DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 679 EC 305 725

AUTHOR Gallagher, R. J. Pat; And Others
TITLE Trends in Integrated Service Delivery: Implications for the Art and Science of Collaboration.
INSTITUTION Kansas Univ., Lawrence. Dept. of Special Education.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (75th, Salt Lake City, UT, April 9-13, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Integrated Services; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Interprofessional Relationship; Long Range Planning; Partnerships in Education; School Community Relationship; Seminars; Special Needs Students; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a 2-year project to foster delivery of collaborative and integrated services to elementary students with disabilities or at risk. During the first year, 21 school-linked service providers from three school districts in Kansas were brought together to explore and implement patterns of collaborative, transdisciplinary planning and shared responsibilities. During Year 2, the project supported these service providers in implementing building-based school improvement plans that addressed issues such as collaborative problem solving of behavior management issues, parental involvement in the school community, and partnerships with community mental health agencies. Among the project's activities have been a seminar in interprofessional service integration, a field trip to two Communities-in-Schools sites, and technical assistance to participants in the design of interprofessional development plans. Project evaluation has indicated: (1) increased participant awareness of professions providing services to students; (2) participants' development of an interprofessional development plan related to each school's School Improvement Plan; and (3) use of information about gaps in participants' collaborative knowledge to improve the Teacher Education Program curriculum at the University of Kansas. Appended are the seminar syllabus and lists of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges at each of the three sites. (Contains 17 references.) (DB)

Trends in Integrated Service Delivery: Implications for the Art and Science of Collaboration

R. J. Pat Gallagher, Earle Knowlton, Marc Mahlios
& Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill
University of Kansas

Carla Max & Maureen McCarthy
Shawnee Mission, Kansas School District

Abstract

An ever-increasing number of our nation's children and families need focused complements of educational, social, and health services if the cycle of hopelessness and its effects are to be broken. Yet, their need for services is exacerbated by the fact that poverty, victimization as the result of violence and abuse, illness, lack of education, and the perception of helplessness make it difficult for families to access existing social services. Statistics tracking child abuse, health, income support, and housing suggest that families' access to support services for children is actually declining in today's political economy (Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh, 1993). As social service funding declines, and caseloads of professional service providers increase, the work of these professionals has become unmanageable in terms of both quantity and complexity; thus, as caseloads have grown, the quality and availability of services have declined (Adler, 1994). Moreover, existing human service systems, funding patterns, and service delivery vehicles typically are organized by categorical programs; thus children and families may qualify for one service, but not for another necessarily complementary service (Gardner, 1994a, 1994b). Consequently, access to the full array of services focused on them and their needs is spotty and often serendipitous.

Given these realities, the movement toward integrated, interprofessional service provision, centered on schools and focused on families, has emerged. Service integration necessitates new forms and patterns of collaboration among professionals and families, particularly families of children and youth with disabilities; however, the developmental history and funding bases of preservice and inservice personnel preparation programs in special education, general education, social welfare, allied health, and other human service professions typically promote intraprofessional specialization to the detriment of interprofessional collaboration.

We are currently completing the second of a two year project, funded through Kansas's Educate America Act (Goals 2000) grant, in which 21 school-linked service providers were brought together during Year I to explore and implement patterns of collaborative, transdisciplinary planning and shared responsibilities on behalf of students with disabilities and students at risk. During Year II, the project is supporting these service providers as they implement building-based school improvement plans that address in a transdisciplinary manner a variety of issues including collaborative problem-solving with regard to behavior management issues, parental involvement in the school community, and partnerships with community mental health agencies. Implications from these efforts are drawn for the promulgation of better patterns of collaborative work, particularly by professional schools and colleges.

Trends in Integrated Service Delivery:

Implications for the Art and Science of Collaboration

R.J. Pat Gallagher, Earle Knowlton, Marc Mahlios,
and Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill
University of Kansas

Carla Max & Maureen McCarthy
Shawnee Mission, Kansas School District

Introduction to the Nature and Objectives of the Project

Public schools today serve an increasingly diverse, multicultural population of students. In the Los Angeles public schools, for example, children come to classes from homes in which 161 separate languages have primacy in the speech and writing of their families and neighbors (Barber, 1996). For many of these children, however, the more welcome features of diversity, characterized by rich linguistic and cultural variance, are occluded by poverty, illness, lack of education, victimization as the result of violence and abuse, and self-perceptions of hopelessness and helplessness. For any one family, a unique combination of these conditions and circumstances makes it difficult to access social services as they are currently configured.

Demographic data patterns with respect to child abuse, health care, income support, and housing suggest that, as lifestyle conditions for them worsen, families' access to support services for their children is declining in today's political economy (Kirst, 1989; Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh, 1993). Documented cases of child abuse increased from 600,000 in 1979 to 2.4 million in 1989. While state and federal spending to support the elderly grew by 52% from 1978 to 1987, spending on children during this period dropped by four percent (Gerry, 1993). These figures are particularly ominous given that approximately one-fourth of children under the age of six live in households with incomes below the poverty line, i.e. $12,675 for a family of four (National Commission on Children, 1991).

As social service funding declines, and caseloads of professional service providers increase, the work of these professionals has become unmanageable with respect both to quantity and to complexity; thus, as caseloads have grown, the quality and availability of services have declined not only in urban centers, but in suburban metropolitan areas as well (Adler, 1994; Gerry, 1996). Moreover, existing human service systems, funding patterns, and service delivery mechanisms typically are driven by often irrational, categorical eligibility

criteria. As a result, children and families may qualify for one service, but not for another necessarily complementary service (Gardner, 1994b). Consequently, access to a full array of supports, focused on them and their needs, is spotty and often serendipitous.

Clearly, an ever-increasing number of our nation's children and families need timely complements of educational, social, and health services if the cycle of hopelessness is to be broken, and its capricious effects, ameliorated. Schools increasingly have incorporated child-centered roles beyond traditional curricular and instructional functions. The Communities-in-Schools program exemplifies the broad milieu of community health, social, and rehabilitative services that, given systemic commitment, can be provided to children and their families within public school settings (Lawson, 1995). Indeed, school-linked service integration is not a particularly new concept; service delivery models emerged on the heels of Lyndon Johnson's array of Great Society programs (Cities-in-Schools, 1993; Gerry, 1996). Nonetheless, while patterns of interprofessional services have been forged, those upon whom the responsibility for service delivery rests continue for the most part to be trained and to practice in traditional, professionally insulated ways (Gardner, 1994a). Crowson and Boyd (1993) synthesized the findings of recent research addressing system-wide and personnel-related variables, pertinent to the education profession, that affect the deployment and quality of interprofessional services:

- Teachers may not fully understand the roles of other service providers in school-linked service integration configurations.
- Service providers from disciplines other than education may not understand the integral role of education in promoting the well-being of children and families.
- Elements of school curricula (e.g. AIDS awareness, drug prevention, nutrition, career and community based education) which serve a broader social service function may not be well integrated into the general curriculum.
- Service providers across disciplines, including education and social welfare, may fail to interact effectively and may tend to work in disciplinary isolation rather than collaborate to meet the needs of children and their families.
- The political realities and organizational configurations of service agencies and disciplines promote increased isolation, turf protection, and disintegration of services when funds are threatened, leadership changes, and/or administrative priorities change.

Service integration necessitates not only a system-wide administrative commitment, it requires new forms and patterns of collaboration among professionals and families. However, the developmental history and funding bases of preservice and inservice personnel preparation

programs in special education and regular education, as well as in social welfare, allied health, and other human service professions typically promote intraprofessional specialization to the detriment of interprofessional collaboration.

Accordingly, we attempted to "bottom-up" an effort designed to buck in a gentle manner this professional isolation by bringing together a diverse group of 21 professionals for participation in the project described herein. Our overarching goal simply became the creation of a context for collegiality and receptivity to the concept of interprofessional service integration. The focus of this case study evaluation report centers on this collaborative effort, involving the Shawnee Mission, Kansas public schools and the University of Kansas's School of Education, to reduce the insulation of various professional educators and to seed a system-wide commitment by the school district to serve in more integrated ways an increasingly diverse student population. The work reported below spanned all but a month of a two-year period during which we established an interprofessional base of service provision within and across three elementary schools in the Shawnee Mission district.

Project Objectives

We identified six objectives for the project:

1. Identify the agencies and their respective professional staff who provide services to students at risk for educational difficulty.

2. Coordinate job exchanges for participants to provide them with opportunities to learn about one another's roles.

3. Provide participants with opportunities for site visits to agencies that provide best practice models of service integration.

4. Identify relevant knowledge bases and skills for collaboration across the disciplines and professional roles of participants.

5. Plan and implement the interprofessional services seminar for participants to assist them in the enhancement of the school improvement plans of their respective buildings.

6. Use the lessons learned from this project to develop for the School of Education an integrated curriculum concerning service integration.

Relationship of Objectives to National Education Goals

Popularly termed, "Goals 2000," the 1994 Educate America Act's intent is to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of achievement for all students in the United States. As such, the Act advances eight national goals for schools. Briefly paraphrased these goals call for: (1) all children to start school ready to learn; (2) a 90% high school graduation rate; (3) all students to be competent in challenging subject matter enabling responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment; (4) teachers' access to continued professional development equipping them to prepare students for life and work in the 21st century; (5) U.S. students to rank first worldwide in science and mathematics achievement; (6) students' literacy, knowledge, and skills sufficient for competition within a global economy; (7) schools to be safe, disciplined, and free of alcohol and drugs; and (8) parents to be meaningfully involved in the education of their sons and daughters.

The aforementioned objectives directly addressed the fourth and, indirectly, the third and eighth National Education Goals (educators' continued improvement, students' subject matter competence, and parental participation, respectively). The three participating elementary schools' School Improvement Plans were used as the context for the development and conduct of the project's centerpiece -- a seminar on interprofessional service integration.

The thrust of the project, while not in direct line with each building's school improvement goals, nevertheless created for participants continued access to a knowledge and skills base from which school improvement goals for their respective buildings could be met. Moreover, much of the work to be described in the following section encouraged participants to establish and/or enhance patterns of communication and collaboration with the families of the students they serve.

Project Workscope

Funded late in 1995, Interprofessional Development for Educators identified as participants 21 professionals from three Shawnee Mission, Kansas, elementary schools: Arrowhead, Santa Fe Trail, and South Park. Participants engaged in the graduate-level project seminar at the University of Kansas as well as in extensive seminar follow-up activities

throughout the spring and summer of 1996 and 1997. Project funds reimbursed participants' tuition fees, and provided them with a small amount of development funds and, as necessary, substitute teachers.

Each school resides in the northern or north-central part of Overland Park, Kansas. Arrowhead Elementary School consists of approximately 200 students and 20 staff members, Santa Fe Trail enrolls about 450 students with 35 staff members, and South Park, around 300 students and 25 staff members. Typically, Overland Park and the Shawnee Mission District are thought to be wealthy and without the diversity that characterizes more densely populated areas. However, the fact is that each school has accommodated increasing student diversity in the last ten years, particularly the northern-most site, South Park, which has seen significant increases through the years in children from low-income, single-parent families.

Since each of the 21 participants had a hand in the education of the children attending the three schools, participants are referred to as "educators." These educators represented the following specific professional roles: (1) classroom teacher, (2) special education teacher, (3) reading specialist, (4) mathematics specialist, (5) speech/language clinician, (6) nurse, (7) guidance counselor, and (8) librarian. All of the participants provided services to students, though only two of them were classroom teachers. Half provided direct instructional services, and the remainder, clinical and support services. Table 1 displays the number of participants by role, school, and role within school.

Insert Table 1, about here

Major Project Activities

Activities that spanned the spring and summer of 1996 centered on: (1) the seminar in interprofessional service integration, (2) a field trip to two Communities-in-Schools sites in Wichita, KS., and (3) technical assistance to participants as they designed interprofessional development plans. During the spring and summer of 1997, these plans were implemented and evaluated.

Seminar in Interprofessional Services. The seminar and its related activities addressed the following anticipated participant outcomes:

1. Knowledge of the expertise and skills local and regional health and social service providers can bring to schools, families and students of the Shawnee Mission district;

2. Knowledge of the changing family demographic patterns and the changing roles of these service providers, and of their respective service agencies, during this era of fiscal retrenchment;

3. Tactics for networking with and accessing services of relevant agencies in an efficient, timely, and effective manner;

4. Ability to work collaboratively with these service providers in ways that integrate and enhance services for students and their families; and

5. Knowledge necessary to help impart information pertaining to the above four outcomes to other building-based screening teams in the district.

Appendix I contains the seminar syllabus. The twenty participants and the three instructors met six times throughout the semester; four of these meetings consisted of formal, four-hour discussions and a sequence of group activities. The fifth meeting was a day-long field trip to Wichita's Commnities-in-Schools program, and the sixth, a less-formal two-hour luncheon in which site-based interprofessional development plans for the 1996-1997 school year were submitted and discussed.

Although formal seminar content and activities were planned a priori, most of what actually transpired with respect to content and activities evolved on the basis of ongoing participant feedback. Seminar instructors met biweekly to respond to feedback and plan accordingly; in addition, the instructors met frequently with the building principals for each site. The underlying reason for an evolutionary rather than rigidly planned approach to the seminar was the fact that the participants were less aware of and less inclined toward a collaborative style of service delivery than the instructors had anticipated. Moreover, the instructors discovered quite quickly that they had much to learn as well. As such, we had planned to begin with the model of service integration devised by Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh (1993), guiding the participants through each of their phases of service integration. However, we learned at the outset that we were wiser to begin, simply, at the very beginning.

Thus, we devoted the first two seminar sessions to a group problem-solving process whereby participants, grouped by site affiliation, first identified themselves and their individual perceptions of the barriers each perceived as impeding her own professional practice. Self-identification allowed participants across (and even within) sites to become more familiar with one another. Participants were asked to provide descriptions of themselves that were unrelated to their professional roles, e.g. jogger, sculptor, mom, etc.

The barriers identified included items such as "too much to do, too many students to serve, too little time, too many roles" and "inflexible grading system to meet varying needs of all children;" as a group, participants ranked the 39 barriers identified, with the former ranked first and the latter among five barriers tied for the bottom rank. Table 2 displays the first ten of these barriers in order of their collectively-judged significance.

Insert Table 2, about here

Once these barriers were identified and consensus on them reached, groups were encouraged to broaden their perspectives on professional practice by parlaying the barriers into a four-part conceptual framework consisting of (1) strengths, (2) weaknesses, (3) opportunities, and (4) challenges. Participants created such a framework per site as displayed in Appendix II. By back-tracking into these unplanned activities, we created a getting-to-know-you atmosphere in which the preplanned project objectives now could be addressed.

Thus, by the third and fourth formal seminar sessions, we had geared ourselves toward the achievement of project objectives three through five, from which the seminar outcomes had emanated, and in which the seminar project was embodied. The project required participants to write for their respective sites a proposal for an interprofessional development plan that promoted the collaborative expenditure of resources within and across sites, and between sites and other community agencies. The instructors arranged for the resources with which participants created site-based interprofessional development plans.

These resources included a small amount of funds as well as formal presentations by

instructors, and by Professors Nathalie Gehrke of the University of Washington and Wayne Sailor of the University of Kansas, informal assistance by the instructors and guest presenters, referrals by the instructors to key community resources such as Wyandotte County Community Mental Health Services, and encouragement to participants to develop their own networks of resources.

Wichita Communities-in-Schools. On April 30th, nine of the participants and two of the instructors visited two of Wichita's Communities-in-Schools (CIS) sites. Hosted by Judy Frick, local CIS Director, participants and instructors spent the late morning and early afternoon at the Colvin and Lincoln community elementary schools in Wichita's inner-city. Whereas both sites exemplify access points for integrated community services, each is configured differently. Colvin is known in local parlance as "community haven." It is essentially a community facility that houses within it an elementary school. Community heath, judicial, and recreational services are also officed there. Lincoln is more along the lines of a community in a school, as the centerpiece of the facility is an elementary school that offers school-linked community services within the traditional K through six curriculum and instruction.

Technical Assistance. During and following the seminar's completion, instructors provided support to participants in informal as well as formal ways. Instructors led presentations and provided responses to questions stemming from group activities. Instructors also responded to funding-related questions during the summer luncheon in which participants presented their projects. Finally, one of the instructors presented a kick-off inservice program to the South Park Elementary School faculty in August of 1996. The instructors continued to provide technical assistance as participants implemented their Interprofessional Development Plans at each of the three sites during the 1996-1997 school year.

Roles of Collaborative Partners in Achieving Project Activities

As mentioned, the major collaborative entities were the Shawnee Mission district and the School of Education at the University of Kansas. The district provided budget management, including substitute personnel for participants, as well as seminar meeting sites. The School provided three seminar instructors who team-taught seminars, worked individually with participants, and managed the seminar curriculum, instruction, and evaluation.

In addition to this level of collaboration, there were nests of collaborative activity within each of these entities, and there were numerous collaborative partners that, on a time-limited basis, participated in the project workscope. These are described in brief below.

Kansas Project Partnership. The Dean of Education at the University of Kansas, Karen Symms Gallagher, serves as the Project Director for a series of Kansas Project Partnership grants. The purpose of these grants is to contribute to reform in higher education teacher preparation. One of the instructors was able to obtain a mini-grant which partially funded the work pertinent to this project of Nathalie Gehrke of the University of Washington.

University of Kansas UAP. The University of Kansas's University Affiliated Program (UAP) provided informal no-cost consultations regarding reform and devolution of welfare services with Martin Gerry and Wayne Sailor. In addition, it provided at no-cost a formal presentation concerning trends in integrated service delivery to participants by Wayne Sailor.

Communities-in-Schools. Judy Moler who, during the 1995-1996 school year, was the director of Kansas's Communities-in-Schools (CIS) program, worked with the project to arrange and facilitate our visit to the Wichita best practice sites. In Wichita, we were graciously received and squired by the local CIS director, Judy Fricke.

Wyandotte County Community Mental Health Services. Director Steve Solomon provided informal, no-cost consultation to participants.

Findings and Implications

Year I of the project (1995-1996) was exploratory in nature and, as such, no attempt was made to summatively evaluate its impact through quantitative means. Rather the evaluation was formative in that the need for and the implementation of refinements, both major and minor, were identified and executed on an enroute basis.

The project's evaluation plan identified three indices of progress: (1) increased participant awareness of the professions providing services to students at Arrowhead, Santa Fe Trail, and South Park Elementary Schools; (2) participants' development of an

interprofessional development plan, promoting achievement of the goals contained in each building's School Improvement Plan; and (3) the drawing of implications from gaps in participants' collaborative knowledge and skills for the Teacher Education Program curriculum at the University of Kansas.

Impact Data

For Year I, the project did not employ quantitative, pre-post measures to assess effectiveness and impact. We considered all feedback, whether sought or serendipitous, as contributory to a formative evaluation process that could lead to the development of a Year II plan of action. We address the first two indices of the evaluation plan below. Index three, tracking the achievement of the sixth and final project objective, is discussed in the concluding section of this report.

Accordingly, on a post hoc basis, we sequenced the timing of feedback into two blocks: (1) serendipitous feedback during the first two seminar sessions, and (2) garnered feedback beginning with the Wichita field trip and continuing as of this writing. As alluded above, the instructors did not need a degree in rocket science to become aware early on that the concept of services that are integrated rather than insulated was not among the operating premises of participants at the seminar's outset.

Chief among the "data" leading to this conclusion were the interactions that emerged from the group activities during sessions one and two in which participants collectively identified barriers to effective practice (see Table 2), and site-based strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and challenges (see Appendix II). Questions of "why," not "how" predominated the initial phases of the seminar until participants saw that a certain degree of bottom-up empowerment could be obtained by virtue of designing an interprofessional development project for Year II. This shift of mindset was significant in that it turned the overall effort away from an instructor-led experience of minimal perceived value to a participant-owned endeavor, holding promise for improved effectiveness and efficiency.

Garnered feedback began with our seeking of perceptions on the part of the nine participants who traveled to Wichita to visit its CIS programs. In general, the experience was worthwhile; however, none of the participants indicated a willingness to engage in another field

trip unless it involved a local best-practices site. This was hardly surprising given nearly seven hours on the road versus four hours on site.

Nonetheless, the opportunity for "captive" interaction, afforded by the employment of two instructor-driven and participant-filled motor pool vans, contributed to an increased rapport among participants and between them and the instructors. We believe that a "trust-boost" occurred as the result of the trip, and that it contributed to the empowerment of the participants that will be critical to the success of the project should it receive funding for a second year.

Finally, as the fourth seminar session drew to an end, we asked participants a simple question: do you want us to submit a Year II proposal? All 21 participants were enthusiastic about the potential for continuing the work they had begun, given the potential for support through Kansas's Educate America Act. Below we briefly describe each site's plan for Year II.

Arrowhead. Toward their School Improvement Plan goal of enhancing a safe and secure school environment, Arrowhead participants have proposed the development of collaborative partnerships with community agencies. Three key resource people whom staff have identified are: Wayne Sailor, Director of KU's University Affiliated Program; Steve Solomon, Director of Wyandotte County Mental Health; and Sherry Wood of Johnson County's Tough Love Program.

Santa Fe Trail. Entitling their effort, "Success of Students' (SOS), Santa Fe Trail participants have proposed a project to address the problem of family-professional collaboration in general and homework completion in particular. Participants will create a resource compendium of business partners, high school and college tutors, and parent and community volunteers to reduce an estimated 40 percent incompletion rate with regard to homework. Participants will also seek to establish a telephonic "homework hotline."

South Park. Proposing to enhance their students' achievement in reading and mathematics, and improving their classroom management, South Park participants have proposed to establish communication and collaboration forums building-wide. These forums are anticipated to improve consistency in classroom management and to maximize staff talents in the areas of reading and mathematics instruction.

Lessons Learned and their Interpretations

The sixth and final project objective called for the development of curricula for teacher education at the University of Kansas on the basis of our experience with the Shawnee Mission participants. Though we are far from achieving this objective, we conclude this report by proffering some preliminary observations from our work thus far.

From our experiences as a result of this project, we learned in essence that the traditions of the helping professions, including education -- suggesting that each profession is uniquely solipsistic -- are nearly intractable. Yet, Ward and June Cleaver's kids no longer attend the nation's suburban schools, and it has become clear to us that their ranks are declining with certainty in northern Johnson County. As Gerry (1996) observed, it's no longer just "their kids" who comprise the underbelly of America's underclass, it's "our kids." We can't know how to prepare tomorrow's helping professionals until today's helping professionals are aware of the new demographics that characterize those with whom they work. These professionals must tell us what they need to know and do. And we can't find out what current practitioners need to know and do until it becomes clear to them that, alone, they can know and do very little that will have any sustaining impact on the lives of children.

As we sought to understand the nature and extent of the collaboration evidenced in the project, we were mindful of the seminal work of Lieberman and Miller (1978) in which they addressed the "...lived experiences of teachers in schools..." (p. 54) in order to help staff developers and school leaders understand the nature of classroom work as experienced by the teachers themselves. While the results of their research have been primarily of interest to staff development experts, there are important findings that lend themselves to an understanding of how the perspectives and working relationships of teachers should be shaped if we are to achieve meaningful collaborative work in schools and communities. The ongoing and enduring nature of teaching and professional life may in themselves limit teachers' abilities to learn and employ collaboration skills and practices.

Lieberman and Miller (1978) observed that, within the 'dailiness of teaching,' style is personalized, rewards are derived from students, teaching and learning links are uncertain, pedagogy's knowledge base is weak, teaching is fundamentally an art, goals are vague, control

norms are necessary, professional support is lacking, teachers rarely practice in the presence of other adults, and teaching is typically experienced as a lonely, segregated, independent endeavor. Clearly, these observations of teachers' professional lives appear antithetical to interprofessional collaboration. And while the past twenty years have brought a softening of these stark realities of insulation and isolation, we remain unconvinced that the 'dailiness of teaching' has changed all that much in spite of the need for collaboration. These characteristics of teachers' work clearly are problematic for promoting and sustaining interprofessional collaboration in schools and communities. We found ample evidence in our work with the Shawnee Mission School District that, in order to achieve a reasonable level of collaboration, we must find ways to address and counter the conditions that define the nature and quality of teachers' daily work and thus their ability to collaborate with other professionals.

A second major issue emerged which impeded the ability of the teachers with whom we worked to engage in more interprofessional collaboration with their colleagues: the influence in professional style and culture of their respective university-based preparation programs. It is clear from the individuals with whom we worked that their professional preparation lacked any significant element of collaborative and interprofessional flavor or structure. This comes as no particular surprise to us; yet the pervasive salience of this critical base of knowledge and practice vis-a`-vis the professional demands on our participants was striking. Professional education's modern history, especially in comprehensive research universities, depicts narrowly defined professional programs too often contained within a single professional faculty. While some will claim that teachers-to-be are engaged with peers from other professional schools within their universities, frankly these interactions are roughly analogous to the parallel play patterns of children in which connectivity is a matter of appearance not substance. Professional preparation programs in higher education remain insulated, within schools of education as well as across professional schools, and thus fail to alter in a manner significant to current professional demands the knowledge, skills, and practice patterns of their graduates.

We are reminded of the pioneering efforts of our colleagues at the University of Washington who for some time have argued that "...preparation programs for interprofessional, collaborative practice must *themselves* be collaborative and interprofessional, thereby demanding of the university and its faculty the same kind of skills, attitudes, and knowledge that are expected of human service professionals in the field" (Knapp, et al. 1993,

p. 137). These authors go on to point out that powerful elements external to professional preparation such as credentialing agencies impose constraints that make true collaboration difficult to enact and sustain. Perhaps even more significant are the respective intellectual and cultural traditions of the university and the ever narrowing specializations within professional organizations which, taken together, insulate us from one another and render as nearly impossible the sharing of ideas necessary to guide collaborative practices. Advances in professional preparation will rely in the end on the adoption of professional curricula that integrate but nevertheless respect intellectual and cultural domains across the university's professional schools. Moreover, such curricula will allow -- indeed compel -- faculty to collaborate toward the preparation of transdiscipline-skilled service providers who can practice efficaciously in a variety professional settings. Of course, the growing need for collaborative personnel preparation flies in the face of the competing trend of factionalism or transferred loyalties and identities from those of the larger university as a whole to its smaller entities such as colleges and schools, and, increasingly, departments and emphasis areas. This trend is one about which we all should be concerned.

The apparent intractability of insulated training in the specialties has not been lost on those in charge of the academy. In a letter and address to faculty at the University of Colorado a decade ago, President Gordon Gee (now of Ohio State University) and Vice President Hunter Rawlings (now President of the University of Iowa), respectively, warned of this growing fractionalism. Gee (1987) observed that, "In a sense...loyalty to the department, school, or college, rather than to the University as an institution, can ultimately mean that special interests drive the University's business. We are, after all, the primary agent uniting humanistic and civil values, research, science, and business. If we don't have a global outlook within the University, how can we communicate it to our constituents?" Similarly, Rawlings (1987) proffered that, "The purpose of a liberal education has always been to enable students to see things whole. Today, however, the academic department structure makes that goal almost impossible to achieve at most colleges and universities by compartmentalizing knowledge mercilessly...the business of departments is to train specialists, not to educate human beings." He went on to note that the quest for mastery of narrow fields and their subdisciplines (preferrably those so limited that no one else knows anything about them) is relentless, thereby reducing a commitment to general education, hindering poignant discussions of broad intellectual issues among faculty, and discouraging interdisciplinary inquiry (Rawlings, 1987).

These sentiments did not originate at the University of Colorado, nor have they been exclusive to those who oversee operations of academe. Nearly 70 years ago, the prodigious philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, posited similar observations written we dare say with at least equal eloquence:

> Culture is activity of thoughty, and receptiveness to beauty and human feeling. Scraps of information have nothing to do with it. A merely well-informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth. What we should aim at producing is men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some special direction. Their expert knowledge will give them the ground to start from, and their culture will lead them as deep as philosophy and as high as art. We have to remember that the valuable intellectual development is self-development...(Whitehead, 1926, p. 13).

Concluding Remarks

Having used the words of better thinkers than ourselves to convey the fact that the current scope and nature of education and human service work demand a broadly connected rather than insulated professional education, we must suggest, somewhat paradoxically, that the ultimate benefit of the practice of service integration within schools and communities is that it enables professionals to rekindle the motives that led them to aspire as teachers, counselors, nurses, social workers, and the like in the first place (Gardner, 1997). Current modes of professional preparation tend to produce those in the helping professions who live within duty boundries, proclaiming activities outside the perceived boundry realm as, "not my job." The promise of interprofessional education and integrated service delivery is the professional who proclaims, "finally I can practice (teaching, nursing, etc.) as I have always wanted." Teachers and service providers, prepared in an interprofessioal educational context and practicing in integrated service delivery context, possess the will and capacity to build connections with one another on behalf of the children and youth they ethically are bound to serve with efficacy (Gardner, 1997).

Such a vision mitigates the current state of practice, from which we provide a simple illustration of how the necessary connections between agencies must be built in order for efficacious services to be delivered, albeit in a plodding cumbersome manner. Of the U.S.'s over four million jobless single women with children, over a million of these women are addicted to alcohol and/or drugs (Gardner, 1997). Whereas the solution for the joblessness of the other three million women lies in a combination of child care, literacy, and job skills

services, the primary remedy for the remainder is recovery from drug addiction and alcoholism. However, the four relevant programs, of the nearly 700 total number of categorical human services programs, insulate themselves intractably thus forcing their service providers to spend months creating tenuous linkages among themselves so that just one of these one million moms has the opportunity to (a) begin recovery, (b) provide her sons and daughters with adequate child care, (c) learn to read, and (d) acquire a skill (Gardner, 1997). For those who continue to say, "that's not my job," we reply that clearly we must find a better way.

In the preceding interpretations of our findings from this project, we suggest that part of the better way is interprofessional education at the preservice level. And, at least with respect to current and future educators who would fail to see relevance in the dire straits through which the four million moms above must sail, we would ask them to be mindful of efficacy and outcomes of what they do in a manner similar to the views of Wade Horn, former Secretary of Health and Human Services under President Bush, who asked the public not to measure the success of human services in terms of jobs, decreased welfare rolls, and other mundane indices; rather, measure success solely on the basis of the well-being of the nation's children and youth (Gardner, 1997). In this light, we're compelled to ask: how are we doing?

References

Adler, L. (1994). Introduction and overview. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services (pp. 1-16). Washington, DC: Falmer.

Barber, B. (1996, August). Liberty, democracy, and the role of education. Paper presented at the convocation for the Lawrence, Kansas public school professional staff, Lawrence, KS.

Cities-in-Schools (1993). Building a cities-in-schools program: A replication process (Volume I of the Cities-in-Schools Strategy Series--Revised Edition). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Crowson, R. & Boyd, W. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. American Journal of Education, 101, 140-179.

Gardner, S. (1994a). Afterword. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (EDs.), Politics of Education Association Yearbook, (pp. 189-199). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Gardner, S. (1994b, May). Reform options for the intergovernmental funding stream: Decategorization policy issues. Paper presented at the Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives for Children and Families, Washington, DC.

Gardner, S. (1997, June). Why interprofessional education? Lecture to graduate course on interprofessional service integration. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Gee, G. (1987). Open letter to faculty. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado.

Gerry, M. (1993). A joint enterprise with America's families to ensure student success. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Gerry, M. (1996, April). Education in a democracy: changing times, changing policies. Paper presented at the meeting of Kansas Project Partnership and Goals 2000 project directors, Salina, KS.

Kirst, M. (Ed.) (1989). Conditions of Children in California. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Knapp, M., Barnard, K., Brandon, R., Gehrke, N., Smith, A., & Teather, E. (1993). University-based preparation for collaborative interprofessional practice. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (EDs.), Politics of Education Association Yearbook, (pp. 137-151). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Lawson, H. (1995). Schools and educational communities in a new vision for child welfare. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 1, 5-26.

Melaville, A., Blank, M.J., & Asayesh, G. (1993). Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI.

National Commission on Children (1991). Beyond rhetoric: A new agenda for children and families. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Rawlings, H. (1987). Faculty convocation address. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Whitehead, A. N. (1926). The aims of education and other essays. New York: Macmillan.

Table 1

Number of Participants by Role, School, & Role within School

Role		
Classroom Teachers		2
Reading Specialists		3
Math Specialist		1
Speech/Language		3
Special Education		4
Nurse		3
Counselors		4
Librarian		1
School		
South Park		9
Arrowhead		7
Santa Fe Trail		5
School	Role	
South Park	Classroom Teachers	2
	Reading Specialists	1
	Math Specialist	1
	Speech/Language	1
	Special Education	1
	Nurse	1
	Counselors	1
	Librarian	1
Arrowhead	Reading Specialists	1
	Speech/Language	2
	Special Education	2
	Nurse	1
	Counselors	1
Santa Fe	Reading Specialists	1
	Special Education	1
	Nurse	1
	Counselors	2

Table 2

Top Ten Barriers to Professional Practice in Order of Severity

Rank	Barrier
1.	Too much to do, too many students to serve, too little time, too many roles
2.	Child-related: truancy, refusals, lack of interest, discipline
3.	Inadequate parenting skils
4.	Resistance to inclusion policies
5.	Lack of ability and/or interest on the part of parents
6.	Different expectations of itinerant personnel
7.	Parents not meeting child's basic needs
8.	Inadequate communication between staff and administration
9.	Poor parental follow-through with jointly developed plans
10.	Scheduling problems

Appendix I

Interprofessional Development Seminar Syllabus

Interprofessional Development Seminar Syllabus

Seminar: C&I/SPED 798: Interprofessional Development for Educators

Dates: Wednesdays (12-4 p.m.), 2/28, 3/13, 4/24, & 5/15

Instructors: Pat Gallagher, Earle Knowlton, & Marc Mahlios
School of Education, University of Kansas 66045

Contact:

Gallagher	--	864-0548; pgallagher@quest.sped.ukans.edu
Knowlton	--	864-0544; eknowlton@quest.sped.ukans.edu
Mahlios	--	864-9666; mahlios@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu

Text:

Melaville, A., Blank, M.J., & Asayesh, G. (1993). Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI. [We will provide copies to all participants.]

Purpose & Outcomes:

This seminar has been funded by the State of Kansas's Goals 2000 program, a federally-funded statewide school reform initiative. Our intent is to provide Child Study/Preassessment Teams as well as other paticipants with a seminar experience addressing problems and strategies related to school-linked related services for students with diverse needs. Upon completion of the seminar, participants would have:

(1) knowledge of the expertise and skills local and regional health and social service providers can bring to schools, families and students of the Shawnee Mission district;

(2) knowledge of the changing family demographic patterns and the changing roles of these service providers, and of their respective service agencies, during this era of fiscal retrenchment;

(3) tactics for networking with and accessing services of relevant agencies in an efficient, timely, and effective manner;

(4) ability to work collaboratively with these service providers in ways that integrate and enhance services for students and their families; and

(5) the knowledge necessary to help impart information pertaining to the above four outcomes to other building-based screening teams in the district.

The seminar will achieve these outcomes by enhancing building-based, community-referenced policies, plans, and procedures, the crafting of which guided by a developmental process offered by Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh in their book entitled, Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services. Four half-day seminar meetings, along with field trips to Topeka and Girard, would occur during the spring semester.

Seminars:

Each of the four seminars will be structured in a discussion/problem-solving format sequenced with reference to a five-stage process developed by Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh (1993). These stages are: (1) Getting Together, (2) Building Trust and Ownership, (3) Developing a Strategic Plan, (4) Taking Action, and (5) Going to Scale. Whole- and small-group sessions will work through these stages with the instructors as well as several guest speakers. Depending on their availability, we'll attempt to include Karen Gallagher, Martin Gerry, and Wayne Sailor of KU, Natalie Gehrke of the University of Washington, and a representative of the Coalition for Positive Family Relationships.

Field Trips:

Field trips for a total of nine participants to Topeka's Project Attention and Girard's Greenbush Service Center would be for a full day each. The grant will provide for transportation and per diem. We'll work with participants and the Principals to schedule these.

Seminar Project:

Building-based, community-referenced policy, plan, and procedures, the development of which is guided by the Melaville/Blank/Asayesh 5-stage process.

Supplemental Readings:

Selections from:

Dryfoos, J. (1994). School-linked comprehensive services for adolescents. Paper commissioned by the Invitational Conference on School-Linked Comprehensive Services for Adolescents. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI.

Elkind, D. (1995). School and family in the postmodern world. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 8-14.

Elkind, D. (1994). Ties that stress: The new family imbalance. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Gardner, S. (1994). Afterword. Politics of Education Association Yearbook, 189-199.

Grissmer, D., Kirby, S., Berends, M., & Williamson, S. (1994). Student achievement and the changing American family. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Institute on Education and Training.

King, A. (1994). Challenges facing successful implementation of a full service elementary school. Paper commissioned by the Invitational Conference on School-Linked Comprehensive Services for Adolescents. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI.

Kirst, M. (1994). School-linked services: Appraisal, financing, and future directions. Paper commissioned by the Invitational Conference on School-Linked Comprehensive Services for Adolescents. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI.

Kunc, N (1992). The need to belong: Rediscovering Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (Eds.), Restructuring for caring and effective education (pp. 25-39). Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Mitchell, B. (1990). Children, youth, and restructured schools: Views from the field. In B. Mitchell & L. Cunningham, Eds., Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools (pp. 52-68). 89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wagstaff, L. & Gallagher, K.S. (1990). Schools, families, and communities: Idealized images and new realities. In B. Mitchell & L. Cunningham, Eds., Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools (pp. 91-117). 89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wang, M., Haertel, G., & Wahlberg, H. (1994). Effective features of collaborative school-linked services for children in elementary schools: What do we know from research and practice? Paper commissioned by the Invitational Conference on School-Linked Comprehensive Services for Adolescents. Washington, DC: USDE--OERI.

Appendix II
Per Site Consensus on Strenghths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges

ARROWHEAD ELEMENTARY'S STATUS TOWARDS OUR GOAL OF BEING A SCHOOL-LINKED SERVICE

STRENGTHS

Leadership of Principal
Building Team
Small Building Population
Equal Partnership as a Staff
Parent Involvement
Multiple opportunities for involvement with a cross-section of children
Homework Club
Peer Tutoring Program
CYKI - Early Identification
Infant Toddler Services
Parent Resource Center
After-School Care
Child care provided for Parent Mtgs.
DARE
Juniper Gardens Programs
Mental Health Center-Consultation
High School Students as Teacher helpers
Osterhaus Model for Discipline
Receptive Staff - openness, respect

CHALLENGES

Commitment by District
Confidentiality
Parental Commitment - different values, vision
Billable Hours Funding

OPPORTUNITIES

Shawnee Mission Medical Center Foundation
Johnson County Health Department
Mental Health agencies
Expanded use of P.T.A.
Physicians
Social Work Agencies
University Programs (Medical, Audiology, Speech/Language Pathology, Child Psychiatry)
Research Medical Center
Families Together
Parent Resource Center
Support Groups (Autism, CHADD...)
Business Partnerships
Churches
Service Organizations
Harmony in a World of Difference, Kaufmann Foundation, Project Essential
Childcare Opportunities
Respite Care

Santa Fe Trail

Strengths:

Leadership - Principal
Strong faculty- competent, professional, caring, dedicated
Faculty- Friendly , inviting to outsiders
Staff respectful of specialists' curriculum
Staff communicate openly differences of opinion
Community resources available and being utilized
Broad spectrum of socio-economic patrons
Parental trust of and support of Santa Fe Trail staff and curriculum
Strong commitment for advancement of School Improvement Plan

Weaknesses:

Lack of knowledge of staff roles
Lack of understanding and flexibililty of student age differences
Need more visibility of available community resources
Need for extended resource for legal counsel

Opportunities:

Network of resources in community
Assistance of local college and universities
Resources for in-service
Faculty support for this project
Close location to community resources

Challenges:

Develop awareness of community providers
Become aware of needs of community and students/families
Professional organizations extend charitable resources
Minimize District bureaucracy for more expediency of services

SOUTH PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Strengths:

* Attendance
* Building Screenings
* Ozanam program
* Diverse heritage of students
* Technology program
* Homework club
* Award winning PTA
* Child centered
* Open minded
* Flexible
* Consistency of staff
* Cooperation of staff
* Humor
* Consistency of discipline
* Utilization of outside resources
* School carnival
* Family involvement nights
* All-day kindergarten
* Before and after school care
* Breakfast program
* Physical structure of school
* Title I Reading and Math
* Scouting programs
* Safe school environment
* D.A.R.E. program
* Counseling program
* History of area

Weaknesses:

* Lack of parental involvement
* Lack of administrative communication
* Lack of opportunity for appreciation
* Fear of collaboration
* Too much to do
* Too many students to see
* Too little time
* Too many roles
* Lack of collaborative planning time
* Few parent volunteers in the classrooms
* Difficulty with inclusion of severe behavior problems
* Classroom teachers are not represented as permanent members of building screening team

Opportunities:

* Establish a primary homework club
* Provide more economical daycare
* Secure more parent volunteers
* Provide parenting classes
* Establish a Recovery Room
* Provide funds for mental health services
* Continue Ozanam support for the entire staff
* Establish a business partnership

Challenges:

* Parent follow-thru
* Parenting skills
* Threats
* Class size
* Keeping roll models at school - avoiding transfers
* Truancy
* Tardies
* Low income
* Having basic needs of students met
* Diversity of student needs
* Differences in priority between teachers and administration
* Parental attitude toward education

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

EC305725

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Trends in Integrated Service Delivery: Implications for the Art & Science of Collaboration	
Author(s): Gallagher, R.J.; Knowlton, H.E.; Mahlios, M.; Kleinhammer-Tramill, J.; ~~Author(s):~~ Max, C.; McCarthy, M.	
Corporate Source: University of Kansas and Shawnee Mission, KS, School District	Publication Date: 1997 (April)

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents	
☒ Check here **For Level 1 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	☐ Check here **For Level 2 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.
	Level 1	Level 2	

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: H Knowlton	Printed Name/Position/Title: Earle Knowlton, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: Dept. of Special Education 3001 Dole Center University of Kansas Lawrence, KS 66045	Telephone: (913) 864-4954	FAX: (913) 864-4149
	E-Mail Address: eknowlton@quest.spsd.ukans.edu	Date: 06/18/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20191-1589

Toll-Free: 800/328-0272
FAX: 703/620-2521

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com