

Socially-Just Disability Resources: An Approach to Enhancing Equity for Teacher Candidates with Disabilities

AUTHORS

Morgan Strimel

Journal of Special Education Preparation
2(3), 60-67

© 2022 Strimel

Licensed with CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 License

DOI: 10.33043/JOSEP.2.3.60-67
openjournals.bsu.edu/JOSEP

ABSTRACT

To effectively diversify the special education profession, the field must recognize disability as an aspect of diversity and critically examine how disabled teacher candidates experience higher education. Research has shown, for example, that during their time in teacher preparation programs, teacher candidates with disabilities encounter numerous barriers and a general sense of unpreparedness for their disability-related needs among several stakeholders (e.g., faculty, staff, disability resource professionals). The purpose of this article, therefore, is to describe an approach for disability resource professionals to apply socially-just disability resources—an emergent professional paradigm in the field of higher education disability resources—to enhance both access and equity in special education teacher preparation programs.

KEYWORDS

Disability resources, equity, special education, teacher preparation

Meet Klaudia. Klaudia is about to begin her third year of study at a large, public 4-year institution. She is enrolled in her university's Bachelor of Science in Education program, specializing in Special Education. At this point in her studies, Klaudia is shifting into coursework that requires hands-on clinical field experiences in special education classrooms. Specifically, by the end of her upcoming semester, she will be expected to take the lead instructional role in a classroom and work directly with students with the support of a cooperating teacher. Klaudia is excited to have reached this point in her program and is looking forward to starting her fieldwork. Because of this change in course structure and recent flares in some of her disabilities, however, Klaudia decided to initiate accommodations with her university's Disability Resource Center (DRC).

Klaudia was diagnosed with Major Depressive Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder in her teens and contracted Lyme disease in her early twenties, which

causes fatigue and joint pain. As of recently, she also started experiencing symptoms of long-COVID that can worsen her fatigue and cause migraines. Klaudia was previously resistant to the idea of establishing accommodations with the DRC, as her disabilities are generally unapparent, and she feared the stigma associated with disabled teachers. Moreover, she did not feel she needed accommodations until this point in her educational career. As a result, she is unsure of what to expect in the accommodations process and is anxious about disclosing such personal information about herself to a stranger. After much contemplation, though, Klaudia submitted her relevant medical documentation to the DRC, as suggested on their website, and awaited her upcoming meeting with a staff member to discuss accommodations.

Disability Resource Centers

Following the enactment of federal civil rights laws relevant to individuals with disabilities (e.g., Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990; Rehabilitation

Act, 1973), higher education institutions established disability resource centers (DRCs), employed by disability resource professionals (DRPs), to uphold compliance with provisions regarding access and inclusion (Evans et al., 2017). Specifically, DRCs exist as a place for disabled college students to work with DRPs to identify barriers in their environments (e.g., classrooms, residence halls, dining facilities, field placements) and, consequently, appropriate accommodations to mitigate them (Kroeger & Kraus, 2017). As a result, the primary roles of a DRP are to facilitate collaborative processes, determine accommodations that address disability-related barriers (Hatzes et al., 2018), and work with faculty and staff to ensure that approved accommodations are implemented effectively (Oslund, 2014).

Generally, DRPs conduct assessments of accommodation on a case-by-case basis by synthesizing students' relevant medical documentation and self-reports of their disabilities, as well as their professional observations and judgments (AHEAD, n.d.; Akins et al., 2001). Broadly, when considering accommodation requests, DRPs are looking to determine whether they meet the threshold of *reasonableness*; the only guidance from federal law on the matter of access that indicates that accommodations must not impose a safety risk to others, create an undue burden on the institution, or fundamentally alter an academic requirement or program (Rehabilitation Act, 1973). Altogether, the role of DRPs in the outcomes of students with disabilities is critical, as approving or denying an accommodation request for a classroom or clinical setting and the level of support provided thereafter can alter the trajectory of a student's outcomes (Papalia-Berardi et al., 2002).

Accommodations and Special Education Teacher Preparation

In determining accommodations for disabled special education teacher

candidates, DRPs may instrumentally influence whether they complete their programs of study and ultimately enter into an understaffed workforce (CEED-AR Center, 2020). In addition, due to the hands-on nature of clinical experiences, DRCs and teacher preparation stakeholders are met with unique challenges in determining and implementing reasonable accommodations in these settings that may require a great deal of creativity (Parker & Draves, 2017). In particular, when considering accommodations for special education teacher candidates with disabilities, one must consider their (a) academic coursework, (b) tests and relevant examinations, (c) teacher preparation program standards, and (d) clinical field placement settings.

Concerningly, numerous researchers demonstrated that disabled teacher candidates historically emphasize difficulties working with DRCs (e.g., unclear accommodations process, lack of understanding of the structure of teacher preparation programs) and other teacher preparation program stakeholders (Csoli & Gallagher, 2012; Macleod & Cebula, 2009; Parker & Draves, 2017). In most cases, teacher candidates attributed these difficulties to an overall awareness of negative attitudes towards educators with disabilities, both covert and overt. In addition, within the context of clinical field experiences, researchers found that some stakeholders perceive accommodating fieldwork as a direct fundamental alteration to the requirements of the teaching profession (Griffiths, 2012; Bargerhuff et al., 2012). When this occurs, disabled teacher candidates are left to report any issues back to their designated DRP. Otherwise, they will go unknown and unresolved, and teacher candidates often feel that they or their accommodations are burdensome to their respective teacher preparation programs (Bargerhuff et al., 2012; Griffiths, 2012).

Purpose

Although special education teacher preparation programs may be acces-

sible to teacher candidates with disabilities per compliance with federal legislation (i.e., the provision of reasonable accommodations), they may not be *equitable* in ways that are conducive to inclusion, degree completion, and ultimate entrance to a classroom. As a result, there is much work to be done in higher education to improve the experiences of disabled teacher candidates in special education teacher preparation programs. The purpose of this article, therefore, is to describe a proposed approach for disability resource professionals to apply *socially-just disability resources* – an emergent professional paradigm in the field of higher education disability resources – to enhance both access and equity in special education teacher preparation programs.

SOCIALLY-JUST DISABILITY RESOURCES

As a framework, socially-just disability resources (SJDR) is not a guide or step-by-step model for DRPs to use in carrying out the functions of their role. It is, however, a lens through which to critically examine all aspects of the disability resources field and consider how to align them more closely with equity-focused work (Evans et al., 2017; Kraus, 2021; Loewen & Pollard, 2010). More specifically, *equity-focused work* seeks to address barriers faced by students with disabilities in higher education, understand *why* they exist, and explore how DRPs can eliminate them. Overall, as defined by Kraus (2021), implementing an SJDR framework involves going “beyond mere compliance and accessibility to promote social justice and impact larger campus dynamics of inclusion, belonging, and climate” (p. 47).

Importantly, foundational to implementing SJDR is the belief that higher education has a long, complex history concerning systemic oppression of students with disabilities influenced by *ableism*, or attitudes, actions, and circumstances which devalue people because they are disabled, both inten-

tionally and unintentionally (Kraus, 2021; Ladau, 2021). Further, Loewen and Pollard (2010) noted that for DRPs, implementation of SJDR must also include (a) a recognition of privilege and power in higher education, (b) an understanding of diversity as it relates to disability, (c) careful attention to intersectionality concerning disability (e.g., access to disability documentation in relation to poverty), and (d) an orientation towards interdependence rather than independence. Similarly, but more concisely, Evans and colleagues (2017) defined SJDR by four core concepts – liberation, respect, interdependence, and justice – noting that they all summarize what *equity* would look like for students with disabilities when DRPs enact SJDR.

In addition to the foundational conceptualizations of SJDR, leading scholars provided operationalizations of SJDR for DRPs to inform their practice. For example, through SJDR, DRPs should take care in identifying and avoiding microaggressions towards disabled students and, regularly reflect on their biases and the presence of power dynamics in their interactions. Additionally, through SJDR, DRPs are encouraged to view students holistically as individuals with multiple, interrelated identities (i.e., not only as students with disabilities) and consider how the language used in interactions with disabled students and the campus community represents disability (Kraus, 2021; Loewen & Pollard, 2010). Further, SJDR involves facilitating an equitable accommodations process through trust in the student as the expert in their disability, support of student agency, a focus on environmental barriers rather than student deficits, and transparency in available resources (Evans et al., 2017; Kraus, 2021).

Moreover, within SJDR, there are several implications for DRPs regarding proactive efforts to advance equity across their campuses. For example, DRPs are encouraged to provide continuing education to campus partners on universal design, work closely with

FIGURE 1: Applying Socially-Just Disability Resources to Special Education Teacher Preparation



faculty to identify disability-related barriers in courses, and collaborate with campus partners to develop cultural centers/programming to represent disability identity on campus (Evans et al., 2017; Kraus, 2021; Loewen & Pollard, 2010). In special education teacher preparation, specifically, the scope of SJDR is far-reaching. DRPs would need to reach not only partners on campuses in these efforts (e.g., faculty and staff) but also those in cooperating schools (e.g., teachers, administrators), where tensions between accommodations, professional standards, and personal beliefs may be at their highest (Sokal & Sharma, 2017). Altogether, SJDR shows promise for guiding DRPs to enact change that creates more equitable experiences for all college students with disabilities (Kraus, 2021) that, over time, may attract more disabled special education teacher candidates and advance efforts to diversify the profession overall.

APPLYING SJDR TO SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION

Let us now meet Eric. Eric is a seasoned disability resource professional with over seven years of experience in his role, which primarily involves determining accommodations in collaboration with college students with disabilities. Throughout his career in disability resources, Eric has worked with hundreds of students from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and degree programs. For this reason, Eric is generally comfortable with his professional skills and expertise. Notably, although Eric does not identify as disabled, he does have disabilities that some might consider disabling. Specifically, he was diagnosed with Generalized Anxiety Disorder as a child, and since 2020, he has expe-

rienced brain fog from time to time as an effect of long-COVID.

Ahead of a new fall semester, Eric is preparing to meet with a new student, Klaudia. Before their meeting, Eric reviews the documentation Klaudia submitted to get a general idea of the direction their meeting might take (e.g., her accommodation requests, degree program, disabilities). Within Klaudia's documentation, Eric sees that she submitted paperwork to support diagnoses of Generalized Anxiety Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, and Lyme Disease. In addition, Klaudia included a note about long-COVID but does not yet have documentation to support this diagnosis. However, after reading through her documentation, what catches Eric's eye is Klaudia's program of study; his gut reaction to her studying special education surprises him – "*how am I going to accommodate her?*"

The following section describes the application of SJDR to higher education disability resources. As depicted in Figure 1, the four steps to applying SJDR to special education teacher preparation include continually (1) engaging in critical self-reflection, (2) ensuring baseline access, (3) equitably implementing accommodations, and (4) proactively creating socially-just experiences. Each step will be explored in depth with practical applications for professionals to adopt to engage with disabled teacher candidates more equitably throughout their programs of study.

Step One: Engaging in Critical Self-Reflection

Eric's internal response to the information he learned about Klaudia before meeting with her and subsequent uncertainty in how he would facilitate access for someone with her disabilities in a special education teacher preparation program is likely the result of

implicit bias. Implicit bias, or "a form of bias that occurs automatically and unintentionally," unconsciously shapes individuals' choices, interactions, actions, and judgments (National Institutes of Health, n.d., para. 1). In higher education disability resources, implicit biases can impact DRPs' accommodation-related decisions and assumptions, interactions with disabled teacher candidates, and choices while facilitating access (Kraus, 2021). For this reason, as depicted in Figure 1, an essential starting place for DRPs in adopting the SJDR framework is to engage in critical self-reflection. Critical self-reflection has been used in teacher education to describe a practice that "requires one to seek deeper levels of self-knowledge and to acknowledge how one's worldview can shape student's conceptions of self" (Howard, 2003, p. 198). If translated to disability resources, this practice can provide a means for DRPs to enhance their self-knowledge by navigating personal biases, disrupting them when they emerge, deeply exploring why they may have formed, and unlearning them over time (Stewart & Payne, 2008).

Critical self-reflection may take many forms, and how this practice is adopted will vary depending upon individual DRPs. *Reflexivity*, for example, is an approach to reflection that requires deep contemplation of the interrelated components of oneself (e.g., identities, experiences, beliefs, values) to monitor, understand, and mitigate the extent to which they influence external action and choices. In Eric's situation, reflexivity could involve taking a step back after he wondered, "*how am I going to accommodate her?*" to explore this reaction, where it may have come from (e.g., personal experiences), and why it occurred. It may be the case, for example, that Eric reflects on experiences he had with educators with disabilities in the past, experiences with disabled teacher candidates in his professional role, personal experiences with Generalized Anxiety Disorder and long-

COVID, and how these may differ from Klaudia's experiences. Based on the answers to these questions, Eric may uncover where his experiences or beliefs may be shaping his gut reactions, judgments, and biases to pay attention and to redirect them if they emerge during his interactions with Klaudia.

Similarly, engaging in critical self-reflection may inherently be accompanied by *humility*. Humility, in the context of disability resources, involves openness and willingness to learn and change opinions, beliefs, and ideas through interactions with others (Haynes-Mendez & Engelsmeier, 2020). It may be beneficial, for example, for DRPs to channel humility as a framework through which they prepare for accommodation meetings and approach interactions with disabled teacher candidates. Moreover, from a place of humility, DRPs can initiate engagements in peer debriefing or consultation with colleagues. Within the SJDR framework, consulting with peers can create more equitable accommodation decision-making procedures by sharing initial judgments, such as Eric's judgments, to monitor the extent to which they were influenced by implicit bias. In any form, critical self-reflection is an essential component of adopting SJDR that can ensure DRPs recognize and minimize the influence of their biases throughout all components of working with disabled teacher candidates, before, during, and after the accommodations process (Kraus, 2021).

Step Two: Ensuring Baseline Access

Central to the SJDR framework is the idea that "access is the starting point, not the end goal" for DRPs' work on college and university campuses (Kraus, 2021, p. 63). It is essential, however, through an SJDR approach, that DRPs examine how they facilitate access and whether it is done equitably to then be able to move the needle of equity and social justice in other higher education contexts. Further, by

engaging in equitable practices, DRPs may model a lens of social justice for their campus partners that translate to changes in additional campus policies, practices, and procedures. As such, the SJDR framework provides numerous suggestions for shifting DRPs' practices to create an equitable experience for disabled teacher candidates in the accommodations process.

First, SJDR calls on DRPs to facilitate an accommodations process that is non-burdensome (Evans et al., 2017). In other words, accommodations processes should not present barriers for disabled teacher candidates, preventing them from accessing their educational experiences. Influential to this charge for DRPs is the idea that social justice for disabled students would entail similar, if not identical, experiences between them and their non-disabled peers (Kraus, 2021); non-disabled teacher candidates are not required to complete accommodations processes, submit disability-related documentation, or disclose personal details to engage in their special education teacher preparation programs. Eric, for example, could be mindful not to create barriers to access by not requiring Klaudia to obtain documentation of her long-COVID diagnosis before establishing related accommodations. Instead, he can lean into her self-report and narratives of the impact of environmental barriers when making accommodation-related decisions. Notably, this practice is also cognizant of disabled teacher candidates' intersectional identities (e.g., culture, socioeconomic status) that may impact their ability to access disability-related documentation (Yull, 2015).

Second, throughout the accommodations process, SJDR calls on DRPs to emphasize designs and environments as inaccessible rather than situating the problem within students and their disability/ies (Evans et al., 2017; Kraus, 2021; Loewen & Pollard, 2010). To accomplish this, DRPs can be attentive to their language when interacting

with disabled teacher candidates and the questions they ask to elicit their self-reports. Eric, for example, may ask Klaudia, "what barriers are present within your teacher preparation program?" instead of "what are your functional limitations?" This practice also reflects the third component of an equitable accommodations process: removing emphasis from assumptions of specific disabilities. Although Eric is a seasoned DRP, he does not know how Klaudia's disabilities interact with her environment until she discloses that information, nor can he base his decisions on his experiences with Generalized Anxiety Disorder and long-COVID. As a result, focusing on Klaudia's self-report is the most reliable and equitable source of information, per SJDR, to identify environmental barriers and determine accommodations for disabled teacher candidates.

Fourth, with a broad focus on environmental barriers while determining accommodations, implementing SJDR also involves DRPs deeply exploring all environments in which disabled teacher candidates are studying to create holistically equitable and accessible educational experiences. When meeting with Klaudia, for example, Eric must ensure that he fully understands the nature of special education teacher preparation and clinical field experiences to identify where barriers are present across all contexts. Further, Eric will also need to consider the professional standards of the special education profession to balance them with his ultimate accommodation decisions. To accomplish this, he may need to engage in additional work beyond his meeting with Klaudia to talk with special education teacher preparation stakeholders to understand the components of her program of study that he needs to be mindful of when making accommodation-related decisions and facilitating access.

Eric consulted with his coworkers before meeting with Klaudia to

discuss the reactions he had to her information and program of study, which led to a productive conversation about how other staff members of the DRC collaborated with teacher preparation programs in the past to ensure access. However, Eric's coworkers also reminded him that Anxiety and long-COVID impact everyone differently and he would need to reserve his assessments of accommodations and environmental barriers until he met with Klaudia and learned more about her experiences. The next day, Eric and Klaudia had a productive initial meeting to discuss her accommodations. First, she shared that she anticipated experiencing barriers in her lecture-style classes and clinical field experiences. The two then discussed the potential barriers at length (see Table 1). Next, Eric learned a great deal about the structure of the special education teacher preparation program from Klaudia, even though he had researched the department's website the day before. After their meeting, Eric and Klaudia agreed upon the following accommodations: extended time on exams, breaks during class, advanced access to course materials (e.g., PowerPoints), access to a chair, and extended time on assignments (2 days).

Step 3: Equitably Implementing Accommodations

Once DRPs establish accommodations, they can use several strategies through the SJDR framework to enhance equity for special education teacher candidates with disabilities in implementing them. For example, disabled teacher candidates cite power dynamics between them and faculty as a persistent barrier to access, due to either not feeling comfortable accessing their accommodations or being denied their usage (Baldwin, 2007; Leyser & Greenberger, 2008). For this reason,

TABLE 1: Connections between Potential Barriers and Corresponding Accommodations

POTENTIAL BARRIER	CORRESPONDING ACCOMMODATION
Fixed exam periods	Extended time on exams
Long lecture or instructional periods (up to three hours)	Breaks during class
Unexpected requirements, activities, or content in lectures or clinical field experiences	Advanced access to course materials
Requirements to stand during clinical field experiences (e.g., instructional settings)	Access to a chair
Rigid due dates for assignments	Extended time on assignments (e.g., 2 days)

DRPs may draw on the SJDR framework and remove these power dynamics by communicating any information about accommodations to appropriate stakeholders rather than requiring disabled teacher candidates to engage in this process. This practice again reiterates that disabled teacher candidates should have similar if not identical experiences as their non-disabled peers. In other words, non-disabled teacher candidates are not required to ask for access each time they need it. Therefore, if candidates are comfortable with this approach, DRPs may remove this burden and collaborate with faculty, clinical field supervisors, and other special education stakeholders to communicate approved accommodations and discuss their implementation. Overall, this practice ensures that disabled teacher candidates are not carrying the burden of inaccessibility in higher education settings.

Disabled teacher candidates may prefer, however, to either communicate their accommodations on their own or to do so in collaboration with DRPs. If candidates are interested in discussing accommodation implementation collaboratively, it is recommended that a meeting with relevant stakeholders be held in advance of their upcoming semester to remain proactive and ahead of any environmental barriers. Specifically, this group should – if possible

– include the teacher candidate, DRP, clinical field supervisor, faculty, and other relevant stakeholders. In this meeting, the group may discuss potential barriers across all environments that they will mitigate via accommodations and modifications to ensure that access is consistent and equitably implemented. Notably, throughout this conversation, DRPs should make efforts to keep the focus on inaccessible structures as opposed to the teacher candidates' disabilities. It is important, through the lens of SJDR, that DRPs follow the students' lead in conversations such as these and center their perspectives, as they are the experts in their own experiences. Moreover, centering the teacher candidate will also help to ensure that the DRP or other stakeholders do not unintentionally patronize the teacher candidate; instead, it is suggested that DRPs adopt a stance of an ally and advocate.

After their initial meeting, Klaudia reached out to Eric to schedule a meeting with the two of them, her clinical field supervisor, and faculty members for the upcoming semester. The group met in the first week of classes before her field experiences commenced. With each bringing an important perspective to the table, they developed a plan to ensure that each of her accom-

modations would be implemented appropriately. Specifically, the clinical field supervisor would speak with Klaudia's cooperating teacher and school principal to communicate the necessary accommodations and decide for each to take place as needed. The clinical field supervisor also planned to check in with Klaudia weekly to ensure that accommodations effectively removed environmental barriers.

Further, if any accommodations needed to be adjusted, Klaudia planned to notify Eric and schedule a meeting to adjust accordingly. The group then prepared to check in with one another at the midpoint of the semester and, once the semester concluded, to monitor the accessibility of Klaudia's experiences to ensure they were also equitable and inclusive. For her other courses (non-fieldwork), Eric communicated Klaudia's accommodations to her faculty members. Then, starting the following week, Klaudia's professors shared their course materials with her, ensured access to a chair, and worked with her to adjust due dates and test times as needed.

Step 4: Proactively Creating Socially-Just Experiences

In the final component of the SJDR

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Morgan Strimel

Morgan Strimel, M.Ed. is a doctoral candidate in the OSEP-funded Policy and Research-Intensive Special Educators (PRISE) program at George Mason University, where she previously worked as an Access Consultant for Disability Services. Based on her time in higher education, Morgan's current research is focused on enhancing postsecondary education experiences for college students with disabilities – including preservice teachers – through the disability resources profession. Specifically, Morgan is studying socially-just disability resources as an approach to access, equity, and inclusion for students with disabilities in higher education settings.

framework, DRPs are charged with going beyond matters of compliance to proactively advance equity and inclusion across their campuses (Kraus, 2021). Over time, these efforts would minimize the need for individual accommodations, as colleges and universities would be designed to be accessible and inclusive for disabled students. To reach this point, however, DRPs may use the SJDR approach to incrementally shift policies, practices, and procedures within all dimensions of higher education to reach a point in which disabled students have similar, if not identical, experiences as their non-disabled peers (Kraus, 2021).

To accomplish this, DRPs will need to develop strong relationships with their campus partners to serve as a foundation for advocating for inclusive, proactive design. In special education teacher preparation, in particular, it will be necessary for DRPs to consider practical approaches to these conversations, given the similarities in professional expertise across departmental faculty and staff. Further, these conversations will need to extend to *all* campus partners in special education teacher preparation, such as cooperating school staff. Through this outreach, DRPs may encourage special education stakeholders to carefully reflect on barriers in their programs, courses, and experiences for disabled teacher candidates and subsequently assess how they may be removed. Given the nature of this suggestion and the corresponding workload to accompany any department-wide initiatives, it is recommended that DRPs offer their expertise in access to higher education as a means of support for creatively thinking through how to design special education teacher preparation environments to be universally designed to the greatest extent possible.

In the same vein, SJDR also involves DRPs engaging in outreach and education around how disability is framed, discussed, and represented

across campus. As such, DRPs may consider encouraging special education teacher preparation stakeholders to reflect on how they represent disability in their programs of study and how it may subsequently impact their disabled teacher candidates. Specifically, because special education law broadly focuses on “fixing the child through a series of interventions to make the child more similar to peers without disabilities,” the content of special education teacher preparation programs can inherently and unintentionally focus on students’ deficits and means of ‘fixing’ disability (Cornett & Knackstedt, 2020, p. 512). Consequently, this framing of disability can harm disabled teacher candidates’ disability identity and self-efficacy concerning becoming a special education teacher. As a result, it may be beneficial for DRPs to draw on fields such as disability studies in education to facilitate conversations across special education teacher preparation programs around how to reframe disability in special education through a lens of social justice and equity rather than individual deficit and a need for intervention.

Later that semester, after forming a relationship with Klaudia’s faculty, Eric had the opportunity to facilitate a workshop among other special education preparation stakeholders about disability equity, identity, and inclusion in their department. In this workshop, Eric discussed disability identity and the impact inequitable and inaccessible experiences have on special education teacher candidates with disabilities, citing previous research. In addition, he thoughtfully facilitated dialogue with special education teacher preparation stakeholders on why this exclusion occurs in degree programs meant to prepare individuals to be inclusive of individuals with disabilities. Through

thoughtful conversations, Eric and the special education stakeholders developed a plan to conduct an equity audit of their department to uncover how ableism and traces of the medical model of disability may be intertwined with how they prepare special education teachers. Through this process, the department hopes to enhance equity and inclusion for disabled teacher candidates in their department and plans to engage in focus groups with disabled teacher candidates currently enrolled in their program to understand how it can be changed to be socially-just.

CONCLUSION

Overall, it is evident that there is a great deal of work to be done in higher education and within special education teacher preparation programs to create equitable educational experiences for disabled teacher candidates, where they feel free from discrimination and disability-related barriers, all of which begins with disability resource professionals. By implementing socially-just disability resources, it may be possible for DRPs to take incremental steps to shift access and equity in special education teacher preparation. Although enacting the SJDR framework inherently requires additional efforts from DRPs and DRCs alike, these efforts may increase the number of teachers candidates with disabilities who enroll in preparation programs and ultimately enter a classroom. With this potential, DRPs are encouraged to adopt SJDR to the greatest extent possible to enhance equity not only for disabled teacher candidates, but for all college students with disabilities.

REFERENCES

AHEAD. (n.d.). The professional's guide to exploring and facilitating access. *Association on Higher Education and Disability*. Retrieved March 29, 2021, from <https://www.ahead.org/professionalresources/accommodations/documentation/profes->

- [sional-resources-accommodations-professional-guide-access](#)
- Akins, W., Chance, C., & Page, F. (2001). *Accommodating student teachers with special needs* (ED4595575). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED4595575.pdf>
- Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 USC § 12101 et seq. (1990).
- Baldwin, J. L. (2007). Teacher candidates with learning disabilities: Effective and ethical accommodations. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 30(3), 128–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640703000302>
- Bargerhuff, M. E., Cole, D. J., & Teeters, L. (2012). Using a transdisciplinary model to address inequities in field placements for teacher candidates with disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(2), 185–206.
- CEEDAR Center. (2020). *Preparing and retaining effective special education teachers: Short-term strategies for long-term solutions* (A policy brief). <https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CEEDAR-GTL-Shortages-Brief.pdf>
- Cornett, J. & Knackstedt, K. M. (2020). Original sin(s): Lessons from the US model of special education and an opportunity for leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(5), 507–520. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0175>
- Csoli, K., & Gallagher, T. L. (2012). Accommodations in teacher education: Perspectives of teacher candidates with learning disabilities and their faculty advisors. *Exceptionality Education International*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.5206/eei.v22i2.7698>
- Evans, N., Broido, E., Brown, K., & Wilke, A., (2017). *Disability in higher education: A social justice foundation*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Griffiths, S. (2012). 'Being dyslexic doesn't make me less of a teacher.' School placement experiences of student teachers with dyslexia: Strengths, challenges, and a model for support. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(2), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01201.x>
- Hatzes, N. M., Reiff, H. B., & Bramel, M. H. (2002). The documentation dilemma: Access and accommodations for postsecondary students with learning disabilities. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 27(3), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073724770202700304>
- Haynes-Mendez, K., & Engelsmeier, J. (2020). Cultivating cultural humility in education. *Childhood Education*, 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2020.1766656>
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, 42, 195–202. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_5
- Kraus, A. (2021). *Operationalizing our commitment to social justice: A guide for disability resource professionals in higher education* [Monograph]. Association on Higher Education and Disability.
- Kroeger, S. & Kraus, A. (2017). Thinking and practicing differently: Changing the narrative around disability on college campuses. In E. Kim & K. C. Aquino (Eds.), *Disability as diversity in higher education: Policies and practices to enhance student success* (pp. 216–229). Routledge.
- Ladau, E. (2021). *Demystifying disability: What to know, what to say, and how to be an ally*. Ten Speed Press.
- Leysner, Y., & Greenberger, L. (2008). College students with disabilities in teacher education: Faculty attitudes and practices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(3), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250802130442>
- Loewen, G. & Pollard, W. (2010). The social justice perspective. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*, 23(1), 5–18.
- Macleod, G., & Cebula, K. R. (2009). Experiences of disabled students in initial teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(4), 457–472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640903352465>
- National Institutes on Health. (n.d.). *Implicit Bias*. <https://diversity.nih.gov/sociocultural-factors/implicit-bias>
- Oslund, C. (2014). *Disability services and disability studies in higher education: History, contexts, and social impacts*. Palgrave Pivot.
- Papalia-Berardi, A., Hughes, C. A., & Papalia, A. S. (2002). Teacher education students with disabilities: Participation and achievement factors. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 25(1), 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640202500104>
- Parker, E. C., & Draves, T. J. (2017). A narrative of two preservice music teachers with visual impairment. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 64(4), 385–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429416674704>
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 USC § 701 et seq.
- Sokal, L., & Sharma, U. (2017). "Do I really need a course to learn to teach students with disabilities? I've been doing it for years." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(4), 739–760. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90018386>
- Stewart, B. D., & Payne, B. K. (2008). Bringing automatic stereotyping under control: implementation intentions as efficient means of thought control. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(10), 1332–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208321269>
- Yull, A. (2015). The impact of race and socioeconomic status on access to accommodations in postsecondary education. *Social Policy*, 23(2), 353–392.