Essential Special and General Education Teacher Competencies for Preparing Teachers for Inclusive Settings

Mary Dingle
Sonoma State University
& Mary A. Falvey, Christine C. Givner, & Diane Haager
California State University, Los Angeles

The passage of the 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as the increased numbers of students with disabilities being educated part or full time in general education classes (U.S. Department of Education, 1997; 2002), create significant challenges for teacher preparation programs for both special and general education teachers. Specifically, the 1997 Amendments to IDEA require that special educators are knowledgeable and skilled in the general education core curriculum standards and the use of accountability assessment systems in order to educate students with disabilities in general education settings. The IDEA amendments also suggest that

Mary Dingle is an assistant professor of special education with the School of Education at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California. E-mail mary.dingle@sonoma.edu

Mary A. Falvey is a professor of special education in the Division of Special Education of the Charter College of Education at California State University, Los Angeles. E-mail mfalvey@calstatela.edu

Christine C. Givner is a professor and chair of the Division of Special Education of the Charter College of Education at California State University, Los Angeles. E-mail cgivner@calstatela.edu

Diane Haager is a professor of special education in the Division of Special Education of the Charter College of Education at California State University, Los Angeles. E-mail dhaager@calstatela.edu

general educators must develop the knowledge and skills necessary to educate the increasing numbers of students with disabilities in their classes and work in collaboration with special education teachers. In addition, the No Child Left Behind legislation (NCLB, 2001) mandates an accountability system for all students, including those with disabilities. It is evident that schools are under increasing pressure to involve students with disabilities in many aspects of general education curriculum, assessment, and instruction.

In response to legislative and policy changes, a growing number of schools and districts across the United States are adopting inclusive education models that integrate students with disabilities into the general education environment (Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 2002; Villa & Thousand, 2000). The concept of inclusion is understood and implemented in a variety of ways. It is generally understood to be a move to educate students with disabilities to the maximum degree possible in general education settings. Inclusive schools have been described as schools in which the importance and value of diversity is shown throughout the entire school culture and within all programs (Falvey, 1996).

Public schools have undergone tremendous changes in the past several decades. The progressively more diverse student body within the public schools has stretched the limits of the traditional school system. In the past, diversity was generally defined in terms of culture, linguistics, economic access, and gender. However, with the recent adoption of inclusive models, the term diversity broadens to include students with varied abilities, particularly those with disabilities (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2002). As general and special education teachers share responsibility for educating students with disabilities, teacher preparation programs must reflect the knowledge and skills needed by both of these groups of teachers.

In most teacher education programs across the country, a discussion has begun between general and special education faculty about the characteristics and competencies needed by both special and general educators in order to effectively teach a diverse population of students. This dialogue has, in some cases, evolved into pilot programs and/or new models of teacher preparation for both general and special education teachers (Blanton, Griffin, Winn, & Pugach, 1997). In 1990, the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children convened a task force of teacher educators to examine the efforts of effectively preparing general and special education teachers to teach students with disabilities. The task force's culminating work was a publication that describes in detail the work at 10 schools of education that have taken on this challenge and conducted systemic and comprehensive changes to

their traditional parallel programs of preparing special and general educators (Blanton, et al., 1997). The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (2001) has concluded that many of the teaching standards needed by general and special educators overlap and have developed a common set of standards (INTASC, 2001) for use in teacher education programs.

Several studies have examined attitudes toward educating students with disabilities in general education settings. Yasutake and Learner (1996) conducted a study of special and general education teacher perceptions of and attitudes toward inclusive practices, concluding that general education teachers did not possess the practical training to make inclusion successful. In addition, teachers felt that special education supports were insufficient within the general education class to foster successful inclusion.

In another study of attitudes toward inclusion in rural settings, special and general education teachers and administrators held cautious attitudes toward inclusion (Wigle & Wilcox, 1997). The researchers offered specific recommendations for both general and special education teachers. Relevant to the study reported here, they found that both groups of teachers must posses the knowledge and skills to effectively collaborate and work together. Also, general and special educators must have the skills necessary to modify educational programs to effectively meet the needs of individual students.

Olson, Chalmers, and Hoover (1997) conducted in-depth interviews with general education teachers who had been identified by principals and special education teacher colleagues as skilled at including students with disabilities in their classrooms. Several themes emerged from this study that have significant implications for teacher preparation programs. The general education teachers

- ◆ considered themselves to possess essential dispositions; specifically, tolerance, reflectivity, and flexibility;
- ◆ assumed responsibility for all their students, including those with disabilities;
- ◆ experienced a positive collaborative relationship with special educators;
- ◆ indicated that students with disabilities required an adjustment time to become acquainted with the classroom routines and culture;
- ◆ indicated that their modeling of acceptance of the student with disabilities in their classes was paramount to the success of the inclusion;
- ◆ cited insufficient time to collaborate;

- and, in spite of their success, expressed reservations about including all students.

One of the most important teacher preparation implications from this study was that prospective candidates should possess a positive disposition toward students with disabilities in order to be *admitted* to teacher preparation programs.

In South Carolina, 342 general education teachers participated in a survey related to attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes (Monahan, Marino, & Miller, 2000). Seventy-two percent of the respondents believed that inclusion would never be successful due to resistance from general education teachers, while 75% of the respondents indicated that general education teachers did not possess the instructional skills necessary to effectively teach students with disabilities. With regard to collaboration, 84% of the respondents felt that both special and general education teachers must possess the skills to effectively collaborate with one another. The authors conclude that offering a "mainstreaming" course as the single method for general education teachers falls short of providing them with the competencies needed to successfully include students with disabilities in their classes. Instead, they argue for a comprehensive teacher preparation program for general education teachers where, throughout their coursework and practica, the general education teacher candidates are learning to effectively include students with disabilities in their classes.

This research provides strong evidence that we must examine teacher preparation programs and how they influence teachers' attitudes toward inclusive practices. We must devise a teacher preparation system that provides systematic and extensive development of the knowledge and skills necessary for teachers to implement inclusive education. D'Alonzo, Giordano, and Cross (1996) recommended that in order to improve general education teachers' attitudes about inclusive education, teacher preparation programs for both special and general educators must provide the competencies necessary to successfully include students with disabilities.

Important questions remain regarding the specific knowledge and skills needed by both general and special education teachers to effectively implement inclusive educational models. The purpose of this study was to identify and validate the essential competencies for special and general educators needed to effectively educate students with disabilities within inclusive settings. We examined the competencies considered essential by three critical stakeholder groups: school principals, special educators, and general educators.

Method

To identify the essential competencies for special and general educators, the authors utilized the expert consensus model of validation developed by Johnson (1977) and used by DeFur and Taymans (1995) to identify competencies needed by transitional specialists. The steps in this model include: (1) identifying the competencies needed to support inclusive education through multiple sources, (2) categorizing and organizing the competencies, (3) developing a social validation instrument for the competencies using a Likert scale, (4) establishing a sample of experts, (5) collecting data from the sample of experts regarding the validity of the list of competencies for general and special educators, and (6) analyzing the data in terms of the purpose of the study.

Participants

The participants in this study were general educators, special educators, and administrators who worked in schools that had been nominated by the leadership team for the California Statewide Systems Change. The grant, funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS), was designed to facilitate inclusive education throughout California. Each of these schools had successfully included students with disabilities for at least three years and each of the participants had worked at the school for at least one year. The surveys were sent to 36 schools, including elementary, middle, and high schools. A total of 76 individuals completed and returned the survey including 18 special education teachers, 46 general education teachers, and 12 administrators. Table 1 includes information regarding teaching experience.

Measure

To develop the measure, we followed the steps in the expert consensus model. First we collected several sources of competencies used in teacher education programs for preparing general and special educators. The sources of competencies compiled for validation included the literature previously reviewed, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Common Core of Knowledge and Skills Essential for All Beginning Special Education Teachers (Swan & Sirvis, 1992), the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (California Department of Education, 1998), and the California State University at Los Angeles Competencies for the Mild-Moderate and Moderate-Severe Preliminary Level I Credential.

Following a structured process of consensus building, three independent investigators organized the competencies into categories. This process included establishing a list of competencies (knowledge, skills

Table 1
Years of Teaching Experience and Years of Experience with Inclusion for Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, and Administrators (n=76)

	Teaching/Administrative Experience			Experience with Inclusion		
	Years	(n)	%	Years	(n)	%
Special Educators	1-2	0	0	1-2	1	6
n=18	3-7	7	39	3-7	3	17
M=11%	8-12	5	28	8-12	13	72
F=88%	13 +	6	33	13 +	1	6
General Educators	1-2	3	7	1-2	6	13
n=46	3-7	7	15	3-7	10	22
M=12%	8-12	10	22	8-12	29	63
F=88%	13 +	26	57	13 +	1	2
Administrators	1-2	1	8	—-	—-	—-
n=12	3-7	3	25	—-	—-	—-
M=25%	8-12	4	33	—-	—-	—-
F=75%	13 +	4	33	—-	—-	—-

and dispositions) and organizing the competencies into categories. The result of this process was that the CEC Common Core of Knowledge and Skills Essential for All Beginning Special Education Teachers (Swan & Sirvis, 1992) subsumed the competencies found in the list compiled by the independent investigators. They agreed that the CEC common core would serve as the organizing frame for this study.

A three-part survey was developed. The first survey section listed 50 author-identified competencies in random order. Participants responded using a four-point Likert scale (not important, necessary, very important, most important). They were asked to rate the importance of the competencies for special education teachers working in inclusive settings, and the importance of these same competencies for general education teachers working in inclusive settings. The second survey section was comprised of 11 open-ended questions about school and classroom contextual variables. These open-ended questions were not used for the study reported here. The final survey section asked specific demographic questions. A field test of the survey was completed prior to the study. Minor adjustments were made to the survey based on the feedback received during the pilot.

Procedures and Data Analysis

We made telephone contact with the 36 schools identified by the California Statewide Systems Change Grant. The administrators at these schools allowed us to send the survey to their school. They further agreed to distribute it to the special education and general education teachers at their site. After a one month period, each of the schools that had not returned the survey was called to encourage the return of the surveys. After two weeks the schools that had still had not returned the surveys were called again. There was a 50% return rate from the schools (n=18), with at least one special education teacher and a range of 1-10 general education teachers completing the survey at each of the responding school sites. There was a 33% return rate from the administrators at the schools (n=12).

Competencies for special education teachers and general education teachers were ranked for each stakeholder group using the mean for each competency. Competencies that had a mean of 3 or higher ("very important" and "most important") on the four point Likert scale were included as essential competencies.

Results

The competencies that all three stakeholder groups ranked as essential were included in the final three lists of essential competencies. The first list included the competencies that all stakeholder groups agreed were essential for both special education and general education teachers working in inclusive settings. The second list included the competencies that all stakeholder groups agreed were essential for the special educators working in inclusive settings. The third list includes the competencies that all stakeholder groups agreed were essential for the general education teachers working in inclusive settings. Means and standard deviations are reported for each competency based on the total ranking of all respondents in the three stakeholder groups. The three stakeholder groups reached consensus on 10 competencies essential for both special educators and general education teachers working in inclusive settings (see Table 2).

The three stakeholder groups reached consensus on 24 essential competencies for special educators working in inclusive settings (see Table 3).

Lastly, the three stakeholder groups reached consensus on 4 competencies essential for general education teachers working in inclusive settings (see Table 4).

The purpose of this study was to examine and validate competencies

Table 2
Competencies Identified by the Respondents in All Three Stakeholder Groups as Essential for Both Special and General Educators (n=76)

Competency (Scale: 4 = most important, 3 = very important, 2 = necessary, 1 = not important)	General Education $\bar{X}$	s.d	Special Education $\bar{X}$	s.d.
Promotes high level integrity, competence, ethics, and professional judgment.	3.88	.36	3.93	.25
Facilitates positive self image of students.	3.71	.56	3.75	.50
Facilitates active participation in a fair and respectful environment that reflects cultural diversity.	3.71	.56	3.71	.56
Demonstrates strong interpersonal skills that are considerate, sensitive, non-judgmental, supportive, adaptive and flexible.	3.68	.62	3.79	.50
Demonstrates positive regard for all students, families, and professionals.	3.88	.36	3.92	.32
Increases participation of students with special needs in general education settings or community settings.	3.21	.90	3.59	.65
Knowledge of interpersonal skills that work effectively with adults who have different styles.	3.25	.79	3.55	.65
Selects, adapts, or modifies core curriculum to make it accessible for all students.	3.16	.73	3.77	.48
Knowledge of instructional adaptations including alternative assignments, supplemental instruction, differential standards, and shortened assignments.	3.05	.81	3.66	.56
Knowledge of specialized instructional styles and non-traditional teaching practices and procedures.	3.18	.78	3.59	.64

needed by both general and special education teachers working in inclusive settings using an expert consensus model of competency validation. We surveyed inclusion experts, i.e., teachers and administra-

Table 3
Competencies Identified by Respondents in All Three Stakeholder Groups as Essential for Special Educators Only (n=76)

Competency (Scale: 4 = most important, 3 = very important, 2 = necessary, 1 = not important)	$\overline{X}$	s.d
Knowledge of common characteristics of different disabilities and the effect on children's education, development and quality of life.	3.75	.49
Knowledge of principles and techniques of behavior modification and cognitive behavior modification.	3.71	.51
Implements collaborative and consultative relationships by co-planning and co-teaching, establishing and adhering to meetings, developing IEPs, and sharing expertise.	3.71	.49
Designs, implements, and evaluates behavior modification programs for individuals and groups of students.	3.55	.65
Facilitates collaborative and consultative relationships with general education teachers and support staff to improve teaching and learning.	3.69	.55
Knowledge of historical and legal aspects of student/parent rights, safeguards, and special education practices.	3.58	.69
Ability to collect background information regarding academic, medical, and family history for assessment and classroom planning.	3.62	.57
Develops individualized programs based on long-term goals and objectives in a variety of settings.	3.62	.54
Implements assessment information to make appropriate instructional decisions and placements that include considerations for diversity.	3.59	.62
Complies with local, state, and federal guidelines for special education programs.	3.50	.72
Facilitates transitions for special education students between elementary school, middle school, and high school.	3.61	.59
Develops a system for monitoring student progress in the instructional setting.	3.54	.60
Trains and directs the activities of paraprofessionals, aides, volunteers, or peer tutors.	3.53	.60

—Table 3 continued on next page—

Table 3 (continued)

Competency (Scale: 4 = most important, 3 = very important, 2 = necessary, 1 = not important)	$\overline{X}$	s.d
Conducts appropriate assessment of student behavior, including standardized and non-standardized tests, observation, environmental assessment, functional analysis of behavior, and other techniques.	3.63	.63
Knowledge of planned and spontaneous adaptations.	3.56	.63
Knowledge of identification criteria for students with disabilities.	3.49	.77
Demonstrates knowledge of current and emerging instructional practices and skills.	3.48	.65
Implements and interprets various types of formal and informal assessments as determined by individual student needs.	3.48	.71
Creates and maintains comprehensive special education files.	3.44	.71
Provides opportunities and experiences that promote choice and self-direction.	3.41	.69
Encourages and assists families to become active participants in the educational team.	3.49	.67
Coordinates services, activities, and planning appropriate for transition to adulthood.	3.35	.76
Develops receptive/expressive communication skills within the learning environment.	3.39	.69
Implements a procedure for effective use of time and management of materials.	3.25	.79

tors who worked in schools that had implemented an inclusive model long enough to "iron out the kinks" in their schools (three or more years). Fullan (2002) suggests that significant change takes three to five years and we reasoned that participants with this level of experience would offer a seasoned "voice of experience" to our expert consensus validation process. In this process, we were looking for *consensus* among raters because multiple perspectives converging on a single competency would indicate validation of its importance.

Surprisingly, there was consistent agreement among the three rater

Table 4
Competencies Identified by Respondents in All Three Stakeholder Groups as Essential for General Educators Only (n=76)

Competency (Scale: 4 = most important, 3 = very important, 2 = necessary, 1 = not important)	$\overline{X}$	s.d.
Knowledge of general education assessment procedures.	3.38	.79
Implements lesson plans that are appropriate for diverse learners.	3.41	.84
Facilitates the physical classroom environment that allows for flexible scheduling and transition times.	3.33	.79
Knowledge of procedures and regulations for reporting child abuse and the legal rights and responsibilities of teachers and students.	3.16	.94

groups of general educators, special educators and school administrators about these competencies. Numerous competencies yielded convergent validation among stakeholders.

As indicated previously, there were 10 competencies identified as essential for both general and special educators to implement an inclusive model. Many of these shared competencies are related to teachers' dispositions and belief systems. For example, the competencies include "integrity, ethics, and professional judgment," fostering a "fair and respectful environment," "having positive regard for students, families and professionals," and having interpersonal skills that are "considerate, sensitive, nonjudgmental, supportive, adaptive and flexible." Most of us would agree that these are characteristics that we would wish for all teachers who work with students with disabilities regardless of their role or model of special education. Yet, the respondents to this survey considered these characteristics to be extremely important to implementing inclusion, so they are not to be dismissed as merely general professional characteristics.

Given the larger philosophical issues underlying inclusion, such as embracing disability as a form of diversity and the notion of welcoming *all* students into a community of learners, we would expect nothing less of the important implementers of the model than to have integrity, ethics, morals, and high regard for individual students. In our society, we expect teachers to be *models* of the dispositions we want to develop among our students. It is reasonable, even highly desirable, to expect that general and special education teachers working in a collaborative imple-

mentation would share the responsibility of being role models of inclusive attitudes and dispositions.

Also among the competencies expected of both general and special educators are student-centered orientations such as promoting positive self-image among students and being flexible and able to make modifications for individual students. Though these are not new ideas for teachers working in a "mainstreaming" model (Vaughn & Schumm, 1995), an inclusive model brings these skills to the forefront in teacher education. It is interesting that our raters agreed on these student-centered competencies considering that our sample included both elementary and secondary stakeholders. Vaughn and colleagues found that as grade increased, general education teachers were less likely to be accommodating of students with disabilities and that secondary teachers were the least adaptive (Vaughn & Schumm, 1993). Yet, teachers with extensive experience in inclusive models rated these competencies highly.

Which competencies were unique to teachers' roles? Some worry that in an inclusive model, the "specialness" of special education may disappear. Yet, there were many areas of expertise that remain in the realm of special education according to our expert raters. Some of the special educator-specific competencies related to specialized knowledge. This includes knowledge of characteristics of disabilities, specialized instructional techniques or methods, and legal responsibilities and processes. There is no question that competent special educators possess technical knowledge that is important to the dynamic and specialized field of special education. Inclusion does not neutralize or diminish the importance of specialization in the field of special education.

Another area of expertise unique to special educators according to our respondent group of "experts" is more pedagogical. Special educators are expected to be skillful in implementing collaborative relationships (perhaps even being the initiators or maintainers), conducting and communicating complex assessments, designing and implementing individualized programs, and managing or coordinating other professionals such as paraeducators. The question arises of whether we would give sufficient emphasis to these skills in merged general/special education preparation programs. Because these are elements of our traditional special education preparation programs, we must ask what might be unique in these topic areas related to implementing an inclusion model. Many special educators operating in a traditional pull-out model have great autonomy in conducting assessment, individualizing instruction and managing paraprofessionals. However, inclusion may change the nature of these traditional roles of special educators.

It is important to note the importance that the three rater groups

gave to the special educator's role in assessing, designing and implementing behavior management plans. It is apparent that we expect special educators to be expert in behavior management. In examining general educators' perspectives, Schumm, et al. (1995) found that students with behavioral challenges presented the greatest barrier to general educators making appropriate adaptations for students with disabilities. It would be important for teacher preparation programs to specifically address the unique behavioral challenges that might arise in inclusive settings.

In examining the competencies needed by general educators in an inclusive model, it is important to note that our competency list was *not* generated from traditional general education sources. Rather, we used the CEC competency list and a review of literature specific to inclusive practices. In a sense, our study asked the question, To what extent might general educators also need additional special education-related competencies? Few competencies were identified with consensus as solely important for general educators. "Knowledge of general education assessment procedures" and "knowledge of procedures …for reporting child abuse…" are responsibilities that would be expected of general educators regardless of the special education model in place. However, implementing lessons for diverse learners and being flexible in scheduling are competencies that would be important in facilitating learning of students with disabilities in an inclusive model. General education teachers often fear that inclusion requires them to have specialized knowledge and skills that they do not possess. "I don't have the training to teach those students" is a common sentiment of general education teachers considering an inclusive model. Teacher preparation programs need to address these concerns.

Implications for Teacher Preparation

Like much of education, teacher education operates with a standards-driven focus. It is common for teacher preparation programs to develop curriculum around required competencies or standards identified as essential for teachers in particular fields of expertise. In recent years, the lines between general and special education have blurred both in terms of practice (i.e., in the schools and community) and teacher education (Blanton, et al., 1997). This study helps to explicate what competencies ought to be included in teacher education programs that prepare teachers to work in inclusive settings.

The shared competencies identified in this study indicate the need for a more coordinated and collaborative effort in the design and delivery of teacher education programs. Common core coursework for all teacher

candidates, both general and special educators, is one way to address the common competencies identified by this study as essential for both special and general education. Teaching the competencies in coursework and supporting them in fieldwork and practicum experiences in inclusive general education classrooms in the teacher education program would ensure that the essential knowledge and skills for inclusive education are addressed in the professional preparation of *both* general and special education teacher candidates.

Consensus ratings indicated that there continues to be a knowledge base that is unique to special educators as we move into inclusive settings. Special educators must continue to demonstrate particular expertise in assessment, procedural matters, and legal foundation and have specialized knowledge about disabilities. As we examine more collaborative models of teacher education, it is important to consider that special educators must obtain a level of specialization that may be unique to their field (Eshilian, Falvey, Bove, Hibbard, Laiblin, Miller, & Rosenberg, 2000). This may require additional coursework and fieldwork. As in other highly specialized fields, it takes time to acquire such expertise.

The list of essential competencies agreed upon by all three constituent groups for general educators, but not special educators, speaks to the lead role that classroom teachers generally play in managing their classrooms. These essential competencies are often included in teacher preparation programs, but without the context that the classroom will include students with disabilities. The implication of these findings for general education teacher preparation is that programs need to include the implications of working with students with disabilities within general education classrooms.

All of the competencies delineated in this study can be found in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) (California Department of Education, 1998). As teacher education programs in California restructure to meet new standards (required in Senate Bill 2042 in 1998), the results of this study can guide the restructuring. Specifically, Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom, and Standard 20: Educating Diverse Students emphasize the importance of competencies delineated in this study. Within the new California standards, there is frequent reference to effectively educating diverse students, and this not only includes gender, ethnicity, and languages spoken, but also varied abilities and disabilities.

The data from this study provide direction and advice to teacher education faculty preparing general and special educators. “Preparing teachers for these roles [educating students with and without disabilities in general education settings] requires teacher educators to blend the

knowledge bases of special and general education while sustaining the distinct knowledge and competencies of the two teaching fields" (AACTE, 2002, p. 5). More research is needed to continually validate and modify the competencies addressed in teacher education programs by those who are teaching in K-12 schools. Such research data provide continuous assessment of competencies taught related to the knowledge and skills needed by both general and special education teachers.

While this study provides valuable information about the essential competencies need by teachers working in inclusive models, there is clearly a need to continue this line of investigation. As well, it is essential to continue to examine how teacher preparation programs can best provide the knowledge and skills to teachers that are necessary to support all students educated in inclusive schools.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2002). *Preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities*: *Possibilities and challenges for special and general teacher education*. Retrieved from http://www.aacte.org/Membership_Governance/specialeducation.pdf

Blanton, L. P., Giffin, C. C., Winn, J. A., & Pugach, M.C. (1997). *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.

California Department of Education. (1997). *California standards for the teaching profession (CSTP*). Sacramento, CA.

D'Alonzo, B. J., Giorano, G., & Cross, T. L. (1996). Improving teachers' attitudes through teacher education toward the inclusion of students with disabilities into their classrooms. *The Teacher Educator, 31*, 304-312.

DeFur, S. & Taymans, J. M. (1995). Competencies needed by transition specialists in vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and special education. *Exceptional Children, 62*(1), 38-52.

Eshilian, L., Falvey, M. A., Bove, C. Hibbard, M. J., Laiblin, J., Miller, C. & Rosenberg, R. (2000). Restructuring to create a high school community of learners. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.). *Restructuring for caring and effective education: piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 402-427). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Falvey, M. (1996). *Inclusive and heterogeneous schooling: Assessment, curriculum and instruction*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Fullan, M. (2002) The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-20.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2001). *Model standards for licensing general and special education teachers of students with disabilities*. Washington DC: Council of Chief State Schools Officers.

Johnson, C. (1997). A Comparative analysis of three basic designs for competency validation. ERIC document ED 171 729.

Monahan, R. G., Marino, S. B., & Miller, R. (2000). Teacher attitudes toward

inclusion: Implications for teacher education in schools. *Education, 117*(2), 316-320.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-11-0, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Olson, M. R., Chalmers, L., & Hoover, J. H. (1997). Attitudes and attributes of general education teachers identified as effective inclusionists. *Remedial and Special Education, 18*(1), 28-33.

Schumm, J. S., Vaughn, S., Haager, D., McDowell, J., Rothlein, L., & Saumell, L. (1995). General education teacher planning: What can students with learning disabilities expect? *Exceptional Children, 61*(4), 335-352.

Swan, W. W. & Sirvis, B. (1992). The CEC common core of knowledge and skills essential for all beginning special education teachers. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 4,* 16-20.

Thousand, J. S., Villa, R. A., & Nevin, A. I. (Eds.). (2002). *Creativity and collaborative learning: The practical guide to empowering students, teachers, and familie*s (2nd Edition). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

U. S. Department of Education. (1997). *Eighteenth annual report to congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education. (2002). *Twenty-third annual report to congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Villa, R. A. & Thousand, J. S. (Eds.) (2000). Restructuring public schools systems: Strategies for organizational change and progress. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 7-37). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Vaughn, S. & Schumm, J. (1993). What do students with learning disabilities think when their general education teachers make adaptations? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26*(8), 545-55.

Vaughn, S. & Schumm, J. (1995). Responsible inclusion for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*(5), 64-70.

Wigle, S. E. & Wilcox, D. J. (1997). Teacher and administrator attitudes toward full inclusion in rural mid-America. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 16*(1), 3-7.

Yasutake, D. & Lerner, J. (1996). Teachers' perceptions of inclusion for students with disabilities: A survey of general and special educators. *Learning Disabilities, 7*(1), 1-7.