ABSTRACT
         Although Public Law 94-142 (Education for All
Handicapped Children Act) raised public awareness of the civil rights
of the handicapped, the policy problems that it was intended to solve
included more than civil rights issues. In particular, the law did
not provide for modifications of its policies in improving public
education opportunities for handicapped children. A critique of
policy implications and lessons of P.L. 94-142 is possible by
examining the law under the categories of policy formation,
implementation, evaluation, and termination. Some laws, such as P.L.
94-142, may reflect only one perception of educational problems and
thus become prescriptive. Moreover, the procedures for implementing
policy often are defined after the fact; in the case of P.L. 94-142,
problems of interagency cooperation and appropriate local strategies
have surfaced. Policy evaluation, which in theory should oversee the
implementation process, may often be neglected due to lack of data or
to public opposition to elements of the originally formulated policy,
as has occurred with P.L. 94-142. Finally, policy termination, little
discussed by educational policy-makers, should be considered even in
the policy formulation stage; neglect of such considerations may
account for dissatisfation with P.L. 94-142. (JW)

THE CYCLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY:

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY RESEARCH

Barbara A. Intriligator
University of Maryland - College Park

A Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting Of

The American Educational Research Association

New York, New York

March 26, 1982

2

THE CYCLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY RESEARCH

Setting the Context

P.L. 94-142 must be viewed as landmark education policy: first, it
served as a basic civil rights document for handicapped children in the
nation, and their families; second, it asserted a federal interest that a
free and appropriate education be provided to all handicapped children, and
then proceded to define the ways in which administrators must provide these
educational services. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975
was ambitious both in its intended purpose and in the amount of money that
was authorized for its administration. This major federal education policy,
in turn, forced the passage of state and local legislation, as state education
agencies (SEAs) and local school systems (LEAs) began to assume responsibility
for delivering expanded and alternative services to an ever-increasing number
of children identified as part of the target population. In this way,
94-142 became the most prescriptive education policy to date.

In essence, federal policy-makers turned to the public schools to
redress the neglect that had been articulated regarding the educational needs
of handicapped children. Interestingly, advocates for the passage of this
special education policy did not come only from the professional education
community. Rather, they represented the interests of groups concerned with
helping handicapped persons become informed and viable citizens in the
society--associations for retarded citizens, United Cerebral Palsy, and
learning disabilities advocate groups. In their view, handicapped children

3

were entitled to free and appropriate services within the public schools,

because schooling was seen as the major access to the common-wealth.

In a sense, then, providing free appropriate public education to the

handicapped was viewed as a liberating force by the advocates of P.L. 94-142.

It was, in my judgement, this "civil-rights" aspect of the proposed policy

that was necessary to get into the public consciousness an agreed upon def-

inition of the problem. On the other hand, the emotionality of this advocacy

position prevented proponents from responding to early reactions to the

administration of the policy. Indeed, implementing the requirements of

P.L. 94-142 created many difficulties for school system personnel who were

asked to organize and deliver these new services. Unfortunately, difficulties

with implementation were often equated by the special education community with

an unwillingness to end discriminatory practices. In fact, the problems that

142 was intended to solve were very complex, and moved far beyond the civil

rights aspects of the legislation.

No aspect of the educational effort was left untouched by P.L. 94-142.

It was passed in 1975, and there are now, in 1982, significant revisions being

considered by the Hill. These intense reactions may be attributed to the

prescriptive nature of the policy, and to the fact that its advocates tended

to view it in a vaccuum, separate from other major issues confronting the

public schools. From a policy analysis perspective, however, P.L. 94-142

allows us an unique opportunity to study the whole policy process in a time

frame of less than a decade.

The Policy Environment

Problems that emerge from the entire social fabric of society are often

treated as matters of concern for the educational community; indeed, the
public turns to education as a potentially accessible governmental institution
and holds it responsible for a variety of dimensions that make a major dif-
ference in children's lives--including their well being, health, basic competence
and future mobility in society. However, at the same time that education
policy-makers and administrators are being asked to respond to problems that
are both consequential and complex, the public is exhibiting an increasing
lack of confidence in their ability and efficacy. All of these issues contri-
bute to the present turbulent environment and set the context in which the
education policy process now occurs.

     For these reasons, a particular policy problem cannot be addressed in a
vaccuum. Mobilizing the attention and resources of the education community
towards the solution of a particular policy issue--such as a free appropriate
public education for handicapped children--displaces the energy of that com-
munity from other issues to which it must attend. In addition, public attention
is not unlimited, and advocates for a particular education policy are at once
asking the public to address its concerns and not to address the concerns of
others. Thus, in considering the possible adoption of a new policy, policy-
makers need to be concerned with those pressing matters that will need to be
displaced temporarily, as the new policy assumes a position of primacy in the
policy terrain.

     At the time of the passage of P.L. 94-142, the educational community
was also being asked to deal with the emerging issues of the back-to-basics
and accountability movements, as well as to continue to deal with the needs
of Title I recipients and other "targeted" populations. Little attention was

paid by the advocates of 94-142 to ways in which their new policy concerns
could be linked to the other issues in the education policy environment.
Indeed, these broad concerns with the general "sorry state" of the public schools
were cast as antithetical to special education needs. Because these competing
demands on the educational community were kept separate and distinct from each
other, it was inevitable that the public attention would again shift, and
therefore, that the special education focus would itself be displaced.
Finally, attention to the general policy terrain informs the entire education
policy process.

Education policy questions have economic, psychological, political, soc-
iological and ethical components, each of which can inform a potential solution
to the problem. Because these problems are so complex, we do not know their
answers, and rather have to posit a variety of complementary solutions. In
this event, any education policy represents only one of a complex variety of
potential responses to the problem. The drafters of Public Law 94-142
treated the legislation as one global response, or solution, to a number of
related educational problems (albeit their over-arching concern was with
issues of inclusion and belated inclusion of previously unserved and underserved
populations). Moreover, they did not treat the enactment of 94-142 as an
experiment, that is as a proposed solution to a problem that would be re-
evaluated within a particular time frame. Indeed, the law does call for
periodic evaluation of its impact on the proposed clientele, but not for a
reassessment of its appropriateness as a strategy for dealing with the
educational problems of the handicapped.

There are probably a number of reasons why this essential check-point
in the policy process was ignored by the special education advocates, including
the adversarial posture that they took towards the more general educational
community. In a more generic sense, however, these policy-makers had treated
the implementation of the legislation as a linear process. In essence,
they had identified what they thought was the solution to the educational problems
of handicapped children--P.L. 94-142. They then went about in a very systematic
way to monitor the programs and activities of designated implementors--State
Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs)--to insure that
these implementors were in compliance with the law. In addition, they identified
points in this systematic process when these implementors would have to
account for the degree of compliance each had achieved. However, provisions
were not made for making modifications in the policy itself--that is, for
re-evaluating whether or not the policy as it was originally constructed remained
a viable and workable national strategy for improving the public education
opportunities of handicapped children.

The Education Policy Process

Education policy may be conceived of as codified public opinion about
the conduct of education. It usually takes the form of a legal, or authoritative,
statement made by a governing body entitled to enact it. Legislation such as
Public Law 94-142 may be viewed as a national education policy statement,
intended to insure the provision of free and appropriate public education to
all handicapped children. The way in which an education policy is formulated,
implemented, evaluated and terminated constitutes the education policy process.
A number of theorists have identified different stages in the policy process,

including Lasswell (1971), Brewer (1974), and May and Wildavsky (1978). However, these theorists have not fully explored the complexity of ties between each of the stages and the way in which each stage informs the other. In reality, while the policy process does occur developmentally--that is, first policies are formulated, then administered and then evaluated--the policy process is not rational and linear.

The education policy process paradigm, on the other hand, provides us with a useful way to design policy research. Indeed, policy research questions differ in each of the stages in the policy process. As May and Wildavsky suggest:

> Compared to organizing research by roles (policy analysts, city
> councilman), functional areas (health, housing), institutions
> (Congress, Office of Management and Budget), or processes (co-
> ordination, bargaining), organizing research by stages of the
> policy cycle focuses attention upon generic activities integrally
> linked with the policy process. It directs attention to the
> ways in which political actors identify problems for collective
> action, conceptualize issues and identify strategic points of
> intervention, mobilize support and enact policies, design insti-
> tutions to carry them out, implement programs to achieve policy
> objectives, evaluate whether those objectives have been achieved,
> and modify or, more rarely, terminate unsuccessful or outmoded
> institutions, policies and programs.
> (1978, p.10)

Policy Formulation

Of the four stages in the policy process, research attention has been
focused primarily on policy formulation issues, including how problems become
matters for public policy consideration, how public policies get on the
agendas of appropriate governmental agencies, and how differing interests
barter for limited official attention and resources.

For example, policy-makers do, in fact, respond to the concerns that
vocal constituencies make known to them; moreover, because of the increasing
influence that education policies are having on their organizations, educators
are now moving from a position of informed neutrality in the policy process
to a posture that assumes involvement in that process as a part of their
professional responsibility (Halperin, 1981). There are many actors,
representing differing interests, that are involved in policy formulation
negotiations. Although each of these actors has a legitimate role in the
education policy process, they do not always agree about the definition of
a proposed education policy problem and therefore do not take similar
positions about possible solutions to that policy problem. Policy researchers,
then, have studied the influence processes that impact on policy decision-
makers, and the way in which policy agenda get set (e.g., Boyd, 1978; Campbell
and Mazzoni, Jr., 1976; Cloward and Piven, 1975; Guthrie, 1981; Sarason and
Doris, 1979; Stan and Russ, 1978).

Policy Implementation

At the implementation stage, education policies get translated into
programs, usually of service delivery as in the case of P.L. 94-142. Organ-
izational plans are developed that implementors follow to deliver those

services (e.g., Elmore, 1978; Hargrove, 1975; Montjoy and O'Toole, Jr., 1979).
Most policies are not as prescriptive as 94-142, in that they will define
program outcomes but not procedures to accomplish those outcomes. In fact,
implementation procedures are usually defined, after-the-fact, and provide
opportunities for opponents to a policy, of for doubters, to sabotage or
modify the policy's intent. Policy researchers have conducted a number of
case studies that trace how policies get interpreted, developed and modified,
while they are being implemented (e.g., Bardach, 1977; Britan, 1981;
Peterson, 1976; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973).

Comprehensive legislation such as the Education for All Handicapped
Children Act requires the involvement of a number of different institutions
in the implementation process. SEAs, LEAs, institutions of higher education
as well as therapists and representatives of the health professions all have
defined roles in the implementation of 94-142 (e.g., Blaschke, 1979; Goor,
et. al., 1978; Helge, 1979; Intriligator and Saettler, 1978; Stearns, Green
and David, 1980; Torres, 1977). The involvement of representatives from
different institutions in the implementation process surfaces problems of
inter-agency coordination as well as issues of conflicting organizational
prerogative. SEAs and LEAs are being asked to deliver services that were not
previously a part of what they viewed as their organizational domain--the
requirement to deliver "related services" in addition to educational services
(e.g., Education Department, 1980; Farrow, 1982). In fact, inter-organizational
coordination of the kind required in PL 94-142 is beyond the administrative
experience of local school systems; also, no time was alloted to them to
develop procedures to accomplish this goal (e.g., Chin and O'Brien, 1970;

Intriligator, 1982; Litwak and Hylton, 1962; Wiles and Branch, 1979).

Paul Berman has written what I believe is a definitive statement about
policy implementation that suggests that there are both programmed and adaptive
approaches to implementation; the task of implementation is to match the
appropriate strategy to the particular organizational situation.

> ...programmed and adaptive implementation reflect different images
> of how policy should be executed and how design choices (e.g.,
> specificity of goals, management responsibilities, extent of staff
> participation, amount of discretion allowed to deliverers and type
> of evaluation) should be treated. Policy could be more effectively
> carried out if these implementation strategies were chosen to meet
> the policy situation,- especially the policy's scope of change,
> its degree of technical certainty, the extent of agreement about
> the policy, the degree of coordination characteristic of the
> implementing system, and the stability of the policy's environment.
>
>   (1980, p. 221)

Policies get implemented in organizations--in this case school systems;
although school systems do have some similar systemic properties, there is
enough variation in their modes of operation to require that they be
given by policy-makers the flexibility that Berman suggests in choosing
from a variety of appropriate implementation strategies that they deem
appropriate to deal with local conditions that are both internal and external
to their organizational situations. At the very least, these questions about
implementation inform a host of policy research questions, that cluster into

three broad categories: (1) the influence of policy implementation in
facilitating or sabotaging the intent of the policy; (2) the unique organ-
izational problems that occur as a result of the need to implement new
education policy at the same time that daily operations are maintained; and
(3) problems of inter-organizational coordination in the policy implementation
process.

In sum, the implementation stage in the education policy process may
not be successfully treated independently from decisions that are made during
the policy formulation process. Policy-makers need to make informed decisions
about the steps that they believe are acceptable for implementors to take in
moving toward the policy's goals. Reasonable time frames for accomplishing
these steps would then have to be determined, and opportunities provided for
modification of these steps after an experimental period of time. In this
way, the policy evaluation stage also in inter-connected with the policy
implementation process.

Policy Evaluation

The evaluation stage in the education policy process should include
attention both to a reassessment of the ability of the policy to accomplish
its intended goal and to a reconsideration of the viability of the enacted
policy to ameliorate the broader policy problem. Theoretically, until formal
evaluation becomes a part of the policy process, policy will continue to be
formed and modified by using political and ideological methods, rather than
rational and scientific methods. Moreover, Shulsky (1976) suggested that we

currently use evaluation data to inform a decision we have already taken:

that is, we use evaluation data "...to put intuitive views into a more obj

form, and if not take away their controversiality, at least raise the cost

controverting them" (p. 197). Finally, Sroufe (1977) has suggested that

policy evaluation becomes an instrument to support who gets what in our so

both advantaged and disadvantaged groups--and not an objective tool for

policy analysis (see also, Applied Management Sciences, 1980; Birman, 1979

Comptroller General of the United States, September, 1981).

There is, in fact, a discrepancy between the stated importance of pol

evaluation and its actual use in informing policy decisions. (See, for ex

Greenberg, et. al., 1977; Rich, 1977; Shumavon, 1978.) The question becom

what data is relevant both to the policy research and to the education pol

process. Lynn, Jr. (1978) suggests that we think about policy as a moving

target; that is, policy is a process that moves through time consuming sta

Policies, then, that deal with social problems are developed incrementally

over time; while the immediate questions may change, the need for research

on the fundamental issues continues. Therefore, the policy process has la

horizons than do individual policy-makers.

In addition, there is some concern about the availability of data sui

to help make these major decisions. In fact, policy analysts have indicat

that data that is available to policy makers for decision-making is inadeq

both in terms of its quality and relevance to policy problems (Louis, 1981

Scott and Shore, 1979; Weiss, 1980); and in terms of the ability of policy

makers to utilize research results in the form in which they are reported

(Caplan, Morrison & Stambaugh, 1975; Rich, 1977). For example, the data

available to the policy makers who enabled P.L. 94-142 centered on "proof"

that handicapping conditions are not barriers to benefiting from public

education experiences, and on the unevenness and inequity of services available

throughout the states for children with special needs (Melcher, 1976;

Sarason & Doris, 1979). Indeed, such data supported the need to make an

education policy statement about free and appropriate public education services

for handicapped children. However, the resulting policy statement, P.L. 94-142,

identified a specific set of procedures for its administration. It was the

impact of these implementation procedures that was not carefully assessed

in the policy formulation stage and that has created such major problems for

implementors that a demand is now being placed on the system for major mod-

ifications of the initial policy (Comptroller General of the United States,

February, 1981; Thomas, 1980). Thus, the collection of appropriate and

useful data is necessary in all three of the stages in the policy process

discussed this far--formulation, implementation and evaluation.

In response to these "user" problems, policy evaluation is shifting

"from being a precise, scientific means of measuring objectives, to a broader

concept of information-gathering, analysis, and dissemination (Comfort, 1980).

This shift may be explained by Wise's (1977) observation that policy decision-

making is a hyper-rational process, and that educational policies fail when

planners and implementors treat the process as rational and linear.

In the last few years, policy researchers have shown an increasing

interest in the conditions under which national education policies succeed or

fail. They cite a general public disenchantment with government as a source

of solution to educational problems, and an expanding perception that current

policies will fail unless they are dramatically altered (See, Ashford, 1977; Clinton, 1979; Ingram and Mann, 1980). This atmosphere of failure has been reinforced by the current administration's reinterpretation of the appropriate federal role in education: in short, the solution to educational problems is the responsibility, they believe, of state and local governments, and the remaining federal responsibility is to provide technical assistance and to filter monies, in decreasing proportions, to the states and locals to administer and distribute.

Public Law 94-142 has been seriously influenced by this major change in the public view of the appropriate federal role in education--and, some say, played a major role in decreasing public confidence in the ability of federal policy-makers to deal appropriately with local educational problems. Indeed, plans for the Special Education Consolidation Grant include efforts at "Administrative Simplification", "State and Local Flexibility", and "Burden Reduction.".

Ingram and Mann (1980) view these conditions of failure as a unique research opportunity:

The current atmosphere in which failure of policies is freely ad-
mitted gives us the opportunity to study such phenomenon as how
agencies adjust goals to match what has actually been accomplished;
how public officials seize upon accomplishments other than substantive
policy for which to claim credit; how agencies that are supposed to
implement policy attempt to transfer responsibility; and on a positive
note, how administrators learn from their failures and seek corrective
action. Policy failure thus constitutes an added dimension that

political scientists can explore in attempting to understand

political behavior. (p. 16)

Policy Termination

-    Policy termination informs the formulation and implementation of new

policies; termination interacts with formulation; and all phases of the education

policy process interact and inform each other (e.g., Brewer, 1974; DeLeon, 1978;

Lasswell, 1971). Indeed, at another level, if education policies are designed

to solve major problems, then an effective policy would in fact solve that

problem and then need to be terminated. One would assume that this principle

would provide important guidance in the policy formulation process and in the

particular form the policy takes. Given this vital connection to the entire

policy process, it is somewhat surprising that termination has not been

meaningfully attended to by both policy analysts and policy-makers.

There are, however, some explanations offered for the relative lack of

attention to the policy termination stage. Policies are proposed solutions

to complex educational problems; however, policy-makers tend to treat education

policies as answers to a problem, and not as one possible solution.

Therefore, policy statements are deliberately designed not be be terminated

(see Bardach, 1976; Behn, 1974; Biller, 1976). In addition, policies are

built on a system of beliefs that policy makers are reluctant to subject to

critical evaluation. Therefore, as Cameron (1978) suggests, negative con-

sequences of a working policy are not linked to the policy's controlling

ideas; in fact, these ideas remain "socially valid long after the policy

effects are dysfunctional." Finally, Wallerstein (1976) proposes an

"entitlement ethic" explanation: the very nature of an entitlement

education policy--such as Public Law 94-142-- makes it difficult to terminate,

particularly when policy makers see a political advantage to continuing the

entitlement. From this perspective, social legislation and "civil rights"

legislation are most difficult to terminate.

Peter DeLeon (1978) makes a convincing argument for policy termination

to be considered as a legitimate part of the education policy process: "the

termination stage can be treated as both an end and a beginning--the end of

a program that has served its purposes and the beginning of a process intended

to correct an errant policy or set of programs" (p 371). Indeed, policy

termination has been viewed in two ways: (1) as an outcome of the education

policy process (see Cameron, 1977; DeLeon, 1978; and Lasswell, 1977); and

(2) as a process in itself in which one policy ends and another begins (see

Bardach, 1976; Biller, 1976; Brewer, 1978). Moreover, difficulties with

terminating a particular policy can be avoided by viewing termination as a

process in which termination goals are paired with new or replacement policies

and both activities are accomplished simultaneously (Bradley, 1976).

The ease with which termination may be accomplished is influenced by a

number of factors. First, the form that the termination takes may be either

functional or structural: Bothun and Comer (1979) define functional termination

as the cessation of all program activities and services, whereas structural

termination includes both the cessation of program activities and of

institutional arrangements made to perform these activities. They suggest

that functional termination is insufficient and allows threatened implementing

agencies time to oppose the termination effort. In addition, a number of major

federal legislative policies authorized the creation of new federal bureau-

cracies or the strengthening of existing agencies, to oversee the administration

of monies appropriate for the policy--in the case of P.L. 94-142, the Bureau

of Education for the Handicapped (renamed the Office of Special Education and

Rehabilitative Services) was given greatly expanded authority and resources

to administer the law.   More often than not, these bureaucracies undertake

a number of activities designed to insure their own permanance in the bureau-

cratic structure (Biller, 1976). Indeed, the energy expended on their own

organizational survival is a second factor that inhibits the ease of policy

termination.

In fact, this last phenomenon--the need to perpetuate the implementing

federal agency--was an unanticipated consequence of the policy process.

Indeed, there is a sense in which the education policy process is analagous

to a change process. First, a new education policy replaces an old policy or

changes an existing state of affairs. As the policy process advances,

implementors and clients alike have an opportunity to adapt to the change;

this adaptation requires a great deal of organizational and individual

energy and causes us to be reluctant to consider the possibility of another

change which might occur as part of the policy termination process. Indeed,

there is much resistance to a proposed new policy, or change, whether in the

policy formulation stage or in the policy termination stage of the education

policy process. Moreover, termination of an education policy is viewed as an

admission of error or failure (see Behn, 1976; Bothun and Comer, 1979;

DeLeon, 1978); therefore, policy makers as well as organizational leaders must

build a tolerance for change in the implementing organizations--a capacity for

ongoing modification and improvement. In sum, this close analogy between

change processes and the education policy process surfaces some interesting

questions for policy researchers, including: (1) can policy research be made

more useful, more timely, more productive if it is shaped to take into account

all phases of the policy process including termination? What influence on the

- success of a policy does the nature of the competing policies, held in abeyance,

have? (2) Can policy research be improved if it is cast in the tradition of

change research and defined as a change? In that case, do all the the questions

and methodologies coming out of the change literature apply? and (3) What

effects do the connections between what we have thought of as stages of the

policy process have on the ultimate success of the policy? And how should we

define success, anyhow? Is it when there is no longer any need for a specific

policy because the job has been done or the values incorporated into the social

fabric?

Conclusion

In retrospect, the seeds of destruction that were sown into PL 94-142

can be seen as the result of the fact that the framers of the policy did not

attend to the policy termination process. They did not attend to the need to

diffuse or incorporate the impact of previous policies. Also, they did not

relate to the wider societal factors that were present in the policy environment,

including the lack of consensus about the function of schooling. In addition,

the prescriptive nature of the policy opened the way for the deregulation

activities now occurring; current federal policy-makers believe that 142

pushed the federal role in education to a place that is unacceptable in the

current public view.

In the education policy process, inattention to issues of termination--
including both the termination of previous policies that a new policy is
intended to replace, and planning for modification and termination of a newly
proposed policy, will lessen chances for the success that the proposed policy's
advocates envision. On the other hand, if success for a policy is defined as
having the functions the policy was designed to serve met, then by widening
the circle of allies, and paying more attention to incorporating the needs
of other groups, advocates for a policy can defuse some of the forces that will
press with competing demands, for a specific policy termination. Special
education may find itself forced, by budget and role exigencies, into that
position (in fact, some of that has happened with the bilingual community) and
may find that there is strength in combining forces. The unintended consequence
of a law perceived as overly perscriptive and under funded may be (1) a modification
of the extreme adversarial, advocate position, and (2) a new coalition, formed
of educators and advocates alike with an interest in those children who are
not currently well served by the schools. The ultimate result may well be just
the kind of schools and educational experiences that the original framers of
P.L. 94-142 hoped for, even if the means are a great surprise.

References

Applied Management Sciences. A study to evaluate procedures undertaken to
   prevent erroneous classification of handicapped children: Draft final plan-
   ning report. (Department of Education, Office of Special Education No.
   300-79-0669) Silver Spring, MD: Applied Management Sciences, June 1980.

Ashford, D. E. (Ed.) Comparing public policies: New concepts and methods.
   Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Bardach, E. The implementation game: What happens after a bill becomes a law.
   Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press, 1977.

Bardach, E. Policy termination as a political process. Policy Sciences,
   1976, 7, 123-131.

Behn, R. D. Closing a government facility. Public Administration Review,
   1978, 38, 332-338.

Behn, R. D. How to terminate a public policy: A dozen hints for the would-be
   terminator. Policy Analysis, 1978, 4, 393-413.

Berman, P. Thinking about programmed and adaptive implementation: Matching
   strategies to situations. In H. Ingram & D. Mann (Eds.), Why Policies
   Succeed Or Fail. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Biller, R. P. On tolerating policy and organizational termination; Some design
   considerations. Policy Sciences, 1976, 7, 133-149.

Birman, B. F. Case studies of overlap between title I and public law 94-142
   services for handicapped students. (DHEW, Office of the Assistant Secretary

for Education No OEC 300-76-0025). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International,
August 1979.

Blaschke, C. L. Case study of implementation of public law 94-142. (Bureau
of Education For The Handicapped No. 300-77-0528). Washington, D.C.:
Education Turnkey Systems, Inc., May 1979,

Bothun, D. & Comer, J. C. The politics of termination: Concepts and process.
Policy Studies Journal, 1979, 7, 540-553.

Boyd, W. L. The changing politics of curriculum policy-making for american
schools. Review of Educational Research, Fall 1978, 48(4), 577-628.

Bradley, V. J. Policy termination in mental health: The hidden agenda. Policy
Sciences, 1976, 7, 215-224.

Brewer, G. D. Termination:-Hard choices - harder questions. Public Administra-
tion Review, 1978, 38, 338-344.

Brewer, G. D. The policy sciences emerge: To nurture and structure a discipline.
Policy Sciences, 1974, 2, 239-244.

Britan, G. M. Bureaucracy and innovation: An ethnography of policy change.
Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981.

Cameron, J. M. Ideology and policy termination: Restructuring california's
mental health system. In J. May & A. Wildavsky (eds.), The Policy Cycle.
Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.

Campbell, R. F. & Mazzoni, Jr., T. L. State policy making for the public
schools. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Caplan, N., Morrison, A. & Stambaugh, R. The use of social science knowledge
in policy decisions at the national level. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for
Social Research, 1975.

Chin, R. & O'Brien, G. M. General inter-system theory: The model and a case
    of practitioner application. In A. Sheldon, F. Baker & C. McLaughlin
    (Eds.), Systems And Medical Care. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press, 1970.

Clinton, C. A. Local success and federal failure. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books,
    1979.

Cloward, R. A. & Piven, F. F. The politics of turmoil. New York: Vintage
    Books, 1975.

Comfort, L. K. Evaluation as an instrument for educational change. In H.
    Ingram & D. Mann (Eds), Why Policies Succeed Or Fail. Beverly Hills, CA:
    Sage Publications, 1980.

Comptroller General of the United States. Disparities still exist in who gets
    special education. Report to The Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Educa-
    tion and Labor, House of Representatives. (No. IPE-81-1). Washington,
    D. C.: U. S. General Accounting Office, September 30, 1981.

Comptroller General of the United States. Unanswered questions on educating
    handicapped children in public schools. Report to the Congress. (No. HRD-
    81-43). Washington, D. C.: U. S. General Accounting Office, February 5, 1981.

DeLeon, P. A theory of policy termination. In J. V. May & A. Wildavsky (Eds.),
    The Policy Cycle. Beverly, Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.

DeLeon, P. Public policy termination; An end and a beginning. Policy Analysis,
    1978, 4, 369-392.

Education Department. Second annual report to congress on the implementation
    of public law 94-142: The education for all handicapped children act.
    Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1980.

Elmore, R. F. Organizational models of social program implementation. Public
    Policy, Spring 1978, 26, 185-228.

Farrow, F. Handicapped public policy analysis. Washington, D.C.: The Center
    For the Study of Welfare Policy, March 1982.

Goor, J., Moore, M., Demarest, E. & Farris, E. School districts participating
    in multiple federal programs, winter 1978-79. (National Center for Education
    Statistics No. 300-76-0009). Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc., 1979

Greenberg, G. D. et. al. Developing public policy from empirical research.
    American Political Science Review, December 1977, 71, 1532-1543.

Guthrie, J. W. Emerging politics of educational policy. Educational Evaluation
    and Policy Analysis, 1981, 3, 75-82.

Halperin, S. A guide for the powerless -- and those who don't know their own
    power. Washington, D. C.: The Institute for Educational Leadership, 1981.

Hargrove, E. The missing link: The study of the implementation of social policy.
    Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Helge, D. I. Problems in implementing comprehensive special education pro-
    gramming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 1979, 47, 514-520.

Ingram, H. M. & Mann, D. E. (Eds.). Why policies succeed or fail. Beverly
    Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Ingram, H. M. & Mann, D. E. Policy failure: An issue deserving analysis. In
    H. M. Ingram & D. Mann (Eds.), Why Policies Succeed Or Fail. Beverly Hills,
    CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Intriligator, B. A. Creating conditions for successful collaboration. Paper
    presented to Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of
    Teacher Education, Houston, February 19 1982.

Intriligator, B. A. & Saettler, H. The federal role in in-service training.

Teacher Education and Special Education, October, 1978.

Lasswell, H. D. A pre-view of policy sciences. New York: American Elsevier,

1971.

Litwak, E. & Hylton, L. F. Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis on

coordinating agencies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 6, 395-420.

Louis, K. S. Policy researcher as sleuth: New approaches to integrating

qualitative and quantitative methods. Paper presented to Annual Meeting

of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 16, 1980.

Lynn, Jr., L. E. (Ed.). Knowledge and policy: the uncertain connection.

Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

May, J. V. & Wildavsky, A. B. (Eds.), The policy cycle. Beverly Hills, CA:

Sage Publications, 1978.

Melcher, J. W. Law, litigation and handicapped children. Exceptional Children,

43(3), November 1976, 126-132.

Montjoy, R. & Toole, Jr., L. Toward a theory of public implementation in an

interorganizational perspective. Public Administration Review, September/

October 1979, 5, 465-475.

Peterson, P. E. School politics chicago style. Chicago, IL: Chicago Univer-

sity Press, 1976.

Pressman, J. L. & Wildavsky, A. B. Implementation. Berkley, CA: University

of California Press, 1973.

Rich, R. E. The use of science in policy-making: A comparative perspective on

science policy. In D. Ashford (ed.), Comparing Public Policies: New Concepts

and Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Sarason, S. B. & Doris, J. Educational handicap, public policy and social

history. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Scott, R. A. & Shore, A. R. Why sociology does not apply: A study of the use

of sociology in public policy. New York: Elsevier, 1979.

Shulsky, A. N. Abolishing the district of columbia motorcycle squad. Policy

Sciences, 1976, 8, 183-197.

Shumavon, D. H. Use of evaluations in AID: The influence of roles and perceptions.

In J. V. May & A. B. Wildavsky (Eds.), The Policy Cycle. Beverly Hills, CA:

Sage Publications, 1978.

Sroufe, G. D. Evaluation and politics. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), The Politics

of Education. Chicar   IL: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.

Stan, B. M. & Ross, J.   mitment to a policy decision: A multi-theoretical per-

spective. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1978, 23(1), 40-62.

Stearns, M. S., Green, D. & David, J. L. Local implementation of public law

94-142: First report of a longitudinal study. (Bureau of Education for The

Handicapped No. 300-78-0030). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International; April 1980.

Thomas, M. A. State allocation and management of PL 94-142 funds. (Department

of Education, Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Budget No. 300-

79-0522). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, September, 1980.

Torres, S. Special education administrative policies manual. Reston, VA:

Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Wallerstein, M. B. Terminating entitlements: Veteran's disability benefits in the

depression. Policy Sciences, 1978, 7, 173-182.

Weiss, C. H. with Bueuvalas, M. J. Social science research and decision-making.

New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Wiles, M. M. & Branch, J. University-public school collaboration models in

   teacher education. Educational Forum, November 1979, 44(1), 35-43.

Wise, A. E. Why educational policies often fail: The hyperrationalization

   hypothesis. Curriculum Studies, 1977, 9(1), 43-57.