated education (Sailor, 1991).

The term *inclusion* began to appear about 1990 and referred specifically to placing students with disabilities of all ranges and types in general education classrooms with appropriate services and supports provided primarily in that context (Filler, 1996). Where integration had principally to do with proximity and opportunities for social interaction, inclusion has to do with full membership and conjoint participation with peers at all levels of education. Each of these three policy thrusts, beginning with mainstreaming, then later integration, and now inclusion, has represented incremental progress toward gradual realization of a common theme: participation. As will be discussed later in this chapter, this theme of participation and its embedded idea of membership has its counterparts in virtually all human services policy reform literature, including all branches of health service delivery (e.g., “family-centered care”), social services (e.g., “person-centered planning”), judicial programs (e.g., “family preservation”), and so on. Collectively, these themes can be viewed as representative of a gradual emergence of localized democratic processes in the use of tax distributive resources (Skrtic, 1995).

Each of these three concepts engendered much controversy before giving way to the next iteration of the common theme. Arguments against integration focused on the “fragility” of the population of persons with severe disabilities and the need to protect them from harm while imparting educational benefits (Haywood, 1981). Arguments against inclusion have been marshaled more against the difficulty of providing “appropriate” special education practices in the general education classroom (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). With each new thrust, however, the person with disabilities comes to be viewed as more like everyone else and less in need of shelter, protection, and otherwise seemingly patronizing ways to provide assistance.

Sailor (1991) attempted a specific six-point definition of inclusion that was further developed and elaborated upon in Turnbull, Turnbull, Shank, and Leal (1995). The six points are:

1. All students receive education in the school that they would attend if they had no disability.
2. A natural proportion (i.e., representative of the school district at large) of students with disabilities occurs at each school site.

3. A zero-reject philosophy exists so that typically no student will be excluded on the basis of type or extent of disability.
4. School and general education placements are age- and grade-appropriate so that no self-contained special education classes will exist.
5. Cooperative learning and peer instruction are the preferred instructional methods.
6. Special education supports exist within the general education class and in other integrated environments.

Lipsky and Gartner (1997) reviewed some 21 state policies, from an assortment of states, that address inclusion. They concluded that they share a “number of common features in the movement toward inclusion: the importance of leadership, collaboration across the lines of general and special education, the need for changes in pedagogy and school staffing, and financial issues” (p. 113).

It is clear from reviewing the literature on definitions of, and approaches to, inclusive education that the focus has shifted away from special education concerns to whole school concerns. The debate has shifted from how to best apply special education supports and services in the general education classroom to how to align special education with all other school-based resources, including general education, in a manner that most effectively and efficiently imparts a quality education to all of the students at the school. Nowhere has this palpable shift in public policy been more forcefully revealed than in the debate that has occurred in both the 104th and 105th Congresses over reauthorization of IDEA. In previous reauthorizations of IDEA—for example, 1990—debate was focused exclusively on special education concerns. Organizations with a primary focus on general education issues and concerns, such as the National School Boards Association, contributed little to the debate. By contrast, the debate in the 104th and 105th Congresses, leading to the 1997 reauthorization, was largely dominated by the general education organizations, particularly over the issue of removal from placement for reasons of discipline (Egnor, 2000).

SCHOOL/COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

School-linked Services Integration

In a nutshell, SLSI brings school resources and processes into a broader planning context for the allocation and distribution of available community resources to accomplish a forward-looking risk-prevention agenda for children and families. Readers interested in a scholarly review of the history of efforts to integrate human services and link services to schools should see Crowson and Boyd (1993), Gerry (1999; Chapter 4), and Kagan and Neville (1993). Although the space limitations of this chapter prevent a detailed explication of various service integration models, such can be found in Calfee, Wittwer & Meredith (1998), Melaville and Blank (1991), and Melaville, Blank, and Asayesh (1993).

As an approach to the formation of school/community/family partnerships, SLSI models typically occur in one of two forms: school-based service integration, and school-linked, community-based service integration. A third form, discussed in Gerry (1999), integrates services in the community but has no particular ties to schools and thus is of no interest here.

School-based Models

Perhaps the best examples of school-based versions of SLSI can be found in implementation of the *full service schools* concept (Calfee, et al., 1998; Dryfoos, 1994; Dryfoos, Brindis, & Kaplan, 1996). As Gerry (1997; Chapter 4) points out, in the school-based strategy, the school becomes a kind of comprehensive children's center, providing a wide range of psychological, health, social, recreational, and other treatment modalities in addition to traditional educational functions. These "one-stop shops" seek to provide support services to all children in the context of a quality education (Sailor, 1994a, 1994b; Sailor et al., 1996). Such models require a full-time coordinator or program director; a team of culturally sensitive, perhaps bilingual, cross-professional staff (and perhaps family and community members); a designated space for meetings and clinic functions; and, finally, a coordinated means of linking families and all services and supports to the child with the child's educational program (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1997, pp. 17, 252–257).

School-linked Models

Other state initiatives that promote school/community SLSI partnerships call for family resource centers, which may or may not include health clinic facilities, to be established in neighborhoods in close proximity to schools, but not on the school campus. In Iowa, for example, family resource centers linked to schools are associated with the state's Child Welfare Decategorization Program. Locally operated "decat" programs are designed to implement services that are "family-focused, community-based and reduce reliance on out-of-home and out-of-community care" (Bennett, 1994). Thus Iowa's SLSI program is stimulated by the Department of Human Services, which oversees all welfare and juvenile justice authorities. Linkages to the schools are left to local policy rather than mandated at the state level. The Iowa program is largely a pooled funding stream effort but contains a unique feature that makes it a very interesting SLSI model in terms of its long-range prevention potential. If prevention works, investments made in the interests of young children and their families should result in downstream savings. Those very much more expensive programs (i.e., substance abuse, teen pregnancy) that address problems of teenagers, for example, theoretically would not be activated if young children at risk for these problems were successfully treated through a risk prevention strategy (Schorr, 1997). Counties participating in the "decat" program are monitored to determine the financial impact of their total service structure when the investment is made in the prevention agenda represented by the "decat" program. Those counties that realize a savings under this yearly evaluation are allowed

to reinvest that savings in an expanded and restructured system of prevention supports and services.

A common theme that emerges in the descriptions of all of these school/community/family partnership arrangements is that of building “*social capital*” (Stone & Wehlage, 1992). Social capital is “the product of social and organizational relationships among people and is a resource for creating collective action” (Corbett, Wilson, & Webb, 1996, p. 47). When democratic processes are set into motion at a *local* level—say, in forming a school/community/family partnership to implement SLSI—the energy, enthusiasm, and time invested by stakeholders, especially family members from high-risk populations, contribute to the formation of social capital, a process that at once empowers the participant and at the same time provides needed resources to the developing structure. American human services systems have failed historically to recognize the value of social capital, preferring instead to lay responsibility for the provision of assistance in the hands of professionals who, from their agency standpoints, are expected to solve the social problems of others (Sailor & Skrtic, 1995).

Collaboration

Detailed analyses and examples of SLSI initiatives can be found in Rigsby, Reynolds, and Wang (1995), who focus primarily on applications in urban settings, and in Kagan, Goffin, Golub, and Pritchard (1995), who examine state initiatives to accomplish SLSI in Colorado, Indiana, Florida, and Oregon. Finally, the Harvard Family Research Project (1996) reported results-based evaluative data from SLSI programs in some 16 states. All school-linked or school-based service integration systems require an enhanced degree of cooperation among diverse service provider systems. Under traditional community services structures, no real coordination or cooperation was required. It was up to the consumer to seek out each agency, fill out forms for each, and be entered into various databases with various “case managers,” and so on. One of the significant virtues of SLSI models is at least the promise, if not the reality, of a single-entry, coordinated planning mechanism. To make such a “seamless” system work requires both inter- and intra-agency planning and systems change. People such as directors of large agencies, whose budgets often compete for scarce state or local resources, must work together. The speed and efficiency of systems change as well as the extent to which the vision for the outcome is realized may well depend on the nature and structure of these planning efforts.

Crowson and Boyd (1993, 1996) have contributed much to the study of cooperation/collaboration. As they point out, the term *case management* is rapidly becoming pejorative. Informed consumers of human services and supports are disinclined to be considered “a case” and would prefer to manage, at least in part, their own assistance plans. Terms like *planners* and *facilitators* or *family advocates* are replacing *case managers* in these arrangements in SLSI systems. Crowson and Boyd (1996) in turn recognize the extensive contributions of Barbara Gray and her colleagues on the nature and practice of institutional models of collaboration (Gray, 1991; Gray & Wood, 1991).

School-linked Services Integration and Inclusive Education

Again, what do these seemingly disparate areas of systems change have in common? Schools can provide inclusive programs for students with disabilities without participating in an SLSI model. There are plenty of SLSI models around that do not exhibit inclusive educational programs. But the processes that establish and characterize each have many common elements. Can these common elements serve to facilitate the reciprocal development of one or the other if brought into tandem relationship? In our introduction to the September 1996 Special Issue of *Remedial and Special Education*, Tom Skrtic and I argued that such a scenario, although untested, appears likely, at least in theory (Sailor & Skrtic, 1996). Whereas traditional bureaucratic interdependence is hierarchical and monological (top-down discourse), problem-solving entities created to decentralize authority and to disburse resources in a shared modality require organizational structures that are holistic and constructivist. Skrtic (1991) argues that the postindustrial age increasingly requires that products and services be personalized to the particular needs of those who will consume them. This personalization is, in turn, dependent upon collaboration between organizations and their consumers (Reich, 1983, 1990). Postindustrial organizational analysis thus offers a theory of change that is applicable to school reform, to inclusive educational processes, and to community services systems change. Partnerships among consumers and providers to achieve new forms of organization impel movement from cooperation to more personalized forms of collaboration (Gray, 1996). One can hypothesize from such a theory that more efficient and effective forms of inclusive education—with more dramatic educational outcomes for students—will result when democratic planning processes involve family members (consumers) rather than just professionals on the problem-solving team. Similarly, SLSI models will be stronger and will produce better outcomes when their governance structures include consumers.

Kirst and Kelley (1995) make the argument that it is not enough to create SLSI systems without directly linking those efforts to school restructuring and, by this mechanism, to academic outcomes. Their vision for restructured schools mirrors the postindustrial organizational themes delineated by Skrtic (1991).

SCHOOL REFORM AND SCHOOL/COMMUNITY/FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS**School Unification**

A summary of findings from the 5-year study of school reform by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools at the University of Wisconsin (Newmann, King, & Rigdon, 1997) reported the results of a study of 24 elementary, middle, and high schools that had undergone restructuring to improve pupil progress in 16 states. The study was designed to examine the relationship of accountability (strong vs. weak) on student outcomes. What they found was that the

relationship was completely compromised by several other intervening factors. The most significant of these were the organizational capacity of the schools and the presence of an internal accountability system (i.e., progress indicators specific to the school) in the absence of a strong external system (i.e., progress indicators set by the district or state) of accountability.

Thus school reformers, of an earlier generation, having built specialized, highly concentrated enclaves within schools such as special education and Title I programs, now argue for unified, integrated resources with a high degree of local autonomy (i.e., decentralization). The same conclusion has been reached by Howard Adelman, Linda Taylor, and their associates at the UCLA-based National Center for Mental Health in Schools (Adelman & Taylor, 1996, pp. 14–15).

I published an article in 1991 that contained the statement, “Sufficient parallels exist between the general and special education reform agendas to suggest that the time may be at hand for a shared educational agenda” (Sailor, 1991, p. 8). I went on to argue that the rights, protections, and specialized funding afforded through IDEA should be maintained, but only in an integrated, programmatic structure that will use IDEA resources to improve outcomes for children with disabilities in ways that also have a positive impact on children who have not been tagged for special education. The newly reauthorized IDEA bill contains “incidental benefit” language to that effect. This theme was also picked up by Paul and Rosselli (1995) and by Miles and Darling-Hammond (1998).

Site-based Management

One element of contemporary school reform that readily lends itself to an agenda of school unification and integration of resources is decentralized management, or site-based decision making (Sage & Burrello, 1994). Site management councils, sometimes called school improvement committees when part of comprehensive school improvement processes, are most effective when they have shared budget authority with the school administration (Darling-Hammond, 1990). Where schools have site management councils in place to ensure equitable and cognizant distribution of available resources, a school unification agenda can prescribe how resources for integration can be harnessed (McLaughlin & Warren, 1992, 1994). A model for implementing a form of unified school resources was described by Burrello and Lashley (1992). Finally, I provided a broader discussion of the relationship of site-based management, as a school restructuring issue, to school unification policy and inclusive education (see Sailor, 1996).

School and the Family

One of the most salient features of emerging school/community partnerships is the “coming of age” of substantive family involvement in the life of the school. Family/school participation arrangements are being enhanced by recent federal law.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, for example, set new standards for student, family, and school performance (Moles, 1996). The law included a new national goal that was systematically tracked by studies on educational performance. This goal read: "Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional and academic growth of children" (National Education Goals Panel, 1994). One of the objectives listed for the goal directs schools to help parents strengthen home learning experiences and to bring parents into active roles in school governance and decision making (Moles, 1996).

Another aspect of the voice/participation manifestation in school reform is the renewed interest in the students' role in partnership arrangements. Without question, the father of participatory education in the modern age was John Dewey. In *The School and Society* (1899) and *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902) (both reprinted in Dewey, 1990), Dewey argued that the educational process must begin with, and expand upon, the interests of the child. The school should be organized as a "virtual community" with the teacher as a guide, alternating as a coworker with the students. Through this interactive participation, with mutual discovery and problem solving, students will become literate, numerate, democratic citizens through the process of learning by participating. Of course, all of this was lost in the industrial expansion that occurred in what has come to be called the "modern era," with specialization and school organization mirroring "machine bureaucracies" (Skrtic, 1995). Bronfenbrenner (1979) has carried these ideas of Dewey forward by consistently arguing for a relationship between development in children and power sharing as a precursor to the acceptance of responsibility. Epstein (1996) reinforces this view and summarizes some of the recent research in student participation in family/school partnerships.

In her summaries of the research of the National Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning especially, Epstein suggests a number of key points for intervention that may be effective to stimulate school/family partnership arrangements: (a) Increase opportunities for and encouragement of parents' volunteer activities at school; (b) increase extent of family participation in homework and school projects; (c) increase parent inclusion on school governance councils and problem-solving teams; and (d) increase the extent of school/community partnerships at large (Epstein, 1996; Bierman, 1996).

IMPLICATIONS FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The perspective that inclusion is embedded in the bigger set of change issues is well represented in the recent monograph by Hal Lawson and Katherine Briar-Lawson (1997), now at the State University of New York at Albany. Lawson and Briar-Lawson discuss four change initiatives that they see as both interactive and interdependent: school reform (including school reorganization to unify and integrate

resources), parent involvement, school-linked services, and community schools. In their analysis, the distinction between school-based models of service integration, such as full-service schools (Dryfoos, 1996), and school-linked, family resource center models should best be viewed as separate initiatives rather than as versions of a single initiative, as in the special-education-focused model delineated by Sailor (1996) and Skrtic, Sailor, and Gee (1996). The fourth component in the Lawson model, “community schools,” is envisioned as a modern-day representation of Dewey’s concept (circa 1902) of the school as a social center (Benson & Harkavy, 1997). Such community schools today would be education-focused community centers for children and families, possibly operating around the clock and offering programs on a year-round basis. Such schools would become key components in plans to rebuild and revitalize inner-city neighborhoods and in the restoration of democratic traditions and processes. Community schools would offer such programs as adult and family literacy classes; homework and other “latch-key” clubs; classes for students suspended or expelled from the regular program; sports programs; arts and crafts programs; microenterprise and small business development for youth, parents, and families (Lawson & Sailor, 2000).

Citing the work of Adelman and Taylor (1996) and Moore (1992), Lawson and Briar-Lawson (1997) use the term *educational reform* to describe the intersection of the four initiatives they delineate. Educational reform differs from *school reform* by placing policy analysis in a larger context, the school as part of a changing and evolving community system of services and supports for children and families. This concept is consistent with the tripartite analysis advanced in this chapter and published under the rubric “New Community School” (Sailor, 1996).

CONCLUSION

“Other People’s Children”

Asa Hilliard in his 1995 keynote address to the TASH Conference developed the theme of “other people’s children.” According to Hilliard, the welfare state in America was constructed for “them” and is not applicable to “us.” If we wish to procure a house, we secure a real estate agent. If they need a house, they are referred to a housing service. We use money or credit cards to buy food. They use food stamps (the welfare reform act notwithstanding). We get around with cars, buses, and taxis. They use a transportation service. The distinctions are numerous. Hilliard pointed out that it is, at times, hard to discern whether the systems evolved by Americans to support those who need special assistance were designed primarily to benefit the providers (i.e., professionals) or the consumers. Can we as a nation, Hilliard argued, continue to increase tax expenditures that primarily support “professionals, bureaucrats, and gatekeepers” while situations in the streets, in deteriorating communities, and in low-achieving schools continue to

worsen? Clearly, the answer is no, and many of the change processes that have been addressed in this chapter and elsewhere in the book can be linked to this critical issue. See also Delpit (1998) for a thorough analysis of the theme of “other people’s children.”

To summarize, I set out in this chapter to examine inclusion first as a work-in-progress in special education reform and next as a metaphor for broad-based systems-change processes in all of the human services professions and their respective service arenas. The history of inclusive education, is now in its fourth stage of progression, a stage in which it has moved from being a concern for the field of special education to becoming, more rightfully, that of general education and schoolwide reform processes. Processes impelling inclusive education are being accelerated, first by the millennium change date (the years 2000–2001) but, more important, by significant economic forces associated with devolution policies at the federal level.

Community services reform processes that include school-linked or school-based service integration (SLSI) models are possible sources of support and development of inclusive education programs. However, for SLSI models to interact successfully with inclusive school practices, other outcomes of transformation associated with school restructuring must be in place. Again, these broader-based school reform processes demand democratic practices of voice, participation, and collaboration that seem to be present in all human services reform efforts. These themes, which may be described in terms of postmodern social theory or, more conservatively perhaps, in terms of postindustrial organizational realignments in corporate America in the age of advanced communication technologies, afford the potential for each reform process to inform as well as contribute to each of the other two processes, so that they advance as a unit through a combination of school/community/family partnership arrangements.

Inclusion, then, is best viewed within this argument as a necessary cog in a bigger and better wheel. All of these substantive transformations have many implications for how kids, families, service providers, professionals, teachers, administrators, and others go about their various roles in the process. Perhaps we are finally winding down our efforts to do something about other people’s children. Perhaps we are reinventing government in a sense, creating new structures that reduce the importance of differences among us and seek to meet all of our needs in a common marketplace.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (1996, October). *Policies and practices for addressing barriers to student learning: Current status and new directions* (CMHS Policy Rep.). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools, Department of Psychology.
- Bennett, B. (1994). *Iowa Child Welfare Decategorization Project: A model of collaboration*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1997). School and community in the global society: A neo-Deweyan theory of community problem-solving schools and cosmopolitan neighborly communities and a neo-Deweyan “manifesto” to dynamically connect school and community. *Universities and community schools*, 5(1/2), 11–69.
- Bierman, K. L. (1996). Family–school links: An overview. In A. Booth & J. F. Dunn (Eds.), *Family–school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?* (pp. 275–287). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Broder, D. S. (1997), (February 2). Ready or not, governors, here comes the devolution. *The Washington Post*, p. C-2.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burello L., & Lashley, C. (1992). On organizing for the future: The destiny of special education. In K. Waldron, A. Riester, & J. Moore (Eds.), *Special education: The challenge of the future* (pp. 64–95). San Francisco: Edwin Mehlen Press.
- Calfee, C., Wittwer, F., & Meredith, M. (1998). *Building a full service school: A step-by-step guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Corbett, H. D., Wilson, B., & Webb, J. (1996). Visible differences and unseen commonalities: Viewing students as the connections between schools and communities. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform* (pp. 27–48). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Council of Governors’ Policy Advisors. (1996). *The states forge ahead despite the federal impasse: CGPA’s January 1996 survey of states on the “devolution revolution.”* Washington, DC: Author.
- Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. *American Journal of Education*, 101(2), 140–179.
- Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1996). Structure and strategies: Toward an understanding of alternative models for coordinated children’s services. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform* (pp. 137–170). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teachers and teaching: Signs of a changing profession. In R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 267–290). New York: Macmillan.
- Delpit, L. (1998). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Dewey, J. (1990). *The school and society and the child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dryfoos, J. G. (1994). *Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dryfoos, J. G., Brindis, C., & Kaplan, D. (1996). Evaluation of school-based health clinics. In L. Juszak & M. Fisher (Eds.), *Adolescent medicine: State of the art health care in schools* (pp. 221–286). Philadelphia: Hanley and Belfus.
- Egnor, D. (1996). *Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1996: Overview of the U.S. Senate Bill (S.1578)*. Unpublished manuscript, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Disability Policy.
- Egnor, D. (2000). *Idea reauthorization and issue of student discipline: A case study of crisis policy-making in the U.S. Congress*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

- Epstein, J. L. (1996). Perspectives and previews on research and policy for school, family, and community partnerships. In A. Booth & J. F. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?* (pp. 209–246). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Filler, J. (1996). A comment on inclusion: Research and social policy. *Social Policy Report*, X(2/3), 31–32.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. *Exceptional Children*, 60(4), 294–310.
- Gerry, M. (1999). Service integration and beyond: Implications for lawyers and their training. In J. Heubert (Ed.), *Law and school reform: Six strategies for promoting educational equity* (pp. 244–305). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gray, B. (1991). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gray, B. (1996). Obstacles to success in educational collaborations. In L. C. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp. 71–100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gray, B., & Wood, D. J. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 29(2), 95–114.
- Halvorsen, A., & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with severe and profound disabilities: A review of research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), *Issues and research in special education* (pp. 110–172). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harvard Family Research Project (1996). *Resource guide of result-based accountability efforts: Profiles of selected states*. Cambridge, MA: Author.
- Haywood, H. (1981). Reducing social vulnerability is the challenge of the eighties (AAMD presidential address). *Mental Retardation*, 19(4), 190–195.
- Hilliard, A. (1995). *Other people's children*. Presentation to the TASH International Conference, San Francisco.
- Kagan, S. L., Goffin, S. G., Golub, S. A., & Pritchard, E. (1995). *Toward systemic reform: Service integration for young children and their families*. Falls Church, VA: National Center for Service Integration.
- Kagan, S. L., & Neville, P. (1993). *Integrating services for children and families*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kansas Legislative Division of Post-Audit. (1998). Performance audit report. Assessing how well the foster care program in Kansas is working. Parts I & II. Topeka, KS: Author.
- Kirst, M. W., & Kelley, C. (1995). Collaboration to improve education and children's services: Politics and policy making. In L. C. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp. 21–44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawson, H. A., & Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). *Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement and community schools*. Oxford, OH: Institute for Educational Renewal.
- Lawson, H., & Sailor, W. (2000). Integrating services, collaborating, and developing connections with schools. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 33 (2), 1–22.
- Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- McLaughlin, M. J., & Warren, S. H. (1992). Outcomes assessments for students with disabilities: Will it be accountability or continued failure? *Preventing School Failure*, 36(4), 29–33.

- McLaughlin, M. J., & Warren, S. H. (1994, June). *Resource implications of inclusion: Impressions of special education administrators at selected sites* (Policy Paper No. 1). Palo Alto, CA: Center for Special Education Finance.
- Melaville, A. I., & Blank, M. J. (1991). *What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services*. Washington, DC: Educational and Human Services Consortium.
- Melaville, A. I., Blank, M. J., & Asayesh, G. (1993). *Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Miles, K. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Rethinking the allocation of teaching resources: Some lessons from high performing schools. *Educational Evolution and Policy Analysis*, (2)1, 9–29.
- Moles, O. C. (1996). New national directions in research and policy. In A. Booth & J. F. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?* (pp. 247–254). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Moore, D. (1992). The case for parent and community involvement. In G. Hess (Ed.), *Empowering teachers and parents: School restructuring through the eyes of anthropologists* (pp. 131–156). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- National Education Goals Panel. (1994). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Rigdon, M. (1997). Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(1), 41–74.
- Paul, J. L., & Rosselli, H. (1995). Integrating the parallel reforms in general and special education. In J. L. Paul, H. Rosselli, & D. Evans (Eds.), *Integrating school restructuring and special education reform* (pp. 188–213). Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Reich, R. B. (1983). *The next American frontier*. New York: Times Books.
- Reich R. B. (1990). Education and the next economy. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Education reform: Making sense of it all* (pp. 194–212). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rigsby, L. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Wang, M. C. (Eds.). (1995). *School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sage, D. D., & Burrello, L. C. (1994). *Leadership in educational reform: An administrator's guide to changes in special education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. *Remedial & Special Education*, 12(6), 8–22.
- Sailor, W. (1994a). New community schools: Issues for families in three streams of reform. *Coalition Quarterly*, 11(3), 4–7.
- Sailor, W. (1994b). Services integration: Parent empowerment through school/community partnerships. *Coalition Quarterly*, 11(3), 11–13.
- Sailor, W. (1996). New structures and systems change for comprehensive positive behavioral support. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 163–206). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A., Doering, K. F., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). *The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

- Sailor, W., Gee, K., & Karasoff, P. (1993). Full inclusion and school restructuring. In M. E. Snell (Ed.), *Instruction of students with severe disabilities* (4th ed., pp. 1–30). New York: Charles Merrill.
- Sailor, W., Kleinhammer-Tramill, J., Skrtic, T., & Oas, B. K. (1996). Family participation in New Community Schools. In G. H. S. Singer, L. E. Powers, & A. L. Olson (Eds.), *Redefining family support: Innovations in public-private partnerships* (pp. 313–332). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sailor, W., & Skrtic, T. (1995). American education in the postmodern era. In J. L. Paul, H. Rosselli, & D. Evans (Eds.), *Integrating school restructuring and special education reform* (pp. 418–432). Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Sailor, W., & Skrtic, T. M. (Eds.). (1996). School/community partnerships and educational reform (Special issue). *Remedial and Special Education*, 17(5).
- Schorr, L. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Skrtic, T. M. (1991). *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Denver, CO: Love.
- Skrtic, T. M. (1995). The organizational context of special education and school reform. In E. Meyen & T. Skrtic (Eds.), *Special education and student disability: Traditional, emerging and alternative perspectives*. Denver, CO: Love.
- Skrtic, T. M. (Ed.). (1995). *Disability and democracy: Reconstructing (special) education for postmodernity*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Skrtic, T. M., Sailor, W., & Gee, K. (1996). Voice, collaboration, and inclusion: Democratic themes in educational and social reform initiatives. *Remedial and Special Education*, 17, 142–157.
- Sontag, E., Burke, P., & York, R. (1973). Considerations for serving the severely handicapped in the public schools. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 8, 20–26.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Stanfield, R. L. (1995, September 9). Holding the bag? *National Journal*, p. 2206.
- Stone, C., & Wehlage, G. (1992). *Community collaboration and the structuring of schools*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Turnbull, A. P., & Turnbull, H. R. (1997). *Families, professionals, and exceptionality: A special partnership* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- Turnbull, A. P., Turnbull, H. R., Shank, M., & Leal, D. (1995). *Exceptional lives: Special education in today's schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1995, May). *Welfare programs: Opportunities to consolidate and increase program efficiencies* (GAO/HEHS-95-139). Washington, DC: Author
- Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language unabridged*. (1986, p. 620). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.