

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313:761-4700 800:521-0600



SPECIAL EDUCATION: THE STATUS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
SERVICES IN INDIAN BAND-OPERATED SCHOOLS  
IN MANITOBA

by  
Ronald Sydney Phillips

---

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the  
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
In the Graduate College  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 9 4

UMI Number: 9527980

---

UMI Microform 9527980  
Copyright 1995, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Ronald Sydney Phillips

entitled Special Education: The Status of Special Education Services in Indian band-operated schools in Manitoba

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

James Chalfant James C Chalfant 11-7-94  
Date

John Umbreit J. Umbreit 11/7/94  
Date

Todd Fletcher Todd Fletcher 11/7/94  
Date

Paul Heckman Paul E. Heckman 11/7/94  
Date

Frank Saunders [Signature] 11/7/94  
Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

James C. Chalfant  
Dissertation Director

2 Dec 94  
Date

## STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrower's under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ronald Phillips", is written over a horizontal line.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of a dissertation is the culmination of the work of many people. The author expresses his gratitude to all those who have contributed to the study. My dissertation committee: Dr. James Chalfant, Dr. John Umbreit, Dr. Todd Fletcher, Dr. Paul Heckman, and Dr. T. Frank Saunders, have been very supportive and I appreciate their time, advice, and personal opinions. My special appreciation is expressed to my chairperson, Dr. James Chalfant, who has supported me through the duration of my program, guided my research, and set a standard for scholarly excellence. I particularly want to thank Dr. Margaret Pysh. Although Dr. Pysh was not a member of my committee, she spent many hours editing the final draft of the manuscript. Without her skills and support during the final days of completing the manuscript, I would not have made the deadline for submission.

I am grateful to Indian educators throughout Manitoba and Canada for their willingness to share information. I express special appreciation to the principals of Indian band-operated schools who participated in this study.

Special thanks to Jessie Fryer for her willingness to work late hours under pressure. Her typing and formatting skills were extraordinary in taking a rough manuscript and transforming it into a professional document.

Finally, my thanks to my wife, Mary Jane, for her support and encouragement and to my two girls, Courtenay and Keeley, for their understanding that daddy couldn't do something with them because he had school work to do.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	9
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	10
ABSTRACT.....	11
1. INTRODUCTION.....	13
Background of the Problem.....	13
Purpose of the Study.....	15
Significance of the Study.....	17
Limitations.....	17
Implications.....	17
2. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW.....	21
Federal Government Special	
Education Policy.....	21
Provincial Systems as Guides.....	21
INAC Policy for Special Education..	22
Past Practices.....	22
Change in Policy.....	23
The Effects of the New Policy.....	24
Removal of Special Education	
Students.....	25
Funding.....	25
Summary.....	26
Special Education in Band-Operated	
Schools in Manitoba.....	26
Indian "Control" of Indian Education....	31
Conclusion.....	33
3. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	34
Types and Numbers of Children with	
Disabilities Served.....	34
Important Characteristics of	
Organizations.....	35
Summary.....	42
Service Delivery Personnel.....	43
Types of Personnel.....	43
Roles of Specialists.....	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
3. <u>Continued</u>	
Special Education Policy.....	45
Policies for Operating Procedures..	45
Programs/Policy Evaluation.....	47
Potential Impact of a Descriptive Study.....	50
4. METHODOLOGY.....	51
Conceptual Model for This Study.....	51
Unit of Analysis.....	53
Selection of Band-Operated Schools.....	54
Data Collection.....	55
Instruments for Data Collection.....	56
Data Collection Forms.....	56
The Interview Guide.....	56
Data Analysis.....	58
5. RESULTS, DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
I. Status of Special Education Students Identified and Served.....	61
II. Status of Special Education Administrative Structure.....	69
III. Status of Special Education Personnel.....	71
IV. Special Education Services and Programs.....	75
V. Operating Procedures.....	80
Identifying Students at Risk.....	80
Parental Consent.....	82
Assessment.....	84
Individualized Education Plans.....	88
Eligibility and Placement Decisions.....	92
Confidentiality.....	94

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
6. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	98
Barrier One: Ineffective	
Administrative Organization.....	104
INAC As A Factor.....	105
Problems Within The Local	
Educational Authorities	
(LEA).....	107
Politics on the Reserve.....	108
Specialist Contracts.....	108
Jurisdictional Issues.....	108
Geographical Considerations.....	109
Barrier Two: Lack of Needed	
Special Education Services	
in Band-Operated Schools.....	109
Barrier Three: Lack of Special	
Education Personnel.....	111
Barrier Four: Operating	
Procedures.....	112
Barrier Five: Lack of Involvement	
of Parent and Community	
with Band-Operated Schools.....	114
Recommendations.....	115
1. Develop Band-Operated	
School and Tribal Council	
Planning Committees.....	115
Tribal Council Planning	
Committee.....	116
Band-Operated School	
Planning Group.....	117
2. Develop an Indian	
Controlled Special	
Education Administrative	
Organization.....	117
3. Increase Number of	
Trained Personnel.....	120
4. Develop Needed Programs	
and Services.....	122
5. Develop Effective	
Operating Procedures.....	122
6. Identify and Serve All	
Students Needing Special	
Education Services.....	124

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
6. <u>Continued</u>	
7. Increase Parent and Community Involvement with Band-Operated Schools.....	125
8. Future Research.....	126
Conclusion.....	127
APPENDIX A: FORMS A, B, AND C.....	129
APPENDIX B: SURVEY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES IN BAND-OPERATED SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.....	143
REFERENCES.....	160

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Categories and Percentages of Students Receiving Special Education Services.....	36
2. Number and Percent of Special Education Students by Category Within Six Schools.....	62
3. Summary and Sources of Special Education Personnel.....	72
4. Types of Special Education Programs at Band-Operated Schools.....	76
5. Summary of Preferred Sources for Special Education Personnel.....	78
6. Screening and Identification Procedures.....	81
7. Parental Consent Procedures.....	83
8. Assessment Procedures.....	86
9. Individualized Educational Plans.....	90
10. Eligibility and Placement Decisions.....	93
11. Confidentiality.....	95
12. Special Education Students Estimated and Not Identified By Category Within the Six Schools.....	100

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Model of Comprehensive System of Special Education.....	52
2. Present Special Education Administrative Structure for Band-Operated Schools.....	70
3. Recommended Structure for Delivering Special Education Services Per Tribal Council.....	118

## ABSTRACT

For many years Indian students requiring special education services were sent to provincial schools where services were provided. In 1985, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) began providing funds to Indian band-operated schools for support of special education services. During the past nine years, parents, teachers, and administrators of band-operated schools have expressed concern about the lack of and the quality of special education services in band-operated schools.

There is an absence of information regarding the provision of special education services in band-operated schools in Manitoba. The purpose of this study is to describe the status of special education in these schools.

The methodology of this study included surveys and in-depth interviews with principals of six band-operated schools in Manitoba. Two schools were randomly selected from each of three student enrollment categories (1200-750; 650-300; and 150-50).

The major findings of this study confirm the concerns of parents, teachers, and administrators that the special education delivery system is not meeting the needs of disabled Indian students. Reasons for the lack of comprehensive services included: inefficient administrative

structure; insufficient numbers of trained personnel; inconsistency of programs and services; absence of operating procedures; and lack of parent and community involvement.

Eight activities are recommended for improving the quantity and quality of special education services to Canadian Indian children. First, planning committees need to be established at the band-operated school and tribal council level to develop cooperative plans for providing special education services to meet existing needs. Second, an Indian controlled special education organization should be developed consisting of band-operated schools, tribal councils, and a provincial agency. Such an organization can develop, support, and monitor special education activities. Third, the kinds and numbers of special education personnel must be increased. Fourth, there is a need to develop special education programs and services. Fifth, policies for efficient and effective operating procedures need to be written. Sixth, all students needing special education services should be identified and served. Seventh, parent and community involvement with band-operated schools must be encouraged. Eighth, additional research is needed in other Indian band-operated schools and reserves before these findings can be generalized.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background of the Problem

In Canada, education is generally considered to be the responsibility of the provincial governments. However, the education of Indians who live on reserves in Canada is the responsibility of the federal government of Canada (Department of Justice, Canada, 1986). This responsibility is governed by treaties between the Indian nations of North America and the British Crown (Barman et al, 1986; Miller, 1989).

At the time of Confederation, these treaty obligations were assumed by the Canadian government. The Federal government of Canada has legislation (i.e., The Indian Act) regarding its commitment to Indians. Provision of education services to Indians is found in sections 114 - 123 of the Indian Act.

Indian children who live on reserves attend the following types of school jurisdictions:

\*Federal schools. These schools are administered by the federal government of Canada's Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC).

Approximately 8,052 Indian students attend a federal school (INAC, 1991).

\*Provincial schools. These are public schools throughout Canada operated by local provincial school boards which negotiate tuition and capital agreements with INAC and the Indian Band for the education of students. About 43,453 Indian students attend a provincial school (INAC, 1991).

\*Band-Controlled schools. Under funding agreements with INAC, Indian Band Councils or local education authorities may opt to administer their own schools. By 1990/91, there were 312 band-operated schools with 40,513 students throughout Canada (INAC, 1991).

In 1991/92, INAC provided funds for the education of 16,717 Indian children attending either band-controlled (10,832 students), provincial (4,175 students) or federal schools (1,074 students) in Manitoba. There were thirty-eight band-controlled and seven federal schools (INAC-Manitoba, 1992).

Historically, Indian students requiring special education services were removed from their communities to attend provincial or private schools (Assembly of First Nations, 1988). The removal of special education students resulted in: a) Indians not being aware of services and professionals which were available to handicapped

individuals throughout Canada (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada - Manitoba, 1982); and, b) "nullified the necessity to create special education programs within the local reserve community" (Phillips & Cranwell, 1988 p. 118).

Since 1984, a series of studies have expressed concern about the lack of and quality of special education in the band-operated schools in Manitoba (Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, 1991, 1984; Bravi, 1984; Island Lake tribal Council, 1987; Manitoba Indian Education Association, 1984; Riffel, 1984; West Region Tribal Council, 1986). At the present time, there is an absence of information regarding the provision of special education services to Indian students attending band-controlled schools throughout Canada.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe and establish the status of special education services among band-controlled schools in Manitoba. More specifically, the purpose is to answer the following research questions:

1. What types of disabilities are:
  - a) served within band-operated schools?
  - b) sent to outside agencies?
  - c) not being served in each disability area?
2. What kinds of special education services are offered and not offered by band-controlled schools?

3. What types of service delivery personnel deliver these services?
4. What are the origins of service delivery:
  - a) school staff member?
  - b) band-controlled (Indian education) agencies?
  - c) outside contracting agencies?
5. What kinds of operating procedures are used for:
  - a) identification?
  - b) parental consent?
  - c) assessment?
  - d) multidisciplinary team?
  - e) individualized education plans?
  - f) confidentiality?
6. What kinds of administrative structures are used to provide special education services to band-operated schools?
7. What barriers, if any, make it difficult to serve special education students in band-operated schools?
8. What do the principals of band-operated schools believe should be done to overcome the barriers, which reduce comprehensive services to exceptional students?

### Significance of the Study

Presently a paucity of studies exists about the status of special education among band-operated schools in Manitoba. Reviews and evaluations of band-controlled schools usually focus on one aspect of the special education system (e.g., the role and functions of the resource room teacher in the school) without examining the system of delivering special education services.

The significance of this study is that for the first time detailed data will be presented describing the status of special education in band-operated schools, identifying needs, and providing recommendations to improve special education services for Indian children.

### Limitations

The findings of this study are limited because only six band-operated schools in Manitoba were involved in the study and these findings may or may not be descriptive of other band related schools in Manitoba or other provinces.

### Implications

There are many implications for the results of this study. These include the following:

1. The band-operated schools and tribal councils could use the results to demonstrate the need for a change in the current system of

special education in the band-operated schools in Manitoba.

2. The administrators of the band-operated schools could use the forms and recommendations to provide information workshops about required special education personnel, programs and services to members of local education authorities and school committees.
3. Band-operated schools and tribal councils in Manitoba and other provinces could use the interview guide, procedures, and forms to determine the status and needs of their special education programs.
4. Band-operated schools could develop their own written operating procedures.
5. The band-operated schools could use the results to provide information to their teachers about operating procedures (e.g., teacher roles and expectations).
6. Principals of band-operated schools may become more aware of the kinds of special education personnel and programs needed in their schools.
7. Teachers, both regular class and resource/special education, may also become more aware of the kinds

of special education personnel and services that are needed in their schools.

8. The provincial Indian education agency and the tribal councils will provide special education information for parent workshops on reserves.
9. Tribal councils could use the interview guide and forms to determine the status and needs of special education in their schools.
10. Tribal councils could use the interview guide and forms to determine the status and needs in their organizations.
11. Indian political organizations (e.g., Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs) could use the information to develop a comprehensive delivery system for special education.
12. Band-operated schools and tribal councils in other provinces could use the interview guide and forms to determine the status and needs of their special education systems.
13. This study could be used by advocacy groups, e.g., Canadian Council for Exceptional Children, to present data to the government of Canada pointing out the advantages of an Indian-controlled comprehensive special system for Indian schools in Manitoba.

14. The study may spur other researchers to investigate the delivery of special education services in other band-operated schools in Manitoba, as well as in other provinces.
15. The study may result in other researchers conducting comparative studies of the delivery of special education services in band-operated schools versus those in provincial schools throughout Manitoba and Canada.
16. Other researchers may be interested in obtaining information about special education services in the band-operated schools by interviewing different people (e.g., parents of special education children, regular and resource/special education teachers, members of local education authorities, or Indian political leaders).

## CHAPTER 2

### HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

This chapter will introduce the literature on the history of the federal government involvement in Indian special education in the province of Manitoba, Canada.

#### Federal Government Special Education Policy

The federal government has policies, guidelines, directives, and initiatives regarding Indian education, but there is no Indian education law (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1984; Cardinal, 1977; Jordan, 1986; Barman et al., 1986).

#### Provincial Systems as Guides

The absence of federal laws for Indian education has resulted in INAC using provincial educational systems as guides in developing educational programs for Indian students (Williams, 1982; Kirkness, 1978; Assembly of First Nations, 1992). A report by the federal government, which reviewed federal programs for Indians, stated that "there is a policy requiring federal schools to operate in manners consistent with provincial standards and practices (p.160)" (Supply and Services Canada, 1986).

This policy continues in the area of special education. Provincial special education guidelines and regulations have been used by INAC in Ontario (INAC-Ontario, 1983;

INAC-Ontario, undated), Saskatchewan (INAC-Saskatchewan, 1987) and Manitoba (INAC-Manitoba, 1985a; INAC-Manitoba, 1987a; INAC-Manitoba, 1988; INAC-Manitoba, 1991, INAC-Manitoba, 1994; INAC-Manitoba, 1986a,b).

#### INAC Policy for Special Education

In Manitoba, INAC's special education policies may be found in their "Federal Schools Special Education Procedures Manual" (INAC-Manitoba, 1985a). Policies included provisions for pupils, screening, assessment, programming, and evaluation. A continuum of services was to be provided for all students. The manual also specified the roles of the resource room teacher, superintendent, classroom teacher, and principal.

Later, INAC-Manitoba (1988) defined special education as: "A broad term covering a spectrum of educational practices that attempts to recognize and cope with the exceptional student. These students may have a visual or auditory problem; they may be especially bright; they may be classed as "slow learners"; or they may have some serious emotional or medical problem" (p. S-2). Numerous special education categories followed the definition.

#### Past Practices

Past federal government practice was "to send [special education] students to provincial or private schools" (National Indian Brotherhood, Assembly of First Nations,

1988, p. 91). Government and tribal council documents indicate that the child was removed because there were no special education services available at the reserve school (INAC, 1978; Island Lake Tribal Council, 1987). The provincial school systems received funds for the education of Indian special needs children from INAC (INAC-Manitoba, 1985b). The schools on the reserve, both band-controlled or federal, were not able to access these funds. No similar policy or agreement existed for the provision of special education services at the reserve schools (INAC-MB, 1984).

#### Change in Policy

However, in 1985 the federal government announced a change in policy. Funding for special education services was to be provided for band-controlled schools throughout Canada. The funding was to be provided through a new "service" (3040 Special Education Band-Operated Schools [S128]) in the federal government's Directory of Services (INAC, 1985). The Minister of Indian Affairs has described the Directory of Services providing funding for "services the department [INAC] is authorized to provide" (INAC, 1986b). The new service for the band-operated schools was described as providing for the "instruction, instructional material, student supplies, diagnostic testing and evaluation for students who have exceptional learning needs,

student room and board and transportation may be provided where required" (INAC, 1985).

#### The Effects of the New Policy

The new special education policy meant that for the first time the band-operated schools would receive funds for their special education students. Each school received funds based on total school enrollment (i.e., \$200.00 per student) [INAC, 1986c].

However, funding for individually identified special needs students was not available to the band-operated school. The inconsistency of Federal Indian education policy was highlighted in a letter to INAC-Manitoba, "Why must we send our children to Brandon?" (Sioux Valley School Board, 1986).

The difference in funding was quite dramatic. Federal documents indicated that in 1985, provincial schools received an average of \$9,549.21, compared with the band-operated schools' average of \$268.24 (INAC-Manitoba, 1985c). Note: The band-operated schools received \$200.00 for each student on their enrollment lists. The rest of the funds (\$68.24) went to tribal councils and to M.I.E.A. for special education co-ordinators.

By the end of 1986, special education students were being identified in the reserve communities and others were being encouraged to return to their home communities (Sioux

Valley, 1986; INAC-Manitoba, 1987b). However, the band schools remained without special education specialist and program support (Waywayseecappo Educational Authority, 1986). The Director of Education for one Indian band wrote that ". . . we are at a loss, as to our next course of action to pursue, as the parents are continually waiting for services for [their daughter]" (Pine Creek, 1987).

#### Removal of Special Education Students

The lack of specialist and program support enabled INAC to continue the removal of special education students from the communities (Ward Mallette, 1986; McFarland, 1988). Tuition agreements INAC continued to pay for students enrolled in "Special Education Programs" and Programs" in the nearby provincial school (INAC-Manitoba, 1986c).

#### Funding

The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs (1991) found that federal government spending on special education (4.4%) in band-operated schools in Manitoba compared unfavorably in comparison with provincial spending on special education (10.7 %).

The Superintendent of Education for the Peguis Indian Band stated that the federal government has two systems for providing special education services to Indian students. There was an "open cheque book" approach for the Provincial

schools. In comparison, the band-operated schools encountered "formula funding" (Thomas, 1988).

The Assembly of First Nations (1992) emphasized that the federal government will pay rates set by the provincial schools for the education of Indian children in provincial schools. However, band-operated schools receive funds based on formula funding. This method of providing funds "is simply a means of dividing monies, and is not responsive to or based on program needs" (p.7). Provincial schools are able to bill actual costs, while band-operated schools must work with a formula set by INAC.

#### Summary

INAC appears to have focused their attention on developing "policies of containment rather than policies of development" (Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, 1991, p. 2) by concentrating on the identification of a small number of special needs students rather than the provision of services.

#### Special Education in Band-Operated Schools in Manitoba

In 1983, the Manitoba Indian Education Association [M.I.E.A.] (M.I.E.A., 1983) examined the special education services for band-operated schools. The Association concluded that the schools lacked trained personnel, follow-up educational support services, preventative

programs, and access to specialist services.

Recommendations included: needs assessments to establish immediate and common needs; inservice programs for teachers and administrators; co-ordination of existing services; establishment of educational support services at M.I.E.A. (i.e., specialists and consultants); and improved record-keeping.

In 1984, The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs' All-Chiefs' Budget Committee recommended that special education services be established for band-operated schools. Their report noted that quality Indian education required the establishment of a basic core of support services (e.g., psychologists, reading clinicians, speech and hearing therapists and social workers). The committee was especially concerned about the practice of sending Indian special education students away from their communities for their education (Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, 1984).

In 1984, M.I.E.A. surveyed 14 band-operated schools. Approximately 31% of the total student population was selected by classroom teachers as requiring special education services (M.I.E.A., 1984a). M.I.E.A. (1984b) developed an "Action Plan" to remedy the situation. The recommendations closely followed the provincial model of providing special education services, clinicians, administration and funding.

An evaluation of one band-operated school's special education program (Bravi, 1984) found that special education students were being identified and classified by private psychologists. However, instructional programming was lacking. There were also indications that inappropriate testing procedures were being utilized.

Riffel et al., (1984) in a school evaluation noted that student vision and hearing screening services from the Department of National Health and Welfare were adequate. However, the authors found that other screening services (e.g., speech/language) were non-existent at the school. The authors observed that while special education students were being identified, additional programs and assistance for the identified students were not available. Parental involvement in the special education process was also a problem. Parental permission for testing could not be found. There appeared to be no reporting or explanation of test results to the parents.

In 1986, the West Region Tribal Council (W.R.T.C.) developed a special education proposal (W.R.T.C., 1986) which focused on providing specialist and clinician assistance to band-controlled schools in Manitoba. The proposal closely followed provincial guidelines in special education.

Island Lake Tribal Council (1987) reviewed the numbers of identified special education students in their schools from 1983/84 - 1986/87. During the four years, the number of special education students had dropped from thirty-two (1.9%) to thirteen (0.79%) of the total school population. In 1986/87, two of the four schools, with a total student population of 854, had no identified special education students. Recommendations by the Tribal Council to improve the situation included workshops for parents and educators, prescreening, on-reserve assessment, increased funding for special equipment and role clarification.

A report by the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs (1991) noted low levels of identified students in the band-controlled schools in Manitoba. As recently as 1988/89, 14 schools with a total student population of 2200 did not report a single student identified as a special education student. The size of the schools varied from seven to seven hundred and forty-seven students. The schools were located throughout the province.

In an evaluation of counseling services offered to Indian students (both on and off-reserve) in Manitoba, The Working Margins Consulting Group (1989) concluded that the present system had developed in an ad hoc manner and was "unbalanced and inadequate" (p. 94). The authors

recommended that a rational and equitable system be established for determining funding and services.

An evaluation of a band-operated school was done by Lowe and Associates and The Working Margins Consulting Group (1991). They found that school staff were concerned about the inconsistencies of special education funding from Indian Affairs. Students who had met eligibility criteria were denied additional funding. No explanations were given by INAC personnel to the school for the denial of funding. The report noted that specialist support was lacking for three special education students at the school, i.e., students identified with a speech impairment, cerebral palsy, and fetal alcohol syndrome. The teaching staff expressed concern regarding the lack of special education specialist support to assist teachers in planning and implementing a program.

A number of school reviews noted problems with the use of private psychologists for the assessment of special education students. The problems are usually related to the appropriateness of the assessment, recommendations and follow-up (Working Margins Consulting Group, 1990a, b; Working Margins Consulting Group, 1991; Working Margins Consulting Group and Lowe and Associates, 1991).

### Indian "Control" of Indian Education

In 1972, the National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) released "Indian control of Indian education" (NIB, 1972). The document examined the status of Indian education in Canada. The NIB was concerned that Indian parents had no input in the decisions of the provincial school divisions. The NIB policy stated that Indian parents were the best judge of the educational needs of their children.

In 1972, the federal minister of Indian Affairs, Hon. Jean Cretien, accepted the NIB statement "Indian Control of Indian Education" as the basis of federal policy in Indian education (Cardinal, 1977; Canadian Education Association, 1984). The federal government would provide funds to allow an Indian band to operate a school.

Indian bands throughout Canada responded to the federal government's offer of controlling the school on the reserve. Since 1975/76, the number of band-controlled schools has increased from 53 to 312 (INAC, 1991).

As schools have become band-controlled, a number of difficulties have emerged. Probably the most important is the different perceptions of "control". The federal government defined Indian control as "a degree of participation" (Penner, 1988, in Long & Bear [ed.], 1988). This view contrasts sharply with the Indian view. Goddard (1993) described control as:

the ability to change, experiment, develop, and grow; it implies that one can identify needs and then plan to meet those needs; it implies that one can control income and expenditures, establish criteria for success, and have direct governance of one's own affairs. (p. 165)

Cardinal (1977) emphasized that the Indians have very little "control" over the operation of a band-controlled school. The Indians may run the school. However, the schools had to be operated within guidelines, rules, and organizational frameworks approved by INAC. Indian control was described as ". . . very narrow rigid agreements that allow Indian bands to run educational programs for the Department of Indian Affairs - their programs, not ours; run their way, not ours" (p. 87). A number of other commentators on Indian education had similar findings (The Canadian Education Association, 1984; Comeau & Santin, 1990; Assembly of First Nations, 1991; Hall, 1992; Goddard, 1993). According to Barman et al (1986), Indians had limited authority in making decisions regarding the education of their children. The limited authority was viewed as the result of the INAC's failure to establish operational guidelines and principles for the band-controlled schools.

Two opposing viewpoints currently exist between the Indians and the federal government over the meaning of

Indian control of Indian education. The first viewpoint envisions Indian control as existing within an organizational framework developed by the federal government, i.e., Indian band-operated schools following federal procedures and guidelines, as well as provincial regulations. The second viewpoint is that local control provides the Indian community an opportunity to develop their own educational system operating in their own interests.

#### Conclusion

Data are needed which describe the current status of special education in the band-operated schools in Manitoba. The purpose of such a descriptive study would be to determine whether or not Indian children attending band-operated schools in Manitoba are receiving the same quality of special education services that other children in the provincial schools are receiving. Key components of such a study should include: the organizational structure; special education policies; special education programs; certified personnel; and effective special education operating procedures.

## CHAPTER 3

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will introduce the literature related to special education systems in Canada and the United States. The literature review includes: types and numbers of children with disabilities served; important characteristics of organizations; the organization of special education; service delivery personnel; special education policy; and the potential impact of a descriptive study.

Types and Numbers of Children  
with Disabilities Served

In the area of special education there is consistency regarding the estimated percentage of the school population who are identified as special education students throughout the United States and Canada. In general, the figures are in the ten to fifteen percentage range.

In the United States, the estimates have ranged from 10.02% (Council for Exceptional Children, 1994), 10.55% (U.S. Department of Education, 1991), 10.76% (U.S. Department of Education, 1984), to 10-15% (Kirk & Gallagher, 1989). Canadian figures have ranged from 9.07% (Canadian Council for Exceptional Children, 1989), 9.7% (Alberta Education, 1977), 12.5% (Roberts & Lazure, 1970) to 15.5% (Council of Ministers of Education, 1983).

These estimates are divided into various categories of exceptionality. These categories may include learning disabled, speech and language impaired, emotionally/behaviorally disordered, mentally impaired, vision impaired, hearing impaired, deaf-blind, multihandicapped, orthopedically impaired, and other health impaired (see Table 1).

Prevalence figures are important because they give educators an estimate of the types and numbers of exceptional students which should be found in any given school population. This is important in planning the development of needed special education within a school or region.

#### Important Characteristics of Organizations

Weber (1947) viewed a bureaucratic organization as a hierarchy of offices where labor is divided by specialized training and expertise and responsibility and authority of officials is specified. The hierarchy of offices is important in a bureaucratic organization as a lower office is subordinate to the office above. The responsibilities of each office is governed by written rules and previous decisions.

Khandwalla (1977) viewed organizations as having properties which enable them to be successful. These properties were: (1) hierarchy of offices, (2) rules,

Table 1

Categories and Percentages of Students Receiving Special  
Education Services

Category of Exceptionality	Percentage of Total School Population
Learning disabilities	5.01
Speech impairments	2.59
Mental retardation	1.38
Serious emotional disturbance	0.96
Multiple disabilities	0.18
Hearing impairments	0.14
Orthopedic impairments	0.12
Other health impairments	0.11
Visual impairments	0.06
Deaf-blindness	0.00
Total	10.55

Source: U. S. Department of Education, 1991

procedures, controls and techniques, (3) formality of communication, (4) specialization of functions and division of labor, (5) employment of skilled personnel, and (6) specificity of purpose.

Child (1977, 1980) has noted six important components of organizational structure. These components include: (1) the allocation of tasks and responsibilities to individuals; (2) the designation of formal reporting relationships; (3) the grouping together of individuals in sections or departments, the grouping of departments into divisions and the larger units, and the overall grouping into the total organization; (4) the delegation of authority; (5) the design of systems to ensure effective communication of information, integration of effort and involvement in the decision-making process; (6) systems for performance appraisal and reward.

The organization of schools and school systems is consistent with the findings on organizations in general. Bidwell (1965) has noted several attributes of school organizations: functional division of labor and specialization; hierarchy of authority; and rules and regulations. Hoy (1982) also noted the similarities between educational and other formal organizations. The similarities included: hierarchical structure, rules and regulations; divisions of labor, and line staff.

### The Organization of Special Education

Deno (1970) developed a cascade system of delivering special education services to students. The cascade model explains the need for different educational settings and services to meet the needs of special education students throughout the educational system. The primary setting for delivering services for special education students is the regular classroom. However, alternate placements with the required services are offered.

David and Greene (1983) noted three common characteristics of the administrative unit of special education systems: specialization of functions, division along lines of different disabilities, and separation between special and regular education systems. They also observed that the basic functions and sequence of special systems are: student identification, referral, evaluation, placement and provision of services.

Burello and Sage (1979) noted the various functions and settings of special education personnel. At the school building level, the personnel may include consultant and resource teachers, itinerant consultants and therapists. At the district level, the special personnel may include specialized teachers, itinerant consultants and therapists, psychologists and social workers.

Maier and Barbrack (1979) viewed special education as having three program levels: individual, group, and organizational. The individual and group levels were programs designed for either an individual student (e.g., IEP) or a group (e.g., remedial reading class). The organizational level referred to a variety of special education programs being available through a service delivery system. Special education was further defined as:

an organized configuration of program staff engaged in programmatic activities (e.g., school psychologists, language development) using a particular amount of resources (e.g., money, materials) over a set time interval (e.g., daily, weekly) in order to assist one or more students to attain certain program ends (e.g., improved self-understanding, increased skill in verbal communication). (p. 414)

Ysseldyke and Algozzine (1990) viewed special education as offering three levels of educational services (i.e., direct, indirect or consultative, and related) for exceptional students. The three services were described as:

Direct services are provided by working with students themselves to correct or compensate for the conditions that have caused them to fall

behind in school or to enrich or accelerate the progress they are making in school.

Indirect consultative services are provided by working with classroom teachers and others who work with exceptional students over a period of time to meet the needs of students.

Related services are provided by specially trained personnel directly (to students) or indirectly (to those who work with exceptional students). Related services include psychological testing and counseling, school social work, educational/occupational therapy, adapted physical education, school health services, and transportation. (p. 25)

Hartman (1992) noted that special education should include instructional programs such as pre-schools, self-contained classrooms, resource programs, home-hospital and residential programs. Also mentioned were supplemental services such as vocational and transition programs. Related services such as assessment, special transportation, speech/language pathology, occupational/physio therapy, guidance/counseling, social work and psychological services and administration, supervision were identified as critical components of a special education program.

There are common characteristics of effective programs and services for special education students described in the literature presented. First, students must go through a process of identification. Second, decisions must be made based on assessment. Third, instructional program modifications or alternatives are provided. Fourth, specialized personnel must be available to provide assessments, instruction and to make decisions. Finally, these steps must be made within an organizational structure which provides administrative and supervisory support.

Burello and Sage (1979) observed that special education should be a support system for all children. Special education personnel should "plan, organize, and evaluate their contributions as a support system to the regular administrative and instructional staff" (p.151). In order to accomplish these objectives, special education should be organized to: provide general education teachers assistance with students who are disabled, provide direct services to the handicapped child; establish a team approach with parents, students and professionals to plan programs; provide alternative services and placements at the building and division level; monitor each student's program and provide program exit criteria; provide teachers and administrators with opportunities to develop skills through professional development; establish a research program

regarding best practices; enable students and parents to become active participants in the process; and coordinate and develop interagency co-operation.

Sage and Burello (1986) in a study of different special education models noted differences in the ways the structures were organized. However, little variability was found in authority structures and goals of the various models. Each of the models viewed special education as being supportive of regular education. Each model was concerned with the need for decentralization and accountability of services. The models viewed school division central offices as providing specialists and technical support, as well as the monitoring of policies and procedures for schools.

Saskatchewan Education (1989) viewed special education as supporting regular education through integration, parent involvement, functional skills development, professional development, and early identification.

#### Summary

There are common characteristics of an effective special education organizational framework within the literature. The organization of special education delivery may be characterized as offering a variety of services (i.e., specialists, programs and placements) for special education students. These students may receive special

education services either individually or in groups. The focus of the system should be to provide services at the school level. However, the school is only one part of the system. School divisions also provide specialists to support and monitor school-based programs. Regionally-based (state/provincial) administrators and program specialists support and monitor divisions/districts to ensure that special education students are receiving an appropriate education.

#### Service Delivery Personnel

There must be sufficient numbers of personnel who have expertise in different areas of exceptionality. These personnel must be part of an organized system of delivering special education services. The personnel have different specialized functions (e.g., direct services, indirect services, supervisory) at the different organizational levels. Finally, special education personnel must serve in a supportive role to regular education.

#### Types of Personnel

Gearhart (1974), Saskatchewan Education (1989), Mandell and Fiscus (1981), and The Manitoba Teachers' Society (1977) observed that in the area of special education, school districts require the services of highly specialized personnel in addition to specially trained teachers. The highly specialized personnel included: resource teachers,

school psychologists, school social workers, counselors, speech and language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, hearing clinicians, vision clinicians, mobility specialists, work study coordinators, consultants and coordinators, as well as a director of special education.

#### Roles of Specialists

Sage and Burello (1986) noted that special education personnel provide policy leadership, general administration, technical supervision and management, ancillary support, and direct instructional services. Programs must be available which take into consideration different student needs (e.g., "type of exceptionality, degree of deviance, approach to intervention, and intensity of service required") (p. 290). Other specialists from agencies should be involved with the school system in providing services in the areas of health, social services, psychological assessment and parent counseling. A program of system monitoring should be established to assess the achievement of objectives and to determine unmet needs (e.g., inappropriate placements).

Winzer (1990) emphasized that ideally teachers should not work in isolation in dealing with special education students. Other professionals (e.g., psychologists, speech therapists, counselor) should work with teachers to plan educational interventions for exceptional children. These

professionals are part of a multidisciplinary team that offers related services (i.e., transportation, physical and occupational therapy, and diagnostic medical services).

In summary, there seem to be common characteristics regarding effective special education delivery personnel presented in the literature. First, personnel must be sufficient in number and have expertise in different areas of exceptionality. Second, the personnel must be part of an organized system of delivering special education services. The personnel have different functions (e.g., direct services, indirect services, supervisory) at different organizations' levels. Finally, special education must be a support to regular education.

#### Special Education Policy

There are many definitions of policy in the literature. Dye (1972) defined public policy as "whatever governments choose to do or not to do" (p. 1). Mitchell (1984) viewed policy as "a vehicle for allocating power to individuals or groups with a legitimate right to exercise it and, conversely, for limiting the power of those whose interests are less than legitimate" (p. 144).

#### Policies for Operating Procedures

In the area of special education, Chalfant and Van Dusen Pysh (1980) developed a compliance manual to explain the rules and regulations of Public Law 94-142. The manual

noted recommended practices in nine areas of special education. The nine areas were: identification and location of handicapped children; prior notice and parental consent; the individual evaluation of handicapped children; the multidisciplinary conference; writing the Individualized Education Program; related services; independent, private and parochial schools; confidentiality: parent rights to inspect and review records; and, impartial due process hearings.

Sage and Burello (1986) noted the importance of policies and procedures throughout the entire special education system. Policies and procedures had to be developed which were easily understood and consistently implemented regarding:

1. Screening within the system
2. Case finding outside the system
3. Referral for evaluation
4. Diagnostic-prescriptive services
5. Placement in programs providing continuing instructional services
6. Evaluation of progress in programs
7. Changes in placement within and between programs and the mainstream.

(pp. 289-290).

Burello and Sage (1986) also noted that policies had to be developed and implemented in the area of parent participation. Policies had to ensure parent involvement in: placement decisions; understanding of program objectives; knowledge of pupil progress; and, awareness of placement alternatives.

#### Programs/Policy Evaluation

The Mid-South Regional Resource Centre (1986) developed a resource handbook for determining the effectiveness of special education policies. The effectiveness indicators were presented as important program elements to consider in program evaluation and in planning program improvements. The handbook was designed "to support local school and program improvement efforts" (p. 3). The effectiveness indicators were organized into six areas: (1) philosophy, policies and procedures, (2) resource allocation, (3) staffing and leadership, (4) parent participation, community and interagency involvement, (5) instruction, and (6) program and student outcomes.

Gearheart (1974) emphasized that effective special education requires a "comprehensive, practical philosophy on which to base educational planning and programming" (pp. 20). Guidelines for developing special education programs and services included: (1) a wide variety of delivery of services; (2) maximizing the child's

potentialities; (3) a continuum of services, and (4) the importance of ongoing informal and formal assessments. According to Gearheart (1980) the following are important elements in special education programs: (1) screening, (2) referral, (3) assessment, (4) staffing, and (5) placement.

Maher and Bennett (1984) described a system for providing special education services. Their system had five components: (1) assessment, (2) instruction, (3) related services, (4) personnel development, and (5) administration.

The Centre for Developmental Disabilities, University of Vermont (1986) developed a framework of "best educational practice statements and their indicators". The purpose of the framework was to improve the delivery of special education services to students with severe handicaps and their parents. The framework was organized into nine major components: (1) age-grade public school placement, (2) integrated delivery of related services, (3) social integration, (4) transition planning, (5) community based training, (6) curricular expectations, (7) systematic data-based instruction, (8) home-school partnership, and (9) systematic program evaluation.

Saskatchewan Education (1989) stated that evaluations of special education programs should consider numerous policies and practices. These included the following:

pre-referral practices (e.g., early identification, screening and support for adaptive instruction); program development and placement; staff development; consultation; parental involvement; assessment; eligibility criteria; planning for transitions; equipment; curriculum and instruction; material development; and evaluation.

Crealock (1989) in a review of school board special education policy implementation in Ontario identified six parts of a special education service model. The parts are: identification and placement, (b) program planning and objectives, (c) program modification and implementation, (d) reviewing student placement and progress, (e) communication among relevant people, and (f) evaluation of service.

Policy is important because it provides the base from which an organizational framework for the delivery of special education can be developed. The literature reveals common characteristics of effective policies for special education students. First, consideration should be given to determining whether policies are written or unwritten. Second, policies should relate to: identification; assessment; parental consent; multidisciplinary teams; Individual Education Plans; and confidentiality.

### Potential Impact of a Descriptive Study

Descriptive studies have the greatest impact when they are used to study a phenomenon about which little or nothing is known. Descriptive studies have been used to describe unique disabilities in children (Strauss and Lehtinen, 1947; Kirk, 1962); the use of collaborative teams (Chalfant, Pysh & Moultrie, 1979); models for individualizing services (Triangle Research Institute, 1993), factors related to the presence or absence of special education services (Chalfant, 1967); operating procedures (Chalfant, 1984) and policies (Will, 1986).

Descriptive studies may have several kinds of impact including: a) allocation of monies for technical assistance, or personnel training; b) the development of legislation; c) the development of rules and regulations; d) the development of guidelines; e) the development of new kinds of agencies; or f) stimulation of pressure groups for change.

It is hoped that the identification of special education needs among the Indian band-operated schools will be useful in bringing about improvements in special education for Indian students.

## CHAPTER 4

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this study. Included is a description of the conceptual model; unit of analysis, selection of band-operated schools, data collection, instruments for data collection, and data analysis.

#### Conceptual Model for This Study

The central tenet of the framework developed for this study is that the educational needs of special education students require a comprehensive system. During the past twenty years, federal, provincial and state governments in Canada and the United States have developed systems for the education of special education students. The special education systems from these jurisdictions are similar but vary due to different educational philosophies, expertise and resources.

Three common components have emerged from the research on a comprehensive special education system. As outlined in Figure 1, these elements include: an administrative structure; types and numbers of special education students by exceptionality; and operating procedures. Indicators of these components include personnel and services.

Figure 1

Model of Comprehensive System of Special Education

System Elements	Personnel	Services
I. Administrative structure	Principals, Directors of special education, Special education coordinators	Monitoring and supervision of programs and personnel
II. Types and numbers of special education students by exceptionality	Certified specialists (e.g., school psychologists, speech and language pathologists, resource teachers, etc.)	Programs for special education students
III. Operating procedures * Screening * Parent consent * Assessment * Eligibility and placement * IEPs * Confidentiality	Assignment of responsibilities to teachers, specialists, consultants	Policies, procedures, forms

The system of special education services for Indian students attending band-operated schools in Manitoba were examined using these three components. The components served as the basis for the data collection instruments. Questions involving barriers to providing special education services in the band-operated schools were added to provide information for the discussion and recommendations section.

#### Unit of Analysis

Six band-operated schools were chosen as the unit of analysis because each band-controlled school receives educational funds from the federal department of INAC on an individual school basis. Each school has full responsibility for providing education services (including special education) on the reserve.

Principals were chosen as the primary data source because they have the responsibility for administering their school's special education program and have the most involvement with special education services. Since there is an absence of special education administrators in the Indian educational system at the local community level (band-controlled school), regional level (tribal councils) and at the provincial level (e.g., Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs), the principals are the most knowledgeable persons about special education in the schools. The principals were asked to involve both school staff (i.e., resource or

special class teachers) and other administrators (i.e., directors of education) for additional information.

#### Selection of Band-Operated Schools

A list of band-controlled schools in Manitoba was obtained from the Assembly of First Nations (AFN, 1993). Information regarding band-controlled school populations was obtained from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba region (INAC-Manitoba, 1992) and from the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs (Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, 1991). The names of band-controlled schools in Manitoba were placed into three categories according to student population (i.e., 1200-750, 650-300, 150-50 students). Schools with student populations outside of these categories were placed in the category nearest their size. Two schools from each of the three categories were randomly selected for participation in the study. The six schools selected represented different sized enrollments and were typical schools of their size in Manitoba.

The principals from the selected schools were contacted by telephone to determine if they were willing to participate in the study. If they agreed, an introductory letter and forms (Appendix A) were mailed or faxed to their schools. An interview time and a date were determined, contingent upon schedules and availability.

### Data Collection

Data collection consisted of two methods. The first required principals to complete three forms (Appendix A. Forms A, B, C) prior to an interview. These forms were either mailed or faxed to the principals. The forms provided information on the number and types of identified special education students, the current number and types of special education specialists, and the organizations from which the school preferred to receive assistance. This information was reviewed with the principal prior to the interview.

The second method of data collection consisted of a guided interview with each principal. The principals received their interview guides at the beginning of the interview. Both the interviewer and the principal, therefore, were able to refer to their own copy of the interview guide during the interview. Orlich (1978) has found that interviews: enable the immediate clarification of questions; reveal the feelings of respondents; allow discussion of causes and solutions; and allow further probes or follow-up. The interviews were audio-taped to ensure the accuracy of the recording of responses and transcribed by the investigator.

### Instruments for Data Collection

Two instruments were developed to collect data to answer the research questions. The two instruments were data collection forms and an interview guide.

#### Data Collection Forms

The first instrument was a package of three forms (Appendix A, Forms A, B, and C) to be completed by the principal prior to the interview. The principal was asked to use these forms to provide information on: numbers and categories of identified special education students; types of special education personnel which were available to the school; location of special education personnel; and preferred location of special education personnel.

These forms were developed after reviewing the literature on special education prevalence estimates, as well as special education programs and personnel.

#### The Interview Guide

The interview guide was composed of both open-ended and closed questions. The intent of the interview was to obtain a description of the present system of providing special education within the band-controlled school system in Manitoba. Additional questions or probes were included in the interview guide to elicit further information. To

ensure accuracy, the interviews were audio-taped and later transcribed by the investigator.

The interview guide items were developed from the seven common operating procedures of special education systems included in the model. The seven common elements included: assessment, identification, parental consent, multidisciplinary team, Individual Education Plan, confidentiality, and related services. Two additional sections were added to the interview guide. The first, school characteristics, provided demographical information about the school. The last, barriers, provided information on barriers to developing a comprehensive special education system.

The interview guide was developed in six phases. First, an initial pool of questions was generated based on a review of indicators of effective special education policy in the United States (Chalfant & Van Dusen Pysh, 1980). Second, the questions were revised after a further review of other indicators of effective special education policy and systems (Baca & Cervantes, 1989; Mid-South Regional Resource Center, 1986; Center for Developmental Disabilities, 1986; Sage & Burello, 1986; Podemski et al, 1984; Burello & Sage, 1979; Gearhart, 1990; Crealock, 1989; Maher & Bennett, 1984). Third, interview questions were developed, reviewed, and revised according to interview methodology

(Orlich, 1978; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Patton, 1990). Fourth, a practice interview was given to a university special education faculty member. Revisions were made to the interview guide. Fifth, two university faculty members, one specializing in minority special education, the other in educational administration, reviewed the content of the interview guide. The interview guide was revised on the basis of the feedback received from the reviewers.

Finally, a pilot study of the interview guide was conducted using one principal from a band-controlled school in Manitoba. The pilot study was arranged by a telephone call to the principal. Upon agreement to participate in the pilot study, an introductory letter and two data collection forms were faxed to the school. An interview time and a date were determined. Prior to the interview, the principal was assured that: (1) participation was voluntary, (2) he/she may withdraw from the interview or decline to answer questions at any time, and (3) the interview was confidential. The purpose of the pilot study was to remove or revise questions that were unclear. A few questions were revised, removed or replaced based upon responses in the pilot study.

#### Data Analysis

Marshall and Rossman (1989) have noted that data analysis is "the process of bringing order, structure, and

meaning to the mass of collected data" (p. 112). This study described the status of the delivery system of special education in the band-controlled schools of Manitoba by using survey methodology (Orlich, 1978; Jackson, 1988; Dillman, 1983; Patton, 1990; McMillan & Schumacher, 1993). This study compared data from the six units of analysis by grouping together answers from different principals to topics from the interview guide.

The descriptive value of survey methodology has been emphasized by researchers. Orlich (1978), Smith and Glass (1987) found that surveys were undertaken to reveal the status and characteristics of a particular program, problem or trait.

The first step in describing the status of special education in band-operated schools in Manitoba was to assemble the raw data on an individual school basis. The raw data includes all of the information collected about a school's special education program (i.e., interview transcript and forms).

Step two was to make four complete copies of the raw data by individual school. A master copy was kept in a secure place (Patton, 1990).

The third step involved collating the data for each question from each school. Due to the nature of the interview guide (e.g., follow-up probes and the opportunity

for discussion) not all of the relevant information was found in the same place in each interview (Patton, 1990; Orlich, 1978).

The fourth step involved developing a table for each question from the factors which emerged from analysis.

Step five involved identifying and analyzing the common themes or patterns reflected in the tables generated from the data on each question.

Data derived from this study describe: the types and numbers of children with disabilities served, the kinds of services provided, the types and sources of personnel, operating procedures, administrative structure, and barriers which interfere with comprehensive special education services.

CHAPTER 5  
RESULTS, DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter reports the results of the study which used interviews and data forms to collect data from principals to describe the current status and needs of special education services in the band-operated schools in Manitoba, Canada. These data present the perceptions of principals regarding the: types and numbers of children with disabilities identified and served; kinds of personnel and programs provided; operating procedures; and barriers.

I. Status of Special Education Students

Identified and Served

Students with all types of exceptionalities are attending the band-operated schools in Manitoba (see Table 2). The six principals identified 70 special education students out of a total student population of 3,257 students (2.12%). Students were identified in all categories of exceptionality except deaf-blind. The categories of exceptionality and the percentage of the school population included: learning disabilities (0.83%), speech impaired (0.34%), mentally-handicapped (0.09%),

Table 2

Number and Percent of Special Education Students by Category  
within Six Schools (Total school population was 3257)

Category of Exceptionality	Identified by Category	
	N	%
Learning disabled	27	0.83
Speech impaired	11	0.34
Mentally handicapped	3	0.09
Behaviorally/ Emotionally disabled	10	0.31
Multi-handicapped	4	0.12
Hard of hearing/deaf	5	0.14
Other health impaired	5	0.14
Orthopedically impaired	3	0.09
Visually handicapped	2	0.06
Total	70	2.12

behaviorally/emotionally disabled (0.31%), other health impaired (0.14%), orthopedically-impaired (0.14%), hard of hearing/deaf (0.14%), and the visually-impaired (0.06%).

There was agreement among three of the six principals that special education students are not being sent out of the communities for their education. The other three principals indicated that a small number of students are being sent out.

There appear to be communication difficulties between the school principals and the local education authority regarding special education students who have been sent off-reserve to school. One principal mentioned that some students are institutionalized outside of the community. The principal noted the lack of formal information/communication regarding these students. The principal was not informed of: a) who the students were; b) their types of disabilities; and c) the location of the institution.

Regarding these special education students, the principal stated "Who they are, I don't know. I just hear of them." In a later interview, the principal again noted the existence of students who were sent out and her lack of information about them. "I only know this from gossip, ah, from different families. And I don't, I don't know. I only know two or three, and I know there's no list available to me. . . ."

In a final interview, the principal again mentioned the difficulty in determining the number of special education students sent out. The principal stated:

. . . just from word of mouth, ah, over the year and a half that I've been here, there are some, ah, multiple handicapped children out there, but no one's talking about them, like they don't even exist.

Another principal had a similar experience in his school. The principal stated that there was a child sent to the School for the Deaf from his community. However, the principal had no idea how the child had been sent there. The principal stated, "How the child got there, I don't know."

The number of students not being identified and served in the band-operated schools may be alarming. In many cases, the students have gone through the eligibility process. The students have been assessed by specialists and reports have been written. Indian and Northern Affairs special education criteria has been met for the purposes of eligibility and additional funding. However, the band-operated schools receive additional funding for only a small number of the identified students.

A number of principals indicated that the difficulties with the identification of special education students were

the result of actions of INAC officials. Most of the difficulties with the government officials stemmed from poor communication with the band-operated schools regarding procedural rules (e.g., list of approved private consultants) and the lack of feedback to the school regarding the refusal of additional funding for students who meet the special education criteria. A number of principals related stories regarding the actions of Indian and Northern Affairs officials.

One principal suggested that the department of Indian and Northern Affairs operates a "quota system" in the area of special education identification and funding. He stated:

I think we have a quota system. This school gets so much and that's it. . . . I don't think that every case is reviewed on its own merit... we're just sort of lumped together and [the school] gets so much. . . .

A principal had a list of seventeen students who were not funded. Thirteen of the students had been assessed in 1993. The other four had been assessed in 1992. The students had been assessed by INAC approved school psychologists. During the interview, the principal reviewed the list of students to illustrate that additional special education students were in the school. The principal noted that:

. . . One of them here says there's a need for therapy. Another one says severe academic delays, need for individual programming. Need for therapy. There's a need for counseling and individual attention. Need for therapy again. And when they need therapy, it's usually due to some severe trauma in life.

The principal emphasized that special education identification and funding criteria had been met. However, the school did not receive additional funds for the students. No explanation was given to the school by INAC personnel.

Another principal had a similar experience. The principal indicated that "five or six students" were refused special education identification in his school. He stated "I don't know the reasons behind it (not funding the students)." The principal stated that "the department [INAC] has to recognize the psychologist before they'll accept the recommendations." The department recognized only certain psychologists. Their names were placed on a list. However, the principal has never seen the list, "No, they didn't provide a list to me." The principal noted that the school could not "get any psychologist" for the assessment of their students. The psychologists had to be approved by INAC for the school to get additional funding.

The funding for assessment by private consultants has caused a number of difficulties for the band-operated schools. After paying assessment costs of approximately five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per student, little was left for instructional programming for special education students recognized by INAC. The problem of using INAC's system of identification and funding private contractors for assessments has been described by one principal as:

. . . before you even get the funding you have to do the assessment. Once you get the funding, then some of that money has to go towards the assessments per child. Then on top of that, if you need consulting after that in order to deliver the proper program for each individual student, you're also spending that money for that. So before you know it, ah, if you have ten students that you're getting funding for, before you know it, you have five students that are doing without because of the fact that the funding is already depleted.

The funding issue was compounded by the nonfunding of students who have met INAC eligibility criteria for special education. The band-operated schools have spent funds on assessments which they will not recover.

The approved list is important for the band-operated schools. In order to obtain funding for identified special education students, the students must be assessed and a report written by a specialist on the list. If the school uses a provincially certified school psychologist who is not on the list, the recommendations are not used by INAC personnel.

Despite their official low numbers, a substantial number of special education students are attending the band-operated schools. Each of the principals had stories to tell about their dealings with INAC officials regarding the identification and funding of special education students. One principal referring to one group of unidentified special education students stated that: ". . . the biggest category who are not being served is behaviorally and emotionally [disturbed]. . . . I could probably say there's at least a dozen that . . . are either suicidal or have attempted suicide."

Another principal also noted the difficulties in getting special education students accepted by INAC personnel. Recently, the school submitted a list of 51 students for special education funding. The school received additional funding for ten. No reasons are provided by INAC for refusing 41 students (e.g., "They [INAC] don't tell us

why . . . they just say these are the ones that got funded.").

A principal related that the school was denied special education funding for one student. The decision from INAC surprised the school staff. The principal stated that "It (the decision) seemed to, to floor us a bit."

In summary, special education students are attending the band-operated schools in Manitoba. A small number of special education students who are severely impaired continue to be sent out of their community for their education. There were probably more students than the numbers indicated because the principals may not be informed of these out-of-community placements. Difficulties exist in the area of assessment due to INAC's use of an approved list of specialists, unwillingness to fund all eligible students, and their unwillingness to inform the band-operated schools of special education information.

## II. Status of Special Education

### Administrative Structure

Special education services in the individual band-operated schools on Manitoba is under the administrative of INAC (see Figure 2). INAC provides the band-operated schools with the following special education services: policy development; monitoring of programs; funding; personnel; and a list of approved specialists.

Figure 2

Present Special Education Administrative Structure for Band-Operated Schools

---

INAC

\*Monitoring of Programs

\*Policies

\*Funds and

\*List of Approved Specialists

Band-Operated School

\*resource/special

education teachers

Health and

Welfare Canada

\*Screening

Private

Contractors

\*Assessments

---

The band-operated schools must follow the special education policies of INAC. The schools must use INAC forms and the list of approved specialists to receive additional funding.

Specialist support for the band-operated schools usually comes from private contractors (i.e., assessment) on a fee for service basis or from Health and Welfare Canada-Medical Services Branch (i.e., screening). School-based personnel usually develop and monitor I.E.Ps of their special education students.

Indian educational support centers (e.g., tribal councils) have a limited role in special education services at the school level. These Indian-controlled agencies do not employ special education administrators, clinicians, or consultants to monitor and support special education programs and teachers.

The band-operated schools are organized as single units. The schools operate in isolation from other band-operated schools. There is a lack of coordination of special education services among the schools.

### III. Status of Special Education Personnel

Although most types of special education personnel (see Table 3) are found in the six schools, not all types are found in each school. Typically, a school has a resource teacher, counselor, and a teacher aide. Twenty (51.3%) of

Table 3

Summary and Sources of Special Education Personnel(N = 6 schools)

Personnel	Number of schools without specialists  N	Agencies providing special education personnel				
		School Staff	TC*	MIEA*	INAC*	PC*
Special education co-ordinator	(6)					
Speech/ language pathologist	(3)					3
Occupational therapist	(5)					1
Social worker	(3)	1	1			1
Resource/ Special ed. teacher		6				
School psychologist	(1)	2				3
Counsellor	(1)	5				
Physio- therapist	(5)					1
Teacher aides		6				

Table 3--Continued

Personnel	Number of schools without specialists	Agencies providing special education personnel				
		School Staff	TC*	MIEA*	INAC*	PC*
	N					
<b>Consultants</b>						
Multihandicapped	(5)					1
Alternate ed.	(6)					
Hearing-impaired	(5)					1
Vision-impaired	(5)					1
Early education	(3)				3	
Learning disabled	(5)					1
Gifted education	(6)					
Behavioral/ emotionally disturbed	(4)					2
Total N	39	20	1	0	3	15
%		51.3%	2.6%	0.0%	7.7%	38.5%

\* Tribal Council (TC)

\* Manitoba Indian Education Association (MIEA)

\* Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

\* Private Contractors (PC)

the special education personnel are members of school staffs. Six schools had a resource teacher and teacher aides. Five schools had a counsellor. Two schools had a school psychologist. One school had a social worker.

Fifteen (38.5%) of the special education personnel came from private contractors. Three schools obtained a speech and language pathologist and a school psychologist from private contractors. Two schools used a privately contracted consultant for the behaviorally/emotionally disordered. Privately contracted personnel used by only one school included the following: occupational therapist, social worker, physiotherapist, and consultants for the multihandicapped, hearing impaired, vision impaired and learning disabled.

Three (7.7%) of the special education personnel used in the band-operated schools come from INAC. Three schools use the services of INAC's early education consultant. One (2.6%) of the special education personnel came from a tribal council. One school used the services of a social worker from their tribal council.

All six principals indicated that their schools were without the services of a special education coordinator and the services of consultants in alternate and gifted education. Five schools were without the services of the following specialists and consultants: occupational

therapists; physiotherapists; consultants for the multihandicapped; consultants for the hearing impaired; consultants for the vision impaired;, and consultants for the learning disabled.

#### IV. Special Education Services and Programs

An examination of the special education programs and services available in the six band-operated schools (see Table 4) indicates that there is no consistency of programs. Schools do not all lack (except for parent counseling and physio-therapy) or all have the same types of programs. School size does not appear to be a factor.

Five of the six schools provided psychological services for their students. Four schools provided early identification programs. Three schools had social work and transportation services. Two schools had hearing and vision assessment services. One school provided occupational and physiotherapy services. No schools provided parent counseling services.

A complaint of a number of principals is that there is little on-going related services support for the classroom and special education/resource teachers in the band-operated schools. One principal stated that there was no on-going support and that his school didn't "have a regular scheduled psychologist that comes in". Another principal noted that support for teachers was "limited".

Table 4

Types of Special Education Programs at Band-Operated Schools

Special Education Programs	Schools						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Psychological	x	x	x		x	x	5
Early identification	x		x		x	x	4
Social work		x	x		x		3
Transportation			x	x		x	3
Vision assessment					x	x	2
Hearing assessment	x	x					2
Occupational/physio therapy	x						1
Parent counseling							0
Programs per school	4	3	4	1	4	4	

Five principals stated that the special education programs and services in band-operated schools were not comparable to services provided in the provincial schools. The five principals stated that they did the best they could with the limited services they had, but many times it "didn't come close" to meeting their needs. One principal was unable to make the comparison since he did not know the status of services among the provincial schools.

When asked from which educational agencies they would like to receive special education specialists, the principals indicated an overwhelming preference (81.1%) for Indian-controlled educational agencies (i.e., M.I.E.A, tribal councils, school staff and Indian band) [see Table 5). There was some support (13%) for obtaining specialists from private contractors. Federal government agencies (i.e., INAC and Medical Services) only received marginal support (5.5%).

In summary, special education personnel, programs and services are limited in the band-operated schools of Manitoba. In general, the schools have the following personnel: resource teachers; teacher aides and counsellors. Most of the schools provide psychological services (assessment) for their students. The principals would prefer to obtain specialist support for their schools from Indian-controlled educational agencies.

Table 5

Summary of Preferred Sources for Special Education Personnel  
(N = 6 schools)

Personnel	School			Med.			
	MIEA	Staff	TC	PC	INAC	Ser.	Band
Special education co-ordinator	1	1	4				
Speech/ language pathologist	3		4	1	1		
Occupational therapist	2		2	1		1	
Social worker			1		1		2
School psychologist	2	1	1				
Counsellor	1	3					
Physio- therapist	1					1	
<u>Consultants</u>							
Multi- handicapped	3		1	1			
Alternate ed.	3		1	1			

Table 5--Continued

Personnel	School			Med.			
	MIEA	Staff	TC	PC	INAC	Ser.	Band
Hearing-							
impaired	3		1	1			
Vision-							
impaired	3		1	1			
Early							
education	3	1		1			
Learning							
disabled	3		1	1			
Gifted							
education	3		1	1			
Behavioral/							
emotionally							
disturbed	2		1	1			
(N = 74)	33	6	19	10	2	2	2
%	44.6	8.1	25.7	13.5	2.7	2.7	2.7

\*Tribal Council (TC)  
 Provincial Indian Education Body (MIEA)  
 Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)  
 Private Contractors (PC)  
 Medical Services (Med. Ser.)  
 Indian Band (Band)

## V. Operating Procedures

### Identifying Students at Risk

All six principals indicated an absence of formal or written policies for screening and identification of special education students (see Table 6). Students may be referred for further assessment by teachers, parents and medical services personnel in all six schools. Administrators may refer in two schools. Educational counsellors, consultants and home-school coordinators may refer in one school.

All six schools used similar tests to screen students for further testing in special education. Students were given pre-school test batteries and achievement test batteries by school personnel. These tests were completed on an annual basis. They may also be given to new students. Student hearing and vision testing was usually completed by Medical Services personnel (Health and Welfare Canada).

All six schools implement annual programs for testing pre-school children and testing achievement. Two schools screen for hearing and vision problems and one school screens for health problems. Schools generally use similar methods and instruments in their screening programs.

The schools use different methods to refer students. Five of the six schools use referral forms. One school uses only verbal contact to refer students.

Table 6

Screening and Identification Procedures

Procedures	Number of Schools
1. Policies for screening and identification	
A. Written	0
B. Unwritten	6
2. Referral sources	
Teachers	6
Parents	6
Medical services personnel	6
Administrators	2
Consultants	1
Educational counsellors	1
Home school coordinators	1
3. Screening methods	
Pre-school screening	6
Achievement testing	6
Vision testing	2
Hearing testing	2
Health screening	1
4. Referral procedures	
Referral form	5
Verbal contact	1

A different process for identification exists in each of the six schools.

School one	12 steps
School six	7 steps
School three	6 steps
School four	4 steps
School two	2 steps
School five	2 steps

There was no consistency between schools with respect to: who did the screening; where the screening is done, either within the school or out of the community; the availability of funds; and the availability of trained personnel.

#### Parental Consent

All six principals indicated that their schools have a policy on parental consent (see Table 7) and always inform parents about the actions the school wants to take. One principal described his policy as "not a written policy, an informal policy where parents always are contacted if anything is going to be done . . ." Only two principals had written policies.

Often the schools' policy on parental consent consisted of a parent consent form for testing a student. One principal's statements on parent consent was similar to other schools. The principal stated that the school's

Table 7

Parental Consent Procedures


---

Procedures	Number of Schools
<hr/>	
I. Policies for parental consent	
A. Written	2
B. Unwritten	4
II. Full information given	
A. Parents informed about actions the school wants to take	6
III. Parent consent forms	
A. Consent forms used	4
B. Verbal consent used	2
IV. Action taken on verbal approval only	
A. Will take action with verbal approval only	3
B. Will not take action with verbal approval only	3
V. Action taken on refusal of consent	
Contact home school coordinator	5
Keeping records of refusal	5
Contacting Child and Family Services	4
Not serve the student	2
Another meeting with parents	1
Explain other options to parents	1

---

policy consisted of requiring the parent to sign "a consent form" before testing. The consent form was described as ". . . quite basic. It's not very complicated at all". Later, the form was described as a "signature consent form." The principal noted that the form did not include "a whole description of parent and student rights."

Three principals said that they will take action with verbal approval only. The other three principals stated that they would not take action with verbal approval only.

When parents refuse to give consent, the actions taken by principals varied. Some kept records of refusal and contacted home-school coordinators or Child and Family Services. Other principals would arrange another meeting with the parents, explain other options, or not serve the student.

In summary, schools seem to be sensitive and considerate toward informing parents and obtaining consent. The most serious need is to produce written policies which fully explain parents' rights and alternatives, as well as the school's responsibilities and options in case of parent-school disagreement.

#### Assessment

The assessment of special education students was generally consistent throughout the six band-operated schools. All six principals stated that their assessment

and multidisciplinary team policies are unwritten (see Table 8).

All six schools use privately contracted specialists for assessment. These specialists included school psychologists, speech and language pathologists. Four schools involve the resource/special education teacher in the assessment process.

Five of the six schools indicated that students referred for special education are given intelligence and educational achievement tests as part of the assessment process. Other areas of assessment (e.g., socio-emotional status, vision, speech and hearing) varied by school.

Native languages and cultures may be informally considered in the assessment by band-operated schools; however, there are no written policies. One principal stated that "There is no policy. There's no consideration for it." Another principal stated that consideration of Native culture and language was ". . . not required." One principal believed that Native culture and language was considered informally by their private contractor. The principal stated that "this psychologist does a lot of testing for Native schools. So he does understand."

Language proficiency in English is not considered during the assessments of most students. Two principals indicated that assessment of language proficiency is only

Table 8

Assessment Procedures

Procedures	Number of Schools
I. Policies for assessment	
A. Written	0
B. Unwritten	6
II. Multidisciplinary team policy	
A. Written policy	0
B. Unwritten policy	3
C. No policy	3
III. Assessment personnel	
A. Privately contracted specialists	6
B. Resource/Special education teachers	4
IV. Areas of evaluation	
A. Six areas of evaluation:	
Educational achievement	5
Intelligence	5
Socio-emotional status	3
Vision	3
Hearing	2
Speech	2
V. Determination of English language proficiency	
A. Do not determine English language proficiency	6
B. Acquire an interpreter if a problem is encountered	6
VI. Consideration of students' Native language and culture	
A. Do not consider	6

Table 8--Continued

---

Procedures	Number of Schools
VII. Re-evaluation schedules	
A. Every year	2
B. Every two years	3
C. Every three years	1

---

considered when new students came into the school. One principal when asked if language proficiency is considered answered, "We don't know. We don't do anything." Later the principal indicated that determination of language proficiency is informal: "If he's a trapline kid, usually we assume that the Cree is better spoken. . . . But we don't do any formal things. . . . There's no assessment that's done to find out what he'd prefer before the testing's done." Another principal stated ". . . up to now, no, no, no" when asked about determination of language proficiency.

The re-evaluation of special education students differed in the six schools. Three principals said that students were evaluated every two years. Two principals indicated that students were evaluated yearly. One principal stated re-evaluations occurred every three years.

In summary, assessment in the band-operated schools are usually conducted by private contractors. English language proficiency and Native culture and language is not considered to be important in the assessment process. There is no indication from the principals that there are formal policies or procedures in the area of assessment.

#### Individualized Education Plans

All six principals indicated that their schools did not have written policies regarding Individual Education Plans (IEPs). However, the six principals indicated that their

schools used IEPs with their special education students (see Table 9).

There are formal IEP meetings in only two of the six schools. Three schools did not have IEP meetings. One school held informal meetings.

The IEPs are usually written three to four weeks after the assessments. The resource and classroom teachers are involved in writing the IEPs in all six schools. Other personnel involved may include the principal and the teaching assistant. Parents have a very limited role (e.g., share information) in one school.

Reviews of IEPs varied in the six schools. Three principals indicated that the IEPs are reviewed every six months. In one school the IEPs are reviewed annually. Irregular reviews took place in two of the schools.

Disagreements with parents regarding IEPs were not a problem in five of the six schools. In one school, the principal indicated that another meeting with parents would be arranged. If parents persisted and refused to give consent for the IEP, the principal would contact Child and Family Services. However, the principal indicated that every effort would be made to accommodate the parents and to ensure that they were fully informed. All six principals stated that the schools would not contact parents if IEPs were revised.

Table 9

Individual Educational Plans

Procedures	Number of Schools
I. Policies for IEPs	
A. Written	0
B. Unwritten	6
II. IEP meeting	
A. Conduct formal IEP meetings	2
B. Informal IEP meetings	1
C. No IEP meetings	3
III. Participants in writing the IEP	
A. Resource teacher	6
B. Classroom teacher	6
C. Principal	1
D. Teaching assistant	1
E. Parents	1
IV. Time for writing IEP after assessment	
A. Five weeks or more	1
B. Three or four weeks	4
C. Two weeks	1
V. Refuse consent for placement decision	
A. Never a problem	5
B. Arrange another meeting, Family Services contacted	1
VI. Review of IEP	
A. Every six months	3
B. Irregular	2
C. Annually	1
VII. Parental Contact for IEP Revision	
A. Do not notify parents	6

Table 9--Continued

---

Procedures	Number of Schools
VIII. Supervision/monitoring of IEP	
A. Principal and resource teacher	5
B. No supervision	1

---

The IEPs are supervised and monitored by in-school personnel in five of the six schools. The supervisors included the principal or the resource/special education teacher. One principal indicated that no one supervised or monitored the IEPs at her school.

The six principals did not mention specialists, clinicians or consultants coming from outside the school having a role in the development, implementation and review of IEPs in their band-operated schools. IEP development, implementation, and review is completed by inschool staff.

#### Eligibility and Placement Decisions

All six principals indicated that their schools did not have written policies for determining eligibility and placement (see Table 10). Principals stated that their policies were "not written down," or that "We don't have a written policy." The principals indicated that their schools had no policies on multidisciplinary teams.

Two principals indicated they used teams to make placement decisions. However, the teams consisted of in-school personnel. Principals made statements indicating the absence of outside personnel: "in-school staff only;" and "there's nobody from outside."

Four principals stated that they did not use teams. Final placement decisions are made by the principal in four

Table 10

Eligibility and Placement Decisions


---

Procedures	Number of Schools
<hr/>	
I. Policies for eligibility and placement	
A. Written	0
B. Unwritten	6
II. Team placement meetings	
A. Decisions made by a team	2
B. Decisions not made by a team	4
C. Final decision made by principal	4
D. Decisions made by principal and resource teacher	1
E. Decision made by resource teacher	1
III. Placement locations	
A. Regular classroom with resource teacher support (both collaborative approach or pull-out)	6
B. Self-contained classrooms (note: one school had both options)	1
IV. Placement before assessment is completed	
A. Yes	6

---

of the six schools, the principal and the resource teacher in one school, and the resource teacher in another school. In all six schools students are usually placed in the regular classroom with support from the resource room teacher. This resource teacher support varies in the schools. Both collaborative (resource teacher in the classroom) and student pull-out approaches were used in the schools. One school is able to place some special education students in their own self-contained classrooms. All principals indicated that students could be placed before assessment is completed.

In summary, there is an absence of written policies regarding placement and eligibility decisions. Personnel involved in making decisions about special education students were school-based personnel.

#### Confidentiality

There appear to be limited written policies (see Table 11) regarding the confidentiality of special education records in the band-operated schools. Three principals indicated that their schools had written policies. One principal stated that their policy included a "written consent form and stuff that we got to get the parents' consent to release any kind of records to other schools." One principal indicated that his school had a written confidentiality policy but as far as parents reviewing the

Table 11

Confidentiality


---

Procedures	Number of Schools
<hr/>	
I. Policies for confidentiality	
A. Written policies	3
B. Unwritten policies	3
II. Access to student records	
A. Open for review:	
parent only	3
parent and representative	3
B. Copies	
yes	1
no	3
C. Only summaries	3
D. Explanations of files	1
III. Safeguards and out of school access	
A. All files secure and locked	6
B. Files can be sent out	6
C. List of people accessing file	1
IV. Policy for amendment of files	
A. No policy	4
B. Change is unacceptable	1
C. Uncertain	1

---

school reports that the policy was "open-ended" and that the principal would make an "administrative decision" depending on the parents' reasons. Another principal indicated that confidentiality of special education records was covered by general school policies. There was no specific policy for special education.

The other three principals indicated that their schools had policies, but that they were unwritten. One principal indicated that the policies were "not written, but it's an unwritten . . . policy." The unwritten policy was described by a principal as "any assessments or psychological tests that are conducted on students are kept on file, ah, and not released to anyone, not even to another school." Another principal stated that her school's policies on confidentiality were unwritten. She stated that ". . . it is understood that all records are confidential. It's not written anywhere but it's just understood."

There is no consistency regarding access rights of parents to student special education records in the six schools. Three principals allow only parents to review records. The other three principals would allow a representative of the parent to review records. Student information is given to the parents in all six schools. However, in one school the matter is determined on a case by

case basis by the principal. Only one principal allows copies to be made by the parents.

The information received by parents varies in the six schools. Three principals indicated that parents would only receive summaries of the reports. In one school parents would have to be given an explanation of the files by the resource/special education teacher or the principal.

Security of special education records is consistent throughout the six schools. The schools keep the records in a locked cabinet. All six principals indicated that special education records could be sent out of the school. One school kept a list of people who had seen the files.

An absence of policy is evident in the area of changing a student's special education file. Four of the six principals indicated that their schools did not have a policy (e.g., "I don't think we have a policy"). One principal stated that change was unacceptable because "it's a record." One principal is uncertain about the policy, however, he stated that he "wouldn't see any problems with it".

In summary, the band-operated schools' policies on the confidentiality of special education records are usually unwritten. There are no consistent statement regarding parental rights to: examine their child's records; and, to amend the records.

## CHAPTER 6

## DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The education of Indians living on reserves in Canada is the responsibility of the federal government of Canada (Department of Justice, Canada, 1986). Indian children living on reserves may attend Federal Schools, Provincial Schools, or Band-Operated Schools. Canada's Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) provides funds for the education of 16,717 Indian children attending either 38 band-operated schools, seven federal schools, or any of the hundreds of provincial schools in Manitoba. At present, Indian children requiring special education services are receiving these services in band-operated schools or are removed from their communities to attend provincial schools, where special education services are provided.

Since 1984 a series of studies have expressed concern about the lack of and the quality of special education services being delivered to band-operated schools in Manitoba (Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, 1991; 1984; Bravi, 1984; Island Lake Tribal Council, 1987; MIEA, 1984; Riffel, 1984; West Region Tribal Council, 1986). At the present time, however, there is an absence of data and information regarding the provision of special education services to

Indian students attending band-operated schools throughout Canada.

The purpose of this study is to describe the status of special education services among band-operated schools in Manitoba. This was done by conducting an in-depth survey of special education services provided in six band-operated schools in Manitoba. Two schools were randomly selected from each of three student population categories (1200-750; 650-300; and 150-50 students). These schools represented different sized schools typical of other schools in Manitoba. Data also were collected through in-depth interviews with the principal of each school. This study reveals that the existing special education delivery system is not fulfilling its purpose.

Although children with many types of disabilities are being served by the band-operated schools, the great majority of those who have been identified as needing special education are not receiving services. In fact, the number of students not being served in band-operated schools is alarming. According to prevalence figures (see Table 12), approximately eighty percent (80%) of the special education students one would expect to identify as disabled are not being served. In many cases, the disabled students who are not being served have gone through the identification process, been assessed by specialists, and

Table 12

Special Education Students Estimated and Not Identified by  
Category within Six Schools (N = 3257)

Category of Exceptionality	Identified by Category		Estimated by Category		Not Identified by Category	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
	Learning Disabled	27	0.83	163	5.01	136
Speech Impaired	11	0.34	84	2.59	73	2.25
Mentally Handicapped	3	0.09	45	1.38	42	1.29
Behaviorally/ Emotionally Disabled	10	0.31	31	0.96	21	0.65
Multi- Handicapped Hard of	4	0.12	6	0.18	2	0.06

Table 12--Continued

Category of Exceptionality	Identified		Estimated		Not Identified	
	by Category		by Category		by Category	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hearing/Deaf	5	0.14	5	0.14	0	0.00
Other Health Impaired	5	0.14	4	0.11	(1)	(0.03)
Orthopedically Impaired	3	0.09	4	0.12	1	0.03
Visually Handicapped	2	0.06	2	0.06	0	0.00
Total	70	2.12	344	10.55	274	8.43

have written eligibility reports. INAC special education criteria have been met for the purposes of eligibility and funding, but services have not been provided.

Approximately 20% of those needing special education are receiving services within the band-operated schools. Three principals reported only a small number of students who are severely impaired, continue to be sent out of their communities for education. There might be more disabled students sent out than the numbers indicate because the principals may not be informed of out-of-community placements. There seems to be some confusion about who is being served elsewhere and how these decisions were made.

INAC's non-recognition of special education students who have met INAC's eligibility criteria is disturbing. Non-recognition of eligible students, plus INAC's unwillingness to inform the schools of the reasons for refusal to fund eligible students, severely restricts the development of a delivery system for special education services. The band-operated school administrators and local education authorities are unable to know where they stand regarding funding and services for special education students who have met all criteria for eligibility purposes.

The schools often find themselves in the predicament of identifying special education students, raising the

expectations of parents and teachers, only to find that large numbers of eligible students are not funded by INAC.

Principals cite three reasons why so few students are being served. First, it is suspected INAC employs a quota and funding cap per school, and that this practice contributes to the problem. Band-operated schools receive additional funding for only a small number of identified students. Second, schools lack personnel in special education. Third, band-operated schools do not control the needed financial and personnel resources.

The information and data from this study point out the following deficiencies in the delivery of special education services to children who are disabled in band-operated schools.

1. The existing administrative structure between INAC and the band-operated schools appears to be inefficient and contributing to the lack of needed services for Indian students who are disabled.
2. There is no consistency of programs and services among band-operated schools. Services in band-operated schools are not comparable to services provided in the provincial schools.

3. Band-operated schools lack sufficient numbers of trained special educators who have expertise in identification, assessment and special education techniques.
4. There is an absence of informal, formal, or written policies for: identifying at-risk students; parental consent; assessment; individualized education plans; eligibility and placement decisions; and confidentiality. All schools are making efforts in each of these areas.
5. There appears to be a lack of involvement from parents as well as from the community with respect to supporting band-operated schools. Parents appear to be alienated and have a feeling of not belonging to school related efforts.

This chapter will discuss these five significant barriers to comprehensive special education for Indian students who are disabled and present recommendations for the band-operated schools, tribal councils, and interested Indian political organizations.

**Barrier One: Ineffective Administrative Organization**

Throughout this study principals commented on the inadequacy of the existing administrative organization as a contributing factor to the lack of special education services for children who are disabled in band-operated

schools. Reasons given for an ineffective administrative organization were: (a) the role of INAC, (b) problems within the local educational agencies, (c) politics on the reserve, (d) the use of specialist contracts, (e) jurisdictional barriers, and (f) geographic considerations.

#### INAC As A Factor

The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) was perceived to be a barrier with respect to funding; control of specialists; relationship with local politicians; interfering beliefs and poor communication.

In the area of funding, the principals believe that each individual student case is not reviewed on its own merits. INAC does not financially support all special education students who have met the criteria for funding. The principals believe that there is a funding cap for special education services. The principals are also concerned that the schools must provide funding (e.g., \$500.00 per student) up front for testing by private contractors. Reimbursement is made only for those students INAC recognizes as needing services.

The principals also believe that INAC special education funding is not equivalent to provincial level of funding for special education. They also complained about having to go through too much "red tape" to get funding.

INAC control of specialists is a concern for the principals. INAC must recognize the private contractor (e.g., school psychologist) before recommendations or funding will be accepted by INAC. However, the list of recognized private contractors is not readily available to the principals.

The principals were concerned that politics or relations between INAC and the reserve's chief and council may interfere with the school's relationship with INAC. If the reserve's chief and council have a history of not getting along with INAC, problems may develop in the school's relationship with INAC (e.g., funding for special education).

The principals expressed concern that INAC personnel may not believe school principal or staff regarding special education needs (e.g., eligible students, funding requests). Additional documentation is often requested of the band-operated schools.

The principals were concerned about INAC communication with the band-operated schools. The principals noted that the INAC does not inform schools regarding services they are supposed to provide or fund. They also complained that INAC changes special education rules or policies without informing the schools.

Problems Within The Local Educational Authorities (LEA)

A total of three issues were identified by principals as contributing to problems within the local educational authorities: interfering beliefs; organization and communication; and tight administrative control.

The interfering beliefs include the following: special education is not important; LEA denies certain health issues such as suicide, gas sniffing and hungry children; LEA does not employ trained special educators because they want to hire only local people who are untrained; LEA is reluctant to admit that needed services are not there; and LEA wants to deal with special education problems locally.

The difficulties in organization and communication include: principals and directors from tribal council do not meet to discuss common issues; and LEA is unaware of how to access special education funds.

Examples of the LEA's tight authoritative control over the school and funds include: school board meetings being closed to the public; school board minutes not being posted; the principal is not involved in bringing in specialists; LEA members appointed by chief and council are not accountable to the public; LEA does not give out financial figures to the public or to school administration; and the principal is unaware of the school's special education budget.

### Politics on the Reserve

The role of politics on the reserve was raised by principals as a reason for an ineffective administrative organization. The Chief and Council may not give educational funds to the local educational authority. There was concern about specialized or preferential treatment of children of parents who are politically active.

### Specialist Contracts

The practice of contracting specialists as an integral part of the administrative organization was identified as a problem. Two principals indicated that specialists did not come to their schools on a regular basis. Principals were concerned that the psychological reports of the contract specialists were poorly written (e.g., spelling errors and wrong names) and contained poor educational recommendations.

### Jurisdictional Issues

Jurisdictional issues seemed to result from the existing administrative organization. Special education students on reserves may fall between the different levels of jurisdiction. For example, it may be difficult to obtain services for blind students. Special education personnel from the Provincial Department of Education are not allowed to help on the reserve. Canadian National Institute for the Blind states "we are not a federal service." INAC has no specialists in this category of exceptionality.

### Geographical Considerations

Band-operated schools are distributed over a large geographic area. Not only is it difficult for schools to contact and communicate with each other, it is even more difficult to arrange meetings with specialists from Winnipeg. The existing administrative organization over such a large region presents practical logistical problems.

#### Barrier Two: Lack of Needed Special Education

##### Services in Band-Operated Schools

Although the schools offer school-based special education programs (e.g., resource rooms), the numbers and kinds of special education programs were limited due to the absence of on-going support from other Indian education agencies. Specialist support was usually from private contractors on a fee for service basis or from Health and Welfare Canada.

Regional centers such as tribal councils and a central Indian education body (e.g., Manitoba Indian Education Association) have virtually no role in special education services at the school level. These Indian education bodies do not employ special education administrators, clinicians, or consultants to monitor and support school programs and teachers.

There is a real need for the development of a "system" for delivering special education personnel and programs to

band-operated schools in Manitoba. One principal recommends that the "whole structure of INAC . . . has to be redone." The principal later described a system where specialists (e.g., speech and language pathologists and psychologists) would be organized at the tribal council levels to provide services to the band-operated schools. The other five principals agreed that specialists and clinicians should be under the control of Indian education bodies.

Reasons for the absence of special education programs and personnel in all six schools include: school size; limited funds; and INAC control of the specialists and funds. School size is important, because there may be too few students to justify full-time school staff in all areas of exceptionalities.

The principals believe that funding for identified special education students has been capped by INAC. Also, INAC maintains control over the specialists and funding by having a list of approved specialists, which the band-operated schools must use to identify students and to obtain additional funding. Principals complain that the list was not made available to them and that students who had been eligible as special education students were denied funding.

### Barrier Three: Lack of Special Education Personnel

The lack of special education personnel among the band-operated schools contributes toward: (a) failure to identify children who are disabled; (b) the lack of special education instruction to Indian students requiring special education services; and (c) inconsistent operating procedures. The specialists, who are available, are primarily focused on the identification of special education students. There is little evidence of follow-up or on-going special education services within the band-operated schools.

There is a lack of trained personnel, who understand the multi-faceted field of special education. This is true in the area of administration of special education and in the assessment, planning and instruction of students. The dependence on private contractors removes consistency and procedural control from the schools and requires large expenditures of money.

The low number of disabled students in a single school of children makes it impossible for a school to employ a specialist in every area of disability. There is no joint agreement or cooperative structure, which allows schools to share staff and personnel in a common program. The lack of an Indian controlled cooperative structure makes it difficult for schools to develop joint cooperative programs and consistent and effective operating procedures.

Geographical barriers and the lack of funds in band-operated schools make it difficult to employ needed special education personnel.

Three principals identified two areas of personnel concern: regular classroom teachers and resource teachers. The principals indicated that they were concerned about the high turnover of regular teaching staff which makes it difficult to develop and maintain programs. The regular classroom teachers are not aware of their role in working with resource teachers in developing programs, writing IEPs, completing paperwork, and collaborating in-class with the resource teacher. The principals expressed concern over resource teachers being over-worked and lacking provincial certification in special education.

#### Barrier Four: Operating Procedures

It should be noted that there are no mandatory rules and regulations from any federal, provincial, tribal or other governing bodies, which provide schools with guidelines for establishing special education operating procedures. The band-operated schools should be complimented, because each of them is making an attempt to implement operational components for delivering their special education services.

Consistent operating procedures should be based on written school policies. The principals stated that their

schools had informal policies, but that the policies were unwritten or in the process of being revised. A clear written statement of special education policy was lacking in all the schools.

The absence of written policies results in a number of problems. First, unwritten policies are perceived in various ways by different people, and are commonly misunderstood. Second, informal policies may be administered differently by various individuals or in different situations all of which contribute to inconsistency. Third, with changes in personnel, unwritten policies may be forgotten, discarded, or new policies instituted which have not been thoroughly examined and approved. Fourth, parents are unable to obtain and read information on the rights and responsibilities of the school in the education of students with special education needs. The absence of written policies has meant that there is no certainty that students who have met eligibility criteria will be identified and served as special education students. Unwritten policies have resulted in a special education system without supervision or monitoring of special education programs, teachers and specialists.

The six band-operated schools have begun to develop operating procedures for delivering special education services to children with disabilities. These procedures:

differ between schools; are not clearly defined; are being implemented in a variety of ways, many of which are inefficient and not as effective as they might be.

There are two major factors which contribute to the lack of systematic, efficient, and effective operating procedures. First, without clearly defined written policies, operating procedures have no consistent foundation upon which to be based. With turnover in personnel, staff with different values and perspectives will modify or alter operating procedures. Within a school, different staff members may interpret policies differently. A history of verbal communication may be related to a lack of written policies.

Second, other than the principal, who is not trained in special education, there is no staff member who has been assigned the responsibility and authority for preparing policies, operating procedures and monitoring special education programs. Only one school assigned a resource teacher to coordinate their program.

#### Barrier Five: Lack of Involvement of Parent and Community with Band-Operated Schools

The parents do not see themselves as partners within the school system, and elders do not see themselves or their ideas as welcome in the school. Many parents who were sent to boarding schools have been alienated from the school and

have not been involved in educational matters. Parents and community members have not demanded special education services. Parents are unaware of the types and range of special education services which should be offered. Due to past government actions (i.e., sending special education students out of the community) parents may want to deal with special education problems locally, without calling attention to their child. If band-operated schools are to have effective programs in special education, parental and community participation and support is essential.

#### Recommendations

Overcoming the five barriers which seem to be contributing factors to the lack of comprehensive special education services for the band-operated schools presents a formidable challenge to Indian Band, Tribal Council and Provincial education agencies. These recommendations attempt to address specific strategies which can be used to create an Indian controlled special education system for meeting the needs of disabled Indian students throughout the province.

#### 1. Develop Band-Operated School and Tribal Council Planning Committees

If band-operated schools are going to improve the delivery of special education services to Indian children with disabilities, strategic planning committees should be

organized at the band-operated schools and tribal council levels.

Tribal Council Planning Committee. One individual with training in special education should be placed in charge of the tribal council planning group. The purpose of this group would be to: (1) oversee special education across band-operated schools, (2) gather tribal data and information concerning needs and available resources, and (3) work with band-operated schools in developing needed services. This planning committee should consist of the tribal council coordinator, two superintendents, two principals, two school special educators, and two parents. The tribal council planning committee should take the following actions:

- a. Develop a survey instrument which each school can use in assessing their available special education services and unmet needs. The instruments used in this study may be helpful.
- b. Train someone from each band-operated school to survey special education services and needs in their school and prepare a written report.
- c. Collate the surveys from each school and develop a tribal council needs and resource assessment report.

- d. Develop a plan for meeting band-operated school, tribal council, and provincial special education needs. Such a plan might include a structure for an administrative organization, written policies for identification procedures, personnel needs, needed special education services, and more consistent operating procedures.

Band-Operated School Planning Group. Each school should organize a school planning group designed to (1) survey special education resources and needs, (2) develop a plan for providing more comprehensive special education services for the school, and (3) cooperate with the tribal council planning group in developing services across the tribal council. The planning group might consist of a special education teacher, general education teacher, principal, and a parent.

## 2. Develop an Indian Controlled Special Education Administrative Organization

Individually, the band-operated schools and tribal councils may have difficulty providing a comprehensive range of special education services to their students. A province-wide Indian controlled special education administrative organization (see Figure 3) should be established which can: (a) coordinate, plan, guide, monitor,

Figure 3

Recommended Structure for Delivering Special Education  
Services per Tribal Council

---

Indian Education Agency  
Director of Special Education  
\* low incidence support  
programs and personnel  
for all the band-operated  
schools in Manitoba

Tribal Council  
Special Education Coordinator  
\* support programs and personnel  
(school psychologists, speech and  
language pathologists, early  
identification programs)

Tribal Council  
Strategic Planning Committee

Band- Operated School *	Band- Operated School *	Band- Operated School *	Band- Operated School *	Band- Operated School *	Band- Operated School *
----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

\* Each band-operated school would select one member for the Tribal Council Planning Committee. This committee would inform the Tribal Council of what each school's special education needs are. Tribal Council would hire staff, develop and co-ordinate programs.

---

and evaluate special education programs; and (b) communicate effectively with INAC and other agencies.

The recommended structure would be based on the needs of band-operated schools and tribal councils through their planning committees or groups. Each of the levels in the structure would have its own responsibilities.

Each band-operated school would be expected to provide a special education/resource teacher. These teachers would be expected to provide: (a) assessments; (b) direct instruction to students; (c) indirect instruction to classroom teachers; and (d) consultative/collaborative services with tribal council or province-wide Indian education agencies.

The tribal council would be expected to provide a special education coordinator and support personnel such as a school psychologist, a speech and language pathologist and a social worker. The tribal council personnel would be expected to establish and coordinate special education programs across the schools within the tribal council (e.g., early identification and screening). Tribal council personnel would also be expected to develop and monitor IEP's. The province-wide Indian education agency would be expected to provide a Director of Education and consultants for areas of low incidence disability (e.g., hearing impaired, orthopedically impaired, multihandicapped). This

agency would: (a) provide special education funds to the tribal councils and band-operated schools; (b) develop and implement special education policies; (c) provide program support for low incidence students; (d) monitor special education programs at the band-operated schools and tribal councils; and (e) provide training for tribal council personnel, band-operated school personnel, students and parents.

### 3. Increase Number of Trained Personnel

There are six kinds of actions which are recommended for assisting band-operated schools in increasing the numbers and types of special education personnel, which will meet the needs of educators of Indian students, parents, and community members.

First, to accomplish these goals it will be necessary for the band-operated schools to establish a comprehensive special education delivery system (described in Recommendation 2). Specialized personnel would be placed at each level within the system.

Second, INAC would have to relinquish control of Indian special education. Funds would have to be given by INAC to band-operated schools, tribal councils, and a provincial special education council to hire certified special education personnel (e.g., school psychologists, speech and language pathologists).

Third, the band-operated schools would continue to have resource/special education teachers, counsellors, and teacher aides.

Fourth, specialists would be placed at the tribal council level to provide support services for band-operated schools. The services would include: screening and identification, assessment, IEP development, programming support, and parent counselling.

Fifth, special education administrative personnel and specialists would have to be placed at a provincial special education agency. The role of the administrative personnel would be: to develop eligibility criteria for funding special education students and programs; and, to monitor and supervise special education programs in the band-operated schools.

The role of the specialists at the provincial special education agency would be to provide assistance (e.g., assessment, programming) to the band-operated schools and tribal councils for low incidence special education students (e.g., hearing impaired, vision impaired, multihandicapped). The low numbers of these students would not allow a school or a tribal council to hire a specialists or consultants in this area.

Sixth, inservice training should be implemented for principals, classroom teachers, and special education staff.

School personnel need to be informed of school policy and become proficient in the skills for identification, assessment, eligibility and placement decisions, instruction, and confidentiality.

#### 4. Develop Needed Programs and Services

Development and local control of special education services could be made possible if: (a) a cooperative joint agreement structure could be created consisting of band-operated schools, tribal councils, and a provincial special education council including a member of each tribal council; and (b) trained personnel were in place at the band-operated school, tribal, and provincial levels. The location of the programs or services would be dependent upon the size of the area needed to provide sufficient numbers of children to justify specific kinds of services.

Programs for disabilities with high prevalence rates could be located at the school level. The tribal level could provide service for those disabilities with moderate prevalence rates. Children with low prevalence disabilities (blindness, deafness) would be served by provincial programs.

#### 5. Develop Effective Operating Procedures

There are two actions which are recommended for assisting band-operated schools to develop systematic,

and effective operating procedures for delivering special education services.

First, one person needs to be given the responsibility and authority to create policy, organize and develop school resources, write operating procedures, and supervise and monitor the implementation of these procedures. This individual might be a staff member in each band-operated school or one person might be employed to assume a director of special education position for a number of schools.

Second, a policy manual needs to be written, which clearly defines school policy on each operating procedure. Band-operated schools have made a beginning in establishing unwritten operating procedures. It would be a relatively easy task to write operational guidelines which reflect the best practices that are already in use in band schools. The planning committee at the tribal council level could provide written guidelines concerning operating procedures for (a) identifying students at risk, (b) parental consent, (c) assessment practices, (d) developing individualized education plans, (e) determining eligibility and placement decisions, and (f) confidentiality.

## 6. Identify and Serve All Students Needing Special Education Services

The goal of identifying and serving all students who need special education services can be accomplished if the previous five recommendations are met.

First, the responsibility for developing special education services must be assigned and assumed by leaders at the band-operated school, tribal council, and provincial levels.

Second, a special education system controlled by the Indian people must be developed. The system must provide specialists, consultants, and clinicians to the band-operated schools and Indian communities to provide services such as assessment, program planning, and IEP development to educators of Indian children. These specialists should also provide informational workshops to educators and community members regarding special education eligibility criteria, and the steps involved in special education (e.g., screening/identification, confidentiality, and IEPs). They should act as a resource for both the schools and the communities.

Third, increased numbers of trained specialized personnel must be employed under provincial, tribal, and band-operated school control.

Fourth, needed special education programs and services must be developed within the new administrative organizational structure.

Fifth, effective operating procedural policy guidelines should be written to help promote the best practices in applying operating procedures at every level of service delivery.

#### 7. Increase Parent and Community Involvement with Band-Operated Schools

It is essential that parents become partners with the school systems. Their interest, support, and participation in decision-making is essential if special education services are to be provided for Indian children who are disabled. Efforts must be made to involve the parents and the community by: (a) having teachers go to the homes of parents when parents are unwilling to come to school, (b) creating parent-teacher work groups for specific projects, (c) presenting programs in which the children perform, and (d) involving parents in decision-making and solving school problems. This should be done with all parents including those parents whose children are disabled. Parent support is crucial to the development of a band or community educational system. Particular attention should be given to identifying and addressing cultural problems within the community.

Two principals indicated cultural barriers to providing special education services in the band-operated schools. Parents may be reluctant to identify gifted and talented children. They also may be embarrassed with their Down's Syndrome child and keep the child at home.

Another cultural problem may be related to communication in the school. One principal indicated that in her community a mother-in-law was not supposed to talk with her son-in-law. This may cause problems when both are teachers or one is an administrator and the other is a teacher in the same school.

#### 8. Future Research

The sample of six schools was not sufficient to generalize these findings to all band-operated schools. There is a need to conduct research on other band-operated schools before wider generalizations can be made. It is particularly important to identify those factors which are contributing to the lack of involvement of parents and the community with the schools.

The creation of demonstration models, which provide different administrative organizations, staffing patterns, and operating procedures would be useful in determining how best to deliver services to band-operated schools on the reserves.

Key to the delivery of service is the allocation of funds to support tribal and band-operated programs. A more in-depth study of financial structures also would be helpful.

What are the most effective ways to prepare principals, general education teachers, special educators, and parents to support and implement special education services? What kinds of in-service training are needed, and how can they best be delivered to far-flung band-operated schools? Research is needed to develop effective in-service personnel training systems for schools on reserves.

#### Conclusion

If Canadian Indian students enrolled in band-operated schools are to be prepared for and to take their rightful place in the 21st century, they must have the same educational opportunities as those available to Canadian students who attend provincial schools. Every student should have the right and opportunity to receive an education which allows him/her to reach his maximum ability regardless of race. Indian students who are disabled also have the right to an education to reach their maximum potential.

This study has presented data and information which reveals that many Canadian students who are disabled, are not receiving the special education services they need

because of the lack of an effective administrative organization, the lack of trained personnel, the lack of specialized programs, inefficient operating procedures, and the lack of parental and community involvement.

This study provides direction and recommendations to Indian band-operated schools, tribal councils and provincial educational agencies to address these inequities.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PRINCIPAL OF BAND-OPERATED SCHOOLS

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS - FORMS A, B, AND C

INSTRUCTIONS - SURVEY INTERVIEW

FORM A: NUMBER OF IDENTIFIED

STUDENTS SERVED BY CATEGORY

FORM B: SOURCES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

FORM C: RECOMMENDED SOURCES FOR SPECIAL  
EDUCATION PERSONNEL

### Principals of Band-Operated Schools

Your school has been randomly selected for participation in a survey "A survey of Special Education Services in Band-Operated Schools in Manitoba". This survey is part of my doctoral studies at the University of Arizona.

The survey will consist of two parts. Part One includes the enclosed forms (Forms A, B, C). Part Two will be an in-depth interview (approximately 1.5 - 2 hours) regarding your school's special education services and operating procedures. I will contact you regarding the scheduling of the interview.

The purpose of the forms and the interview is to examine the delivery of special education services for Indian students attending Band-Operated school. Your responses will be extremely important for this study in determining current services and future needs.

Your participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participating at any time.

Your responses will be combined with those of other principals of band-operated schools in Manitoba. No person or schools will be identified. A copy of the results will be given to each of the participating schools.

I am grateful for your participation.

Thank-you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Ron Phillips

Subject's Consent Form for Research Project:  
A Study of the Delivery of Special Education  
Services in Indian Band-Operated Schools in Manitoba

I AM BEING ASKED TO READ THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL TO ENSURE THAT I AM INFORMED OF THE NATURE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY AND HOW I WILL PARTICIPATE IN IT, IF I CONSENT TO DO SO. SIGNING THIS FORM WILL INDICATE THAT I HAVE BEEN SO INFORMED AND THAT I GIVE MY CONSENT. FEDERAL REGULATIONS REQUIRE WRITTEN INFORMED CONSENT PRIOR TO PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY SO THAT I CAN KNOW THE NATURE AND THE RISKS OF MY PARTICIPATION AND CAN DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN A FREE AND INFORMED MANNER.

Purpose

I am being invited to voluntarily participate in the above-titled research project. The purpose of this project is to establish the status of special education services among Indian band-operated schools in Manitoba.

Selection Criteria .

I am being invited to participate because of the following:

1. I am the principal of an Indian band-operated school in Manitoba.
2. The demographics of my school (size) fit the requirements of this study.
3. The issues affecting the delivery of special education services at my school are representative of issues at other Indian band-operated schools in Manitoba.

### Standard Treatment

If I choose not to participate, I understand that I would not be subject to subsequent consequences of any kind.

### Procedure

If I agree to participate, I will be asked to:

1. complete forms regarding special education students and services prior to an interview;
2. participate in an individual interview session of approximately 1 1/2 hours, at which time my responses will be audio taped to ensure accuracy;
3. participate in a follow-up interview (personal or phone) to verify initial interpretation of interview responses and to clarify responses.

### Risks

Because the project does not involve intervention measures there should be no risks associated with our participation

### Benefits

There will be no monetary benefits to our participation. Other benefits, however, would include the furthering of research on the delivery of special education services in Indian band-operated schools in Manitoba, and also the opportunity to share my perceptions regarding the special education delivery system.

### Confidentiality

My privacy will be protected through limited access to the data generated in the project (Ron Phillips and Dr. James Chalfant both of the University of Arizona). My identification, as well as the identification of my school, will be kept confidential and anonymous at all times.

### Participation Costs

I will not be responsible for any costs of the project.

### Authorization

BEFORE GIVING MY CONSENT BY SIGNING THIS FORM, THE METHODS, INCONVENIENCES, RISKS, AND BENEFITS HAVE BEEN EXPLAINED TO ME AND MY QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. I UNDERSTAND THAT I MAY ASK QUESTIONS AT ANY TIME AND THAT I AM FREE TO WITHDRAW FROM THE PROJECT AT ANY TIME WITHOUT CAUSING BAD FEELINGS. MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROJECT MAY BE ENDED BY THE INVESTIGATOR OR BY THE SPONSOR FOR REASONS WHICH WOULD BE EXPLAINED. NEW INFORMATION DEVELOPED DURING THE COURSE OF THIS RESEARCH WHICH MAY AFFECT MY WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY WILL BE GIVEN TO ME AS IT BECOMES AVAILABLE. I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS CONSENT FORM WILL BE FILED IN AN AREA DESIGNATED BY THE HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE WITH ACCESS RESTRICTED TO THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR, RON PHILLIPS, OR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT. I UNDERSTAND THAT I DO GIVE UP ANY OF MY LEGAL RIGHTS BY SIGNING THIS FORM. A COPY OF THIS SIGNED CONSENT FORM WILL BE GIVEN TO ME.

---

Subject's signature

Date

### Investigator's Affidavit

I have carefully explained to the subject the nature of the above project. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the person who is signing this consent form understands clearly the nature, demands, benefits, risks involved in his/her participation and his/her signature is legally valid. A medical problem or language or educational barrier has not precluded this understanding.

---

Signature of Investigator

Date

A Survey of Special Education Services  
in Band-Operated Schools in Manitoba

Instructions: Forms A, B, C.

Form A.: Number of Identified Students Served by  
Category.

Review the attached list of special education categories and indicate the number of identified special education students attending your school and those sent to other agencies for their education. Also, indicate the number of students you suspect are not being identified and served.

Form B.: Sources of Special Education Personnel

Indicate from which organizations you obtain the special education personnel.

Form C.: Recommended Sources for Special Education  
Personnel

Indicate from which organizations you would like to obtain special education personnel.

A Survey of Special Education Services  
in Band-Operated Schools in Manitoba

Instructions: Interview

You will be given a copy of the interview form to assist you in answering questions. Please do not write on or mark the interview form. The interview should take approximately 1.5 - 2 hrs. to complete. The interview will be audio-taped to ensure accuracy.

The confidentiality of your responses is guaranteed. Neither your school or yourself will be identified in this study.

This interview should not be viewed as an evaluation of your school's special education program. Do not answer the questions to put your school into a more favorable light. The accuracy of the information is important as the survey's results may be used to get band-operated schools needed special education services.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Ron Phillips

School Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Form A: Number of Identified Students Served by  
Category

Type of Disability *	Served Within School	Sent to Other Agencies	Suspected
Learning Disabled			
Speech Impaired			
Mentally Handicapped			
Behaviorally/ Emotionally Disabled			
Multi-Handicapped			
Other Health Impaired			
Orthopedically Impaired			
Hard of Hearing/Deaf			
Visually Handicapped			
Deaf-Blind			
Total			

\* definitions for each category are provided on the following pages.

## Special Education Definitions

### Learning Disability

Means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as a perceptual handicap, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include a learning problem which is primarily the result of a visual, hearing or motor handicap, of mental retardation, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

### Speech impaired:

Means having a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment.

### Mentally Handicapped

Means having significant sub-average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period.

### Behaviorally/Emotionally Disturbed

Means having a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree:

- a. An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors;
- b. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers;
- c. Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances;
- d. A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or
- e. A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems;
- f. Being schizophrenic.

### Multihandicapped

Means having concomitant impairments (such as mentally handicapped-blind, mentally handicapped-orthopedically impaired, etc.), the combination of which causes such severe educational problems that the child cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for one of the impairments. The term does not include a deaf-blind child.

### Other Health Impaired

Means having an (a) autistic condition which is manifested by severe communication and other developmental and educational problems, (b) limited strength, vitality or alertness due to chronic or acute health problems such as a heart condition, tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, nephritis, asthma, sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, epilepsy, lead poisoning, leukemia, or diabetes.

### Orthopedically-Impaired

Means having a severe orthopedic impairment. The term includes an impairment caused by a congenital anomaly (e.g., club foot, absence of some member, etc.), an impairment caused by disease (e.g., poliomyelitis, bone tuberculosis, etc.) and an impairment from any other cause (e.g., cerebral palsy, amputations, and fractures or burns which cause contractures).

### Hard of Hearing/Deaf

Hard of hearing means having a hearing impairment, whether permanent or fluctuating, which is not included under the definition of "deaf" in this section. Deaf means having a hearing impairment which is so severe that the child is impaired in processing linguistic information through hearing, with or without amplification.

### Visually Handicapped

Means having a visual impairment with or without correction.

The term includes both partially seeing and blind children.

### Deaf-Blind

Means having concomitant hearing and visual impairments, the combination of which causes such severe communication and other developmental educational problems that the child cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for deaf or blind children.

School Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Form B: Sources of Special Education Personnel

Indicate from which organizations you obtain the special education personnel.

Personnel	Do not have	School staff	TC*	MIEA*	INAC*	PC*	other
Special education co-ordinator							
Speech/ language pathologist							
Occupational therapist							
Social worker							
Resource/ Special ed. teacher							
School psychologist							
Counselor							
Physio- therapist							
Teacher aides							
Consultants							
Multi- handicapped							
Alternate education							

Hearing-  
impaired

---

Vision-  
impaired

---

Early  
education

---

Learning  
disabled

---

Gifted  
education

---

Behavioral/  
emotionally  
disturbed

---

- \* Tribal Council (TC)
- \* Manitoba Indian Education Association (MIEA)
- \* Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
- \* Private Contractors (PC)

School Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Form C: Recommended Sources for Special Education  
Personnel

Please indicate from which organizations you would like to obtain the following personnel.

Personnel	School				
	staff	TC*	MIEA*	INAC*	PC* other
Special education co-ordinator					
Speech/ language pathologist					
Occupational therapist					
Social worker					
School psychologist					
Counselor					
Physio- therapist					
Consultants					
Multi- handicapped					
Alternate education					
Hearing- impaired					
Vision- impaired					

Early  
education

---

Learning  
disabled

---

Gifted  
education

---

Behavioral/  
emotionally  
disturbed

---

- \* Tribal Council (TC)
- \* Manitoba Indian Education Association (MIEA)
- \* Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
- \* Private Contractors (PC)

APPENDIX B  
A SURVEY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES  
IN BAND-OPERATED SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA

School Code: \_\_\_\_\_

A SURVEY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES  
IN BAND-OPERATED SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA

A. School Characteristics:

Student Population: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of teachers: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade Levels: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of years band-operated: \_\_\_\_\_

Special Education

Number of identified  
special education students: \_\_\_\_\_

## IDENTIFICATION

1. How are special education students identified in your school? Please check all that apply.

preschool screening (visual motor, language, self-help skills)  
 reading screening  
 audiological screening  
 vision screening  
 health screening  
 achievement tests  
 referral by teachers  
 referral by parents  
 liaison with medical community  
 other, please list \_\_\_\_\_

2. Who can refer a student for an evaluation? Please check all that apply?

parents  
 teachers  
 administrators  
 student him/herself  
 others, please list \_\_\_\_\_

3. How are students referred for special education services?

referral forms  
 verbal contact  
 other, please list \_\_\_\_\_

## PARENTAL CONSENT

4. Do you have a policy regarding parent consent?

Yes  No

What is it?

---



---

Is it written?

Yes  No

5. Are parents fully informed about all pertinent information of the actions the school wants to take?

Yes  No

If yes, how are they informed?

---



---

6. What procedures are followed if parents do not get involved or refuse consent?

contact Child and Family Services  
 contact home-school coordinator  
 keep records of refusal/non-involvement  
 other, please list \_\_\_\_\_

---

7. Is it possible to take any actions with only verbal approval?

Yes  No

What kind of action? \_\_\_\_\_

8. What does your parent consent form include?  
Please check all that apply.

- a full description of all parent and student rights
- a description of the action proposed or refused by the school
- an explanation of why the school proposes or refuses to take action
- a description of any options the school considered and why these options were rejected
- a description of each evaluation procedure, test, record, or report the school has used as a for the proposal or refusal
- a description of any other factors which are relevant to the school's proposal or refusal
- written in language understandable to the general public
- provided in the Native language of the parent or other mode of communication used by the parent
- that the notice is translated orally or by means to the parent in his/her Native language other mode of communication
- that the parent understands the content of notice

## ASSESSMENT

9. Must written parental consent be sought before a student assessed?

Yes  No

10. Must written parental consent be sought every time student is assessed?

Yes  No

11. Which special education personnel are involved in the assessment? Please check all that apply?

school psychologist

resource teacher

speech/language pathologist

other(s), please list:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

12. Is it required that evaluation and testing take into consideration the student's language culture?

Yes  No

If yes, how?

interpreter

test translated

Native speaker tester

other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Do you determine in which language the student is most proficient?

Yes  No

14. Are special education students evaluated in all relevant to their education?

Yes  No

If yes, how? \_\_\_\_\_

15. To what extent is the regular classroom teacher's information used by the special education/resource room teacher? Please check all that apply.

given equal consideration

given partial consideration

given no consideration

other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

How is the regular classroom teacher's information used?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. How often are special education students evaluated?

every year

every 2 years

every 3 years

more than 3 years

How are they evaluated?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

By whom? \_\_\_\_\_

## MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAMS (Eligibility and Placement)

17. Do you have a policy regarding the use of multidisciplinary teams in evaluation and decision-making?

Yes  No

If yes, what is your policy?

---



---

Is it written?

Yes  No

18. Do you have multidisciplinary team meetings to discuss a student's case prior to placement?

Yes  No

If yes, who is in the multidisciplinary team conference? Please check all that apply.

- principal  
 resource teacher  
 regular class teacher  
 parents  
 other(s), based on case:  
 school psychologist  
 speech/language pathologist  
 social worker  
 others \_\_\_\_\_

If no, please describe procedures used to determine placement, teaching strategies, information on students?

---



---



---

19. What happens when a student is found to be for special education services?

- return to referring teacher with resource teacher assistance
  - return to referring teacher with written, concrete suggestions
  - return to referring teacher with modified
  - place in an alternate program
  - return to referring teacher without supports
-

## INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN (IEP)

20. How soon after assessment is the IEP generally written?

- 1 - 2 weeks  
 3 - 4 weeks  
 5 weeks or more

21. When are IEPs reviewed?

- every 6 months  
 annually  
 biannually  
 irregular  
 not at all

By whom? \_\_\_\_\_

Is there written evidence that the IEP has been reviewed?

- Yes  No

What kind of written evidence?

22. Must placement decisions be made by a team?

- Yes  No

23. What kinds of information are considered in meetings?

- intellectual ability  
 age  
 social and emotional maturity  
 grade level  
 student health and medical history  
 language  
 culture  
 adaptive behavior  
 ability of student to cope and maintain him/herself in a particular setting



28. What is the role of the parent in developing the IEP?  
Please check all that apply.

attendance  
 share information  
 decision-making  
 implementation  
 other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. If teachers or parents disagree with the IEP in of placement or appropriate services, how is this of situation resolved? Check all that apply.

negotiation  
 administrative decision  
 written objection  
 other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

30. What procedures are followed when parents refuse to give consent of the placement decisions?

contact Child and Family Services  
 another meeting is arranged to discuss placement alternatives  
 placement terminated  
 other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

31. Must parents be contacted if revisions are made to the IEP.

Yes  No

How are they contacted? Check all that apply.

phone call  
 home visit  
 invited into the school  
 other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

## CONFIDENTIALITY

32. Does your school have policies regarding the confidentiality of your school's special education records?

Yes  No

Are these policies written?

Yes  No

33. What access rights do parents have to inspect student records?

parents are allowed to inspect and review any educational records relating to their child are collected and used by the school

the right to a response from the school to reasonable requests for explanations and interpretations of the records

the right to have a representative to inspect and review the records

school provides copies of records to parents

34. What safeguards does your school provide to control access to confidential information?

list of persons with access

information stored in secure cabinet

no safeguards

other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

35. Can special education records be sent out of the school?

Yes  No

36. What is your school's policy when a parent wants to amend a child's record?

- parent's request in writing to amend
- school decides whether or not to amend the records
- refusal to amend, inform parents in writing
- no policy
- other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

## RELATED SERVICES

37. What related services are available at your school?  
Please check all that apply.

- audiology
- counseling services
- early identification
- medical services
- occupational therapy services
- parent counseling and training
- physical therapy
- psychological services
- school nurse
- social worker
- speech/language pathology
- transportation
- other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

38. How do you meet the special education needs of your students if you do not have special education related services?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

39. Which organizations provide supervision of the special education personnel and services?

Specialists/clinicians: \_\_\_\_\_

Special education program: \_\_\_\_\_

Individual Education Plan: \_\_\_\_\_

Special education teachers: \_\_\_\_\_

40. Where are your special education students educated?

\_\_\_ regular classroom (without support)

\_\_\_ regular classroom (with regular classroom teacher receiving support)

\_\_\_ alternate classroom

\_\_\_ resource room (pull-out of the regular classroom)

\_\_\_ other, please list: \_\_\_\_\_

41. Do you believe that your school has the level of special education related services which are available in nearby provincial schools?

\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_ No

42. If no, What services do you not have?  
Please list:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



## REFERENCES

Alberta Education. (1977). The Alberta special education study: Condensed report. Edmonton: Alberta Education, Planning and Research.

Assembly of First Nations. (1988). Tradition and education: Towards a vision of our future. Ottawa: Author.

Assembly of First Nations [AFN]. (1993). Letter (August 30) from Mr. Alfred Linklater, Director of Education to Ron Phillips, re. list of band-operated schools. Ottawa: Author.

Assembly of First Nations. (1991). The current situation of First Nation education in Canada. A discussion paper submitted to the Special Chief's Conference on Education "Tradition and Education: Toward a Vision of our Future" November 27-29, 1991, Skyline Hotel, Ottawa.

Assembly of First Nations, Education Secretariat. (1992). Treaties and education. A discussion paper. Ottawa: Author.

Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs. (1984). Our tomorrows --- Today: Different paths to quality Indian education in Manitoba. Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs' Budget Committee, April, Winnipeg, MB.

Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs [AMC]. (1991). Indian education funding study. Final report. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Baca, L.M., & Cervantes, H.T. (1989). The bilingual special education interface. Toronto, ON: Merrill Publ. Co.

Barman, J., Hebert, Y., & McCaskill, D. (1986). The legacy of the past: An overview. In Barman, J., Hebert, Y. & McCaskill, D. (eds.), Indian education in Canada, Vol. 1: The legacy (pp. 1- 22). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Bidwell, C.E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations (pp. 972-1022). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bravi, G. (1984). An evaluation of special education and related services at E.J. Johnson School. Winnipeg, University of Manitoba.

Burello, L.C., & Sage, D.D. (1979). Leadership and change in special education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Canadian Education Association. (1984). Recent developments in Native education: A CEA report. Toronto: Author.

Cardinal, H. (1977). The rebirth of Canada's Indians. Edmonton: Hurtig Publ.

Center for Developmental Disabilities. (1986). Best educational practices '86: Educating learners with severe handicaps. Burlington, VT: The University of Vermont.

Chalfant, J.C. (1967). Factors related to special education services. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Chalfant, J.C. (1984). Identifying learning disabled children: Guidelines for decision making. Burlington, VT: Northeast Regional Resource Center.

Chalfant, J.C., Pysh, M.V., & Moultrie, R. (1979). Teacher assistance teams: A model for within building problem solving. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 2, 85-95.

Child, J. (1977). Organizations: A guide to problems and practice. New York: Harper & Row Publ.

Child, J. (1980). The contribution of organizational structure. In Lockett, M. & Spear, R. (1980), Organizations as systems (pp. 97-104). Milton Keynes, Eng.: The Open University Press.

Comeau, P., & Santin, A. (1990). The first Canadians: A profile of Canada's Native people today. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Committee on Tolerance and Understanding (1984). Native education in Alberta: Discussion paper #2. Calgary: Author.

Council for Exceptional Children (1994). Statistical profile of special education in the United States, 1994. TEACHING Exceptional Children (Supplement), 26(3), 1-4.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (1983). Survey of Special Education in Canada 1982-1983. Toronto: Author.

Crealock C. (1989). Implementation of special education legislation by teachers and principals in Ontario. Canadian Journal of Education, 14(1), 31-47.

Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 37, 229-237.

Department of Justice, Canada. (1986). The Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supply and Services.

Dillman, D.A. (1983). Mail and other self-administered questionnaires. Found in Petre H. Rossi, James D. Wright and Andy B. Anderson (eds), Handbook of survey research (pp. 359 - 377). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Dye, T.R. (1972). Understanding public policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gearheart, B. (1980). Special education for the '80s. St. Louis: Mosby.

Gearheart, B.R. (1974). Organization and administration of educational programs for exceptional children. Springfield, ILL: Charles C. Thomas Publ.

Goddard, J.T. (1993). Band-controlled schools: Considerations for the future. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 20(1), 163-167.

Hall, D.R. (1992). FED-BOS: The federally controlled band operated school and the no-policy policy. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 19(1), 57-66.

Hartman, W.T. (1992). State funding models for special education. Remedial and Special Education, 13(6), 47-58.

Hoy, W. (1982). Recent developments in theory and research in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 1-11.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC]. (1978). Educational assistance program 1978-79. Ottawa, Ont.: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC]. (1980). Submission to Special committee on the disabled and the handicapped. Ottawa, Ont.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC] (1982). Manitoba region: Operational plan 1983/84 - 1984/85. Winnipeg, MB: author

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC] (1985). Call Letter, Education Data Base, from Director General. June, Ottawa, Ont.: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC] (1986a).  
Letter from Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern  
Development to Executive Director, Manitoba Indian Education  
Association. November 28.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC] (1986b).  
Letter from Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern  
Development to Chairman, Manitoba Indian Education  
Association. November 26.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada [INAC] (1986c).  
Letter from Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern  
Development to Mr. Rod Murphy, M.P., March 7.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (1991). Basic  
departmental data: 1991. Ottawa: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (1991b). Main  
Estimates, Part II, 1991-92. Ottawa: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba (1982).  
Manitoba region operational plan 1983/84 - 1984/85.  
Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba. [INAC-MB].  
(1984). Education Program. September, Winnipeg, MB: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba. [INAC-MB]  
(1985a). Federal schools: Special education procedures  
manual. Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1985b). Letter from Director of Education, Manitoba Region,  
to Superintendent of Services, Keewatin Tribal Council, May  
2. Winnipeg, MB: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1985c). Education: Elementary/Secondary Data Base, Fiscal  
Year 1985/86, November. Winnipeg, MB: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1986a). Letter from Director of Education, Manitoba Region  
to Director of Education, Pine Creek Education Authority,  
October 15.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB]  
(1985b). Letter from Director of Education, Manitoba Region  
of All bands, tribal Councils, Educational Authorities, re:  
1985/86 Nominal Roll, Oct. 10 1985.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1986c). Tuition agreement between the Long Plain Indian  
Band, Portage la Prairie School Division No. 24 and Her  
Majesty the Queen as represented by the Department of Indian  
Affairs and Northern Development, January.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1987a). Federal schools: Special education procedures  
manual. Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1987b). Letter from Director of Education, Manitoba Region  
to Director of Education, Pine Creek Education Authority,  
Feb. 4.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1988). Glossary of educational terms frequently used by  
teachers and other educational leaders dealing with Native  
education. Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1991). Resource unit: Special education procedures manual.  
Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(1992). Presentation at University of Winnipeg, Educational  
settings: The psychology of learning, by Mendel Schitzner,  
manager of operations, October 2, 1992. Presented by Mr.  
Graham Lloyd. Department data: 1992. Winnipeg: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada- Manitoba [INAC-MB].  
(undated). Resource unit: Special education procedures  
manual. Winnipeg, MB: author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Ontario (1983).  
Special education pilot project: Preliminary report.  
Toronto: Author.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Ontario (undated). Letter from G.P. Kerr, Director of Education, Ontario Region to District Superintendent of Education, Education staff, Chief and Band Councils, Education committees, re: Ontario Region special education handbook.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada-Saskatchewan. (1987). Letter from Superintendent Education, Prince Albert District to Chief and Council, attention Director of Education, Re: high cost handicapped - special education funding. Prince Albert, SK.: Author.

Island Lake Tribal Council. (1987). Report on special education in the Island Lake Region. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Jackson, W. (1988). Research methods: Rules for survey design and analysis. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall.

Jordan, D.F. (1986). Education and the reclaiming of identity: Rights and claims of Canadian Indians, Norwegian Sami, and Australian Aborigines. In J.R. Ponting (ed.), Arduous journey: Canadian Indians and decolonization (pp. 260-283). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Johnson, D.J., & Myklebust, H.R. (1967). Learning disabilities: Educational principles and practices. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Kirk, S.A. (1962). Educating exceptional children. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Kirk, S.A., & Gallagher, J.J. (1989). Educating exceptional children. 6th edition, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

Kirkness, V. (1978). Evaluation report: Education of Indians in federal and provincial schools in Manitoba. Ottawa: Author.

Khandwalla, P. (1977). The design of organizations New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Low & Associates and The Working Margins Consulting Group. (1991). Long Plain school evaluation: Final report. Winnipeg: Author.

Maher, C.A., & Barbrack, C.R. (1979). Perspective and principles for the evaluation of special-service programs. The Journal of Special Education, 13(4), 413-420.

Maher, C. A., & Bennett, R.E. (1984). Planning and evaluating special education services. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mandell, C.J., & Fiscus, E. (1981). Understanding exceptional people. West Publ. Co.: St. Paul, MN.

Manitoba Indian Education Association, M.I.E.A. (1983). Rational and proposal for special education services for band-operated and federal schools. September, Winnipeg, MB.

Manitoba Indian Education Association [M.I.E.A.]. (1984a). Special needs data base: Summary report. June, Winnipeg, MB.

Manitoba Indian Education Association [M.I.E.A.].  
(1984b). An action plan for special education funding and service development in band-operated schools. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Teachers' Society (1977). Students with special needs. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.R. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Mid-South Regional Resource Center (1986). Effectiveness indicators for special education: A reference tool. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky.

Miller, J.R. (1989). Skyscrapers hide the heavens: A history of Indian-White relations in Canada. Toronto, Ont: University of Toronto Press.

Mitchell, D.E. (1984). Educational policy analysis: The state of the art. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 129-160.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.

Penner, K. (1988). Their own place: The case for a distinct order of Indian First Nation government in Canada. In Long, J.A. & Bear, L.L. (eds.), Governments in conflict?: Provinces and Indian Nations in Canada (pp. 31-37). University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Phillips, R.S., & Cranwell, C.R. (1988). The need for community-based special education programs in band-operated schools of Manitoba. In Alba A. Ortiz and Bruce A. Ramirez (Eds.). Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Pine Creek. (1987). Letter from Pine Creek's director of education to M.I.E.A., March 5.

Podemeski, R.S., Price, B.J., Smith, T.E.C., & Marsh, G.E. (1984). Comprehensive administration of special education. Aspen Publ.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD. (1976). Reviews of national policies for education. Paris: author.

Research Triangle Institute (1993). Resource guide for school practitioners on integrating students with disabilities. Research Triangle Park, NC: author.

Riffel, J.A., Sealey, D.B., Bravi, G., & Woodley, K.F. (1984). Education in Nelson House: A report for community discussion. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Roberts, C.A., & Lazure, M.D. (1970). One million children: A national study of Canadian children with emotional and learning disorders. Toronto, Ont.: Crainford.

Sage, D.D., & Burello, L.C. (1986). Policy management in special education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Saskatchewan Education. (1989). Saskatchewan school-based program evaluation resource book. Regina, SK: Author.

Smith, M.L., & Glass, G.V. (1987). Research and evaluation in education and the social sciences. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sioux Valley School Board. (1986). Letter from Sioux Valley's director of education to INAC's director of education, July.

Sioux Valley. (1986). Letter from Sioux Valley reserve's director of education to INAC-Manitoba director of education, Oct. 16.

Supply and Services Canada. (1985). A study team report to the task force on program review, Nov. 1985. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Thomas, W. (1988, February 29). Funding stingy [Letter to the editor]. Winnipeg Free Press, p. 6.

United States Department of Education. (1984). Sixth annual report to Congress on the implementation of Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Education (1991). Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ward Mallette. (1986). Special investigation - Manitoba region. Ward Mallette Chartered Accountants, Ottawa, Ont.

Waywayseecappo Education Authority. (1986). Letter from principal Waywayseecappo Community School to director of education, Indian and Northern Affairs, Manitoba Region. Oct. 29.

Weber, M. (1952). The essentials of bureaucratic organization: An ideal-type construction. Found in Robert K. Merton, Ailsa P. Gray, Barbara Hockey, & Hanan C. Selvin (eds), Reader of Bureaucracy, (pp. 18-27). New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

West Region Tribal Council. (1986). Special education funding strategy. June 24, 1986, Dauphin, MB.

Will, M. (1986). Educating students with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Williams, C.E.J. (1982). Indian control of Indian education in Ontario, Canada: Success or failure? A dissertation submitted to Michigan State University.

Winzer, M. (1990). Children with exceptionalities: A Canadian perspective, (second edition). Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada, Inc.

Working Margins Consulting Group. (1989). Evaluation of Indian counselling services in Manitoba: final report. June, Winnipeg, MB.

Working Margins Consulting Group. (1990a). Evaluation of the Lac Brochet School: Final report. Winnipeg, MB.

Working Margins Consulting Group (1990b). An evaluation of the Pukatawagan School: Final report. Winnipeg, MB.

Working Margins Consulting Group (1991). Little Black River school evaluation: Final report. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Working Margins Consulting Group and Lowe & Associates (1991). Roland Lauze school: Evaluation final report. Winnipeg: Author.

Ysseldyke, J.E., & Algozzine, B. (1990). Introduction to special education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.