

A Consideration of What Educational Faculty
Need To Know and Be Able To Do:
Federal and State Policies and Best Practices
for Collaborative Preparation Programs

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer & Jennifer J. Coots
California State University, Long Beach
& **Kathryn Bishop-Smith**
University of San Diego

Heightened interest in teacher preparation, concerns with the conditions of schools, and the vast number of educational reforms pressing in on schools have resulted in the teaching profession continuing to be at the front and center of discussions in local communities and in our nation's capital. The education of America's children, those with and without disabilities, continues to be of concern to parents, teachers, legislators, and to university faculty. The genesis for this article began as many do, in a hallway in a college of education. An examination of specific teacher preparation programs led to subsequent discussion regarding the broad field of teacher preparation. Based upon the seminal work of Darling-Hammond (1996), faculty concerned with the preparation of teachers and other specialists came together to discuss the essence of what teachers need to know and be able to do. Though such discussion,

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer is a professor of special education and associate dean of the College of Education at California State University, Long Beach. E-mail mgrenot@csulb.edu

Jennifer J. Coots is an associate professor of special education with the College of Education at California State University, Long Beach. E-mail jcoots@csulb.edu

Kathryn Bishop-Smith is an associate professor of special education with the School of Education at the University of San Diego, San Diego, California. E-mail kbishop@sandiego.edu

faculty hoped to construct common purposes (Trent, Artilles, & Englert, 1998) and a system of mutually constructed knowledge (Popkewitz, 1998) essential for systemic reform of current practices. The construction of shared local knowledge was viewed as essential by participants based upon their understanding of the literature on school reform. As noted by Riehl (2000), "real organizational change occurs not simply when technical changes in structure and process are undertaken, but when persons inside and outside of the school construct new understandings about what the change means" (Riehl, 2000, p. 60).

Urban comprehensive universities have a primary mission to prepare teachers and other educational personnel. This mission has perhaps never been as important as now, as contemporary teachers and other educational professionals serve the most diverse population of students in the history of education (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995). "More than ever before, teacher education is being challenged to prepare graduates who will skillfully and eagerly teach *all* the students who enter the classroom" (Blanton, Griffin, Winn, & Pugach, 1997, p. ix). In diverse schools, teachers and other educators must know their content deeply, understand the complex ways in which their diverse students learn, develop and provide meaningful learning experiences, and care about the whole child (Darling-Hammond, 1996). In addition, teachers and other educational professionals must work together to best meet the needs of this diverse population.

University faculty responsible for the preparation of teachers and others must consider these and other priority areas as they collaborate to develop preparation programs that will ensure that *all* teachers, both general and special education, as well as other educational personnel, can effectively teach and interact with students with and without disabilities and their families. Such collaboration may require crossing the discipline boundaries between colleges of education, colleges of arts and sciences, and other colleges, as well as programs within these colleges, to model for future educational personnel the collaborative skills so critical to effective practice (Nevin, 2000).

It is particularly timely to reflect upon preparation programs given recent federal and state legislation and initiatives. Teacher preparation faculty in California are revising preparation programs to comply with new mandates set forth by Senate Bill 2042 (1998) that include standards for professional preparation and for subject matter preparation (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2001) within the framework of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession [CSTP] (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1997). In addition, the reauthorization of two national legislative acts, the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act [ESEA] and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA] (U. S. Department of Education, 1997) have specific implications for the preparation of educational professionals.

The central question addressed in this paper is how teacher preparation programs can best respond to the broad, complex calls for reform in ways that are locally meaningful and honor academic integrity, but that are also true to the intent of the reform mandates. We begin with an overview of some of the federal and state initiatives that are presenting challenges for schools and teacher preparation programs. We then look at “lessons learned” from several teacher preparation programs that have responded to reform mandates by developing programs that increase collaboration between generalists and specialists. These examples will show how in some instances teacher preparation programs respond to reform initiatives in a piecemeal fashion by continually adding courses as new mandates occur, while other programs make revisions with limited lasting effects, and still others rework their entire program to accommodate new mandates guided by a shared vision of truly collaborative teacher preparation.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which re-authorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), was signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002. NCLB is considered to be the most significant reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since it was first enacted in 1965. NCLB requires that all teachers are highly qualified within four years of enactment of the legislation. We acknowledge the controversy regarding the implementation of this law, especially in the area of teacher quality. However, it does attempt to redefine the federal role in K-12 education so as to close the achievement gap between disadvantaged and minority students and their peers. The law is based on four basic principles:

- ◆ Stronger accountability for results
- ◆ Increased flexibility and local control
- ◆ Expanded options for parents
- ◆ Emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work

Of particular importance to university faculty is the emphasis on teacher quality, reading methods, and promotion of English proficiency. Additionally, it is emphasized that “scientifically proven” methods must support such initiatives. The bill requests that states put a highly qualified teacher in every public school classroom by 2005. The bill also

creates a Teacher Quality Program that will allow greater flexibility for local school districts as well as gives school districts more discretion regarding spending decisions with the non-Title I federal funds they receive. The bill authorizes increased funding for supporting proven methods of reading instruction in support of the President's Reading First plan. Finally, the bill consolidates the U.S. Department of Education's bilingual and immigrant education programs to streamline program operations and to provide increased flexibility and support for English Language Learners to learn English as quickly and effectively as possible.

Another significant implication of this act has to do with adequate yearly progress (AYP) and the set of graduated accountability measures that result from this act when students fail to meet AYP. The law requires schools to show adequate yearly progress toward meeting the goal of 100% proficiency in reading and math for all students in grades 3-8 within 12 years. The performance of students is disaggregated based upon a number of factors, including disability status. If children with disabilities (as well as other students) in a school fail to make adequate yearly progress, serious remedial actions may be taken (Council for Exceptional Children, 2003a). While it is unclear what the direct impact on special education practice will be, it seems reasonable to assume that both special and general education teachers will experience greater pressure to ensure that students with disabilities are exposed to the general education curriculum and have Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals that are content based, thus aligning the principles of the NCLB act with IDEA.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

The landmark federal legislation known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; formerly the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) was scheduled for reauthorization in 2002. At the time of preparation of this article, the bill had still not been reauthorized. There is speculation that the bill would not be considered in its entirety until Spring, 2004 (Council for Exceptional Children, 2003b). In spite of the potential changes associated with the current reauthorization, the law's assurance that a free and appropriate education be made available to all students with disabilities, regardless of how significant the disability, in the least restrictive environment, continues to be a hallmark of national educational policy (National Council on Disability, 2000). For the past three decades, this Act has yielded great progress in ensuring the educational rights of more than 5 million children and youth with disabilities. The number of students protected by this law and the subsequent impact of the law is both impressive and staggering:

- ◆ The number of students ages 6-21 with disabilities has reached 5,683,707, a 2.6% increase over the 1998-1999 school year;
- ◆ Students with specific learning disabilities continue to represent half of the students with disabilities served under IDEA;
- ◆ African American students continue to be overrepresented, especially in the Mental Retardation and Developmentally Delayed categories; and
- ◆ Over the last decade the percentage of students ages 6-21 with disabilities served in both regular schools and regular education classes has increased steadily. (U. S. Department of Education, 2001)

The IDEA statute is comprised of several parts including grants to states, infants and toddlers programs, and support programs. Part B, "Assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities," describes the basic rights and responsibilities of children with disabilities and their parents. IDEA mandates that students be provided with a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment and be given access to the general education core curriculum. Free and appropriate is defined as special education and related services and includes appropriate preschool, elementary school, and secondary school education. The least restrictive environment is that environment which provides for maximum interaction with non-disabled children. The *Twenty-Second Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (U. S. Department of Education, 2001) continues to emphasize as a priority the education of children with disabilities alongside their non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. Access to the core curriculum ensures that students with disabilities will receive educational content that is equivalent to their non-disabled peers.

We believe that these components of the federal law have the greatest impact for faculty concerned with the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel. The reauthorization of IDEA in 1997 resulted in specific implications for general education teachers, and consequently for those of us who help to prepare them. Most notably, the special education planning team (Individual Education Plan, or IEP) must include at least one general education teacher who participates in the development and implementation of the IEP. The IEP is considered the primary tool for describing a student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. Specifically, IDEA requires that

1. The IEP team for each child with a disability must include at least one regular education teacher of the child (if the child is, or may be, participating in the regular education environment) (see section 300.344(a)(2)); and
2. The teacher must, to the extent appropriate, participate in the

development, review, and revision of the child's IEP, including: (a) the determination of appropriate positive behavioral interventions and strategies for the child, and (b) the determination of supplementary aids and services, program modifications, and supports for school personnel that will be provided for the child consistent with the IEP content requirements in section 300.347(a)(3).

Given such requirements, it is clear that general education teachers must have meaningful experiences in their teacher preparation programs that will assist them to be effective members of this critical planning team.

IDEA also requires that students with disabilities be included in state and district wide assessments. Currently, many students with disabilities are excluded from state and district wide assessments (McDonnell, McLaughlin, & Morison, 1997). There are many reasons for such exclusion. Students with disabilities are often placed in a separate class or setting and do not have access to the general education curriculum. For many students with disabilities, participation in large-scale assessments requires some form of testing accommodation. Such accommodations are required by law and are intended to remove any unnecessary barriers to performance. The determination of appropriate accommodations is a difficult and time-consuming process that requires careful consideration of the learning strengths and characteristics of the student. In this era of high-stakes testing, general education teachers are under intense scrutiny and tremendous pressure to not only make appropriate referrals to special education, but also to work with their special education colleagues to develop and provide appropriate testing accommodations.

The aforementioned requirements and recommendations from professional educational organizations regarding reauthorization of the IDEA compel university faculty to work together in the development and implementation of preparation programs for teachers and other school personnel including special education teachers, school psychologists and school counselors. The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the largest international professional organization committed to improving educational outcomes for individuals with disabilities, has prepared a set of recommendations for Congress to consider (Council for Exceptional Children, 2002). Two recommendations regarding the disproportionality of students of color in special education and qualifications of personnel seem particularly pertinent for this discussion regarding the preparation of teachers and others, and are briefly summarized here.

Disproportionality of Minority Students in Special Education

As noted by Echevarria, Powers, and Elliott (this volume), certain

groups of students with disabilities from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds continue to be disproportionality represented in special education. That is, minority children and poor African American children are more likely to be identified and served in special education than would be expected from the percentage of such students in the general education population (Losen & Orfield, 2002). This serious and pervasive problem has concerned educators, parents, and researchers for decades, and the current reauthorization provides yet another opportunity to aggressively attack this problem. Specifically, the Council on Exceptional Children recommends language in both the ESEA and IDEA that has direct implications for teacher preparation faculty:

...ensure that effective early intervention strategies are in place in general education as an integral part of the total educational process to safeguard against inappropriate referral, unnecessary testing, and misclassification in special education. Such efforts should maximize the involvement of all family, school, and community resources to provide effective intervention strategies early to address students' learning needs. These efforts should occur prior to referral to special education. (CEC, 2002, p. 9)

In recognition of the need for early intervention strategies, many school districts rely on a school site team to recommend pre-referral strategies to assist learners at risk. Members of such teams include the general education teacher, family members of the student, the student, a school district representative knowledgeable regarding evaluation results, and other individuals as appropriate (Salend, 2001). The team gathers information about a particular student and suggests methods to keep students in the general education curriculum and classroom. Such pre-referral strategies are critical to address the problem of disproportionality and may avoid unnecessary referrals to special education. The need for collaboration and shared expertise between what historically have been parallel fields of education (i.e., general and special education) is clear and readily apparent in surveys of teachers, in IDEA, and in various standards documents promulgated by professional organizations (e.g., Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium [INTASC], National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]).

Qualified Personnel

National experts in education, research, and policy agree that what students need most is a qualified teacher for every classroom. The most significant variable within the school related to student achievement is qualified teachers (National Council on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF], 1996). We propose that this same tenet is true for students with

disabilities, and perhaps even more so. Not only do students with disabilities need qualified general and special educators and other support personnel, including school psychologists and counselors, it is also essential that these professionals collaborate effectively in the development and implementation of educational programs. The collaboration between general and special educators is critical to the achievement of students with disabilities. Research and practice has demonstrated improved functioning and effectiveness of school-based collaborative teams relating to teacher assistance, instructional support and teaching teams, from preschool through secondary levels (Thousand & Villa, 2000). By engaging in the complex and hard work of collaboration, general and special educators and related service personnel may be better able to effectively develop, implement and evaluate the often complex IEPs of students with disabilities.

It may be an obvious statement, but children with disabilities are children first, and, more specifically, “general education children first.” This remarkable statement was made by members of The President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, which was formed by President George W. Bush in the fall of 2001 to provide recommendations regarding the reauthorization of IDEA. The Commission was composed of nineteen individuals representing many constituents: parents, teachers, school administrators, university faculty from various disciplines and elected government officials, as well as ex-officio members and staff. The report suggests that despite the obvious nature of this statement, too many educators and policy-makers think of two separate systems, general and special education. We agree with their recommendation that general and special education teachers and others share responsibilities for children with disabilities and are not separable at any level, especially not in preparation programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

In recognition of both the need for qualified personnel and the importance of collaboration, the Council on Exceptional Children recommends the following:

In order to ensure that all children and youth with disabilities achieve high results, every child and youth with a disability must receive services from highly qualified special education teachers, related services providers, and early intervention teachers, as well as highly qualified general education teachers and administrators, consistent with the requirements of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. (CEC, 2002, p. 12)

CEC also recommends that a new priority be established to provide funds to colleges and departments of education and special education to pursue systemic reform efforts related to capacity building and program

improvement. Specifically, it is recommended that funds would be targeted to integrate teacher preparation programs across each of the general education content areas and to focus on restructuring colleges of education to work collaboratively across general and special education as well as related discipline areas. These recommendations would also extend to partnerships between institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to encourage ongoing professional development.

As faculty continue the important work of revising teacher preparation programs, they are charged with incorporating state guidelines and standards, as well as national policies and legislation. These external mandates do bring faculty to the table, but may result in fast and furious piecemeal approaches to multiple and competing reform demands. To avoid such fragmentation and continual reactivity, university faculty must think holistically and reflectively to capture their own vision and mission while honoring the academic integrity of their discipline. To insure that no child is left behind, no teacher can be left partially qualified. To prepare fully qualified teachers, faculty must work collaboratively, thoughtfully, and with full understanding of and investment in all aspects of what teachers need to know, be, and do, for all children.

Collaborative Teacher Preparation

The Special Education Focus Council of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (2001-2002) was a group of distinguished faculty and administrators representing both general and special education. The charge to this council from the AACTE Board of Directors was multifaceted. Particularly relevant to this paper was a request to examine the related issues of special education content in the general education curriculum. The members of the focus council suggested that the statutes of IDEA present a two-part challenge to faculty in colleges of education.

First, the statute's emphasis on children with disabilities meeting the same content standards as other students require special education teachers to know more about the curriculum, instruction, and assessments found in general teacher education than ever before. Second, the expectation that children with disabilities will be served in regular classrooms means that general education teachers must have a command of much of the special education curriculum. (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 2002, p. 3)

A growing number of faculty in colleges nationwide have responded to this challenge and recognize that they rarely have the breadth of knowledge regarding curriculum and instruction nor the knowledge of

individual differences to adequately prepare educational personnel for contemporary inclusive schools. Others have responded to the challenge with concern that specific areas of expertise will be devalued as faculty focus their attention on the breadth of knowledge necessary to prepare personnel for inclusive schools that serve the diverse student population. The tug between specific areas of expertise and a broad generalist perspective is not a new area of concern in teacher preparation, but rather is moved to the forefront by the new expectations for inclusive teacher preparation and the need for increased collaboration. Effective collaboration requires time for teaming, reflection, and commitment on the part of all team members, as well as recognition of the complexity of the process (Grenot-Scheyer, Fisher, & Staub, 2001). Indeed, true reform requires teachers to fundamentally change what they do and how they think about professional activities by creating settings where four change elements — shared goals, measurable indicators, assistance by capable others, and leadership that supports and pressures — are in operation (Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001). It would also seem necessary for teacher educators to fundamentally change what they do and how they think about their professional lives to bring about lasting reform.

In this section we will briefly describe the work of faculty at three different universities who created such transformational activity settings to bring about fundamental changes in their collaborative teacher preparation programs. The reader is encouraged to read faculty accounts of their collaboration in Blanton, Griffin, Winn, & Pugach (1997), a comprehensive description of these and other programs. Faculty at these universities and elsewhere have crossed program and departmental lines to work together to develop programs, plan courses, team teach, and ultimately share responsibility for the preparation of general and special educators as well as other educational personnel. The three programs were selected with regard to a number of considerations including, size and demographic characteristics of the university and surrounding community, longevity of the collaborative program, nature of the collaboration, and familiarity with each of the universities.

Syracuse University, Inclusive Teacher Preparation Program

Syracuse University is an urban institution, serving one of New York's "Big Five" school districts. The Syracuse school district serves more than 20,000 children and youth, more than half of whom are culturally and linguistically diverse. Teacher education at Syracuse is considered an all-university responsibility, and there are many joint faculty appointments across the School of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences. The teacher preparation program in inclusive educa-

tion is one of the oldest (if not the oldest) in the country. The program is unique in that degree and certification program options lead to dual certification in both general and special education. Illustrative of the faculty's commitment to prepare teachers who can teach all students, the inclusive teacher certification is the only certification option available (Meyer, Mager, Yarger-Kane, Sarno, & Hext-Contreras, 1997).

A small group of faculty conceived of the idea for such a program at a faculty retreat in 1987. These faculty drafted a set of shared principles and a formal proposal. As formal drafts of the program design were completed, these were shared with the faculty at large for review and revision. What emerged from this process was an entirely new program with new coursework and program requirements. The program contains three major components: (1) the liberal arts cluster, (2) the specialization area, and (3) professional education. Central to the curriculum is a commitment to multiculturalism, with relevant course content, readings, activities and field experiences. Throughout the four years of study, students engage in both liberal arts and professional education coursework with an emphasis on the knowledge and skills needed for the cultural pluralism of contemporary classrooms.

An important feature of the Syracuse Inclusive Teacher Preparation Program is the broad range of field experiences required throughout the program. Through relationships with various Professional Development Schools, the program requires that students complete extensive and structured field experiences across students and settings. Such field experiences include working with students with and without disabilities and their families in inclusive preschools, community agencies supporting children with disabilities and their families, and urban and suburban school placements from kindergarten through intermediate grades. Each field experience has a concomitant practicum requirement (e.g., visit child in home; classroom observations; student assessment; structured guided tutorial; IEP development; and team collaboration) that builds upon the curriculum as well as previous field experiences. Despite changes in faculty and leadership, the Inclusive Teacher Preparation program continues, and graduates exposed to important issues of diversity and inclusion are prepared in the critical practices of collaboration and individualization.

University of Cincinnati

The University of Cincinnati is a comprehensive Research I university with a total enrollment of nearly 33,000 students (AY 2002-2003). As a member of the Holmes Group in the mid-1980s, College of Education faculty were committed to a comprehensive reform agenda with a focus on

urban education. Both external and internal pressures formed the foundation for the faculty to pursue reform within a wider context than previous efforts. Of particular interest was the challenge to special education faculty. Prior to reform efforts there were multiple special education certification paths with separate methods courses in special education. The contribution to the general education curriculum was a course on individuals with disabilities and a course on mainstreaming. (Sapona, Etienne, Bauer, Fordon, Johnson, Hendricks-Lee, & Vincent, 1997)

Faculty discourse was based upon an extensive and complex design process from the University of Oregon (Alexander, Silverstein, Shlomo, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975). This planning approach attempted to ensure consistency and flexibility across programs. The process allowed deliberation and discussion to proceed in a non-threatening manner and the resulting language became part of the College of Education NCATE knowledge base. Unique to this program was the extensive discussion, deliberation, and planning that occurred within the special education faculty prior to interactions with the teacher education program. Sapona, et al. (1997) described an extensive and seemingly painful process that special education faculty underwent to develop a cohesive special education core prior to interactions with teacher education faculty:

The emergence of trust and comfort in sharing ideas was necessary to the development of a cohesive special education core. We also needed to be very clear about our shared beliefs as we became aware of our potential to influence or participate in the education of all teachers in the college — general and special education alike. (p. 138)

The goal of the special education program faculty to become a presence in all levels of undergraduate teacher education was accomplished in a number of innovative ways. Linking Seminars were designed to explore the relationship between the teacher, the school, students, and the community. These Seminars were designed as one-credit-hour education courses offered in the students' first and second years. The Seminars assured that students would interact with College of Education faculty in the early years of their program and Special Education Program faculty members participated in the design and implementation of these Seminars to ensure that their "voice" would also be represented. Special education program faculty developed a series of Coordinated Seminars that occurred in the third, fourth, and fifth years of the undergraduate preparation. Faculty members in special education and educational foundations developed and implemented seminars in the following areas: human learning, individual development, individual diversity, language and communication, assessment and evaluation, and social inequalities

and schooling. The goal of the faculty was to provide specific content information to students in their undergraduate years. A final unique feature of the program was a fifth-year seminar, The Student Support Services. This seminar was part of the fifth-year internship and was designed to provide content knowledge in areas such as referral for identification of disability and knowledge of the array of support services required by law.

The results of the work of faculty within the College of Education resulted in Special Education faculty members collaborating to provide an integrated program of study. Faculty members served as liaisons to Professional Practice Schools and worked as members of teams to provide mentoring for special education interns. The Special Education faculty continue to provide seminars to students in the early childhood, elementary, and secondary programs and work with teacher education colleagues to ensure that the seminars are integrated and coordinated with other coursework within the 5-year undergraduate program. Although all of the teacher preparation programs currently vary in the level of integrated content and instruction, the Inclusive Preschool Program continues to be representative of the original collaboration (A. Bauer, personal communication, February 10, 2003).

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Collaborative Teacher Education Program for Urban Communities

“Develop a critical mass” is the advice of one faculty member who has been involved in developing and implementing the Collaborative Teacher Education Program for Urban Communities at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (M. Pugach, personal communication, January 25, 2003). As is true of many teacher preparation programs, the teacher education program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has evolved over the years as a result of state department mandates and requirements regarding teacher certification (Hains, Maxwell, Tiezzi, Simpson, Ford, & Pugach, 1997). As noted by Hains, et al., (1997),

Each time a mandate was received, we responded by adding a course to the program. As needed, requests were made to departments outside Curriculum & Instruction and Exceptional Education to provide service courses to meet these mandates. Some changes also were made by individual faculty initiative. As a result, the program grew and changed piecemeal, without a strong framework within which changes could be considered. (p. 183)

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee is the only urban university within the University of Wisconsin system. The greater Milwaukee area

is a diverse and racially mixed community. Faculty engaged in several initiatives beginning in 1988 to move toward a model of collaborative teacher preparation. Of particular interest was the decision to develop the Center for Teacher Education, which provided an alternative governance structure to house reform in teacher education. This Center brought faculty together and a first initiative was to develop and implement a Professional Development School (PDS). Faculty members from both the Department of Curriculum & Instruction and Exceptional Education (of five departments within the School of Education) led the PDS efforts. Beginning with these efforts, additional conversations regarding potential collaboration occurred, and faculty broached the idea of dual certification. Faculty highlighted the parallel between the dilemma facing public school educators and what faces university faculty. Just as special education teachers attempt to have a greater presence in the general curriculum and classroom, so too the special education faculty worked to have a greater presence in the general education program.

This dilemma is not unique to the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, but is one that faculty nationwide share. Faculty at this university approached the issue of role clarification committed to a dual or unified teacher education approach. The questions posed during this discourse were difficult yet necessary ones as faculty engage in the hard discussion regarding roles and responsibilities of general and special educators:

- ◆ Are the roles of the special and general educator so interchangeable that, upon completion of our unified program graduates could assume either role with no distinction?
- ◆ Through this unified approach, are we mostly hoping to prepare more collaborative, more accommodating, and more highly skilled general educators, and, in turn, be in the position to expect more unique contributions from special educators? (Hains, et al., 1997, pp. 185-186)

The Collaborative Teacher Education Program for Urban Communities is based upon the belief that preparing teachers to provide high quality education for all students in urban schools requires significant changes in traditional teacher education programs. The program rests upon a set of eight core values which not only guide program development, but also the work of the faculty teams. The core values embrace concepts of diversity, inclusion, and collaboration. The program includes an Early Childhood Program and the Primary/Middle Program. A fifth-year postbaccalaureate option is available for students interested in assuming the role of a special educator. Unique design features of the program include a Liberal Arts foundation, field-based experiences in

urban schools, linking seminars, professional blocks and student cohorts. Faculty at UW-M were committed to preparing teachers who would not perpetuate the overrepresentation of minority students in special education, and they discarded the notion of trying to prepare teachers to “be all things to all students,” thus recognizing the value of specialized knowledge and the complementary contributions of each discipline.

Lessons Learned

We began this paper with an often-quoted summary of what all teachers should know and be able to do that has been part of the national conversation in teacher preparation for nearly a decade (Darling-Hammond, 1996). That is, what *does* matter most in regard to student achievement is that teachers care about the whole child, know their content deeply, understand the complex ways in which their diverse students learn, are able to develop and provide meaningful learning experiences, and effectively collaborate together with other educational professionals to best meet the needs of the diverse student population.

What is also clear is that the faculty who help to prepare current and future generations of teachers must also engage in similar types of “knowing and doing” together. As we have seen, collaborative teacher preparation programs can be initiated from many points including external demands and initiatives, partnership requests, and faculty initiative. Even if all constituents don’t initially “buy in” to changes, progress can be made with a small but critical mass of faculty. True changes in teacher preparation will require acknowledgement that such changes do not come easily. As noted earlier, Gallimore and Goldenberg (2001) state that true reform requires fundamental changes in the activity settings in which teachers, and we add faculty in teacher preparation programs, participate. Such changes will present challenges as they will not likely occur in a smooth, linear fashion. Wilson and Berne (1999) point out that

Perhaps the most formidable challenge is one endemic to all education. Learning, real learning, is hard work. You read, you think, you talk. You get something wrong, you don’t understand something, you try it again. Sometimes you hit a wall in your thinking, sometimes it is just too frustrating. Yes, learning can be fun and inspiring but along the way, it usually makes us miserable. And to move forward, we often have to acknowledge that which we do not know. Ball and Cohen (in press) theorize that teacher learning requires some disequilibrium and that important teacher learning emerges only from occasions when teachers’ extant assumptions are challenged. (p. 200)

As faculty reflect on the hard work of developing successful collabora-

tive teacher preparation, several key features emerge which may be useful to consider.

A *commitment to the values* inherent in collaborative teacher preparation programs is paramount to the success of such programs. Syracuse University offers one program with one degree and one certification in Inclusive Elementary and Special Education for all teaching candidates, illustrative of the faculty commitment to collaboration. As we have seen, explicit and sustained discourse including all relevant constituents regarding the benefits and challenges of developing and implementing such programs throughout all stages of development is essential. The work of the Holmes Group (1995) regarding reform is useful to consider. They suggest that in any reform at the university level, at least four groups of faculty can be identified:

- ◆ Those ready and able for change.
- ◆ Those capable of change but unwilling to change until a different sort of reward structure is present.
- ◆ Those interested in change but in need of professional development to do so successfully.
- ◆ Those who refuse to promote change and undermine the process.

As Fullan (1991) and others have suggested, change involves a complex interplay of forces. Reform must go beyond cosmetic changes on paper to reflect the depth of reform necessary to bring about meaningful change. The task to reform a large social institution such as a school or college of education may seem impossible. However, as was demonstrated, progress does occur, and it occurs in ways that increase the number of people who are affected (Griffin & Pugach, 1997).

An *alternative governance structure*, as was used in the program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, may be a necessary and useful first step to bring together faculty committed to innovation and collaboration. Support from leadership, be it from a department chair or a dean, is essential to provide the resources and support necessary to allow faculty the time and opportunity to engage in authentic collaborative program development. It has been suggested that the term “collaboration” may be used too glibly:

If the conversation between teacher educators in special and general education is not directed to the most difficult issues — for example issues of equity, or fundamental shifts in curriculum and instruction — collaborative efforts will be surface-level and short-term. To be enduring, the most pressing needs of children and youth must drive our efforts. (Griffin & Pugach, 1997 p.269)

The goal of collaborative teacher preparation programs should be to create new habits and structures, as opposed to isolated policies and practices that may not be sustainable. Those who educate teachers and others must fundamentally change the activity settings in which they participate so as to change what they do and how they think about their professional lives.

Establish linkages across and throughout the curriculum, (e.g., the Linking Seminars at the University of Cincinnati). This process will help beginning teachers to make sense of the breadth and depth of the often complex general education curriculum, as well as to build an understanding of the individual and developmental needs of all students. This collaboration requires sustained discussions of alternative ways of teaching and learning and recognition of complementary contributions. Such discourse is valuable regardless of whether these discussions begin with philosophical distinctions between disciplines, or if they emerge throughout the collaboration over time. It is critical that in this process, academic integrity and specific areas of expertise are honored, while also building the competence of all participants.

Collaborative teacher preparation programs must also include *meaningful field experiences* in diverse classroom and community settings to ensure that future teachers have the critical experiences necessary to effectively interact with students with and without disabilities from culturally and linguistically diverse groups and their families. Field experiences must be embedded throughout the preparation program, and are most useful when they build upon one another, thereby scaffolding the learning of the beginning teacher.

As the AACTE Special Focus Group concluded, “Unless there are teachers who can succeed with students who experience disabilities, the promise that all children can and will learn is rhetoric” (AACTE, 2002, p. 5). Without these teachers, some children will certainly be left behind. At the end of the day, students with and without disabilities need knowledgeable general and special educators and other support personnel who have the disposition and skills to collaborate with one another in the delivery of education for all students. Faculty have no choice but to respond to national legislative mandates and policies that will result in teachers and others who can work with all students. While mandates are important and must be adhered to, they are subordinate to the larger moral imperative facing teacher preparation faculty, which is to ensure that all teachers can teach all students. Only then will we as an educational community achieve the shared responsibility in practice so critical for the success of not only our students in preparation programs, but also, ultimately, for students in our schools.

References

- Alexander, C., Silverstein, M., Shlomo, A., Ishikawa, S., & Abrams, D. (1975). *The Oregon experiment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Blanton, L. P., Griffin, 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 Company.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1997). *California standards for the teaching profession*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2001). Elementary subject matter standards. Retrieved at www.ctc.ca.gov. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2002). *IDEA reauthorization recommendations*. Arlington, VA: Author
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2003a). *No child left behind act of 2001: Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act. A technical assistance resource*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2003b). CEC policy update, October 10, 2003. Retrieved from www.cec.sped.org/pp/legislative_update. Washington, DC: Author.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(3), 1-14. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan International.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of education change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallimore, R., & Goldenberg, C. (2001). Analyzing cultural models and settings to connect minority achievement and school improvement research. *Educational Psychologist*, 36, 45-56.
- Grenot-Scheyer, M., Fisher, M., & Staub, D. (2001). A framework for understanding inclusive education. In M. Grenot-Scheyer, M. Fisher & D. Staub (Eds.), *At the end of the day: Lessons learned in inclusive education* (pp. 1-18). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Griffin, C. C. & Pugach, M. C. (1997). Framing the progress of collaborative teacher education. In L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators* (pp. 249-269). Denver: Love Publishing Company.
- Hains, A. H., Maxwell, C. B., Tiezzi, L., Simpson, J. J., Ford, A., & Pugach, M. C. (1997). From individual and ambiguous to collaborative and explicit: Reform in urban teacher education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. In L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators* (pp. 180-206). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

- Holmes Group. (1995). *A report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Losen, D. J. & Orfield, G. (2002). *Racial inequity in special education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- McDonnell, L. M., McLaughlin, J. J., & Morison, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Educating one and all: Students with disabilities and standards-based reform*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Meyer, L. H., Mager, G. M., Yarger-Kane, G., Sarno, J. & Hext-Contreras, G. (1997). Syracuse University's inclusive elementary and special education program. In L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators* (pp. 18-38). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.
- National Council on Disability. (2000). *Back to school on civil rights: Advancing the federal commitment to leave no child behind*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF]. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. Woodbridge, VA: Author.
- Nevin, A. I. (2000). Collaborating to connect the inclusion puzzle. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education* (pp. 249-253). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Pallas, A. M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1995). Changing students/changing changing needs. In E. Flaxman & H. Passow (Eds.), *Changing populations changing schools* (pp. 30-58). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). The culture of redemption and the administration of freedom as research. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(1), 1-34.
- Riehl, C. J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 55-81.
- Salend, S. J. (2001). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices* (4th Ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Sapona, R., Etienne, J., Bauer, A., Fordon, A. E., Johnson, L. J., Hendricks-Lee, J. & Vincent, N. C. (1997). Teacher education reform with the special education program at the University of Cincinnati: An ongoing journey. In L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators* (pp. 128-151). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.
- Thousand, J. S. & Villa, R. A. (2000). Collaborative teaming: A powerful tool in school restructuring. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 254-291). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Trent, S. C., Artilles, A. J., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From deficit thinking to social constructivism: A review of theory, research, and practice in special education. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 277-307.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *A new era: Revitalizing special education for children and their families*. Retrieved from www.ed.gov/inits/commissionsboards/whspecialeducation. Washington, DC: Author.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Twenty-second annual report to congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Retrieved from www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP. Washington DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act* (PL 107-110). Retrieved from www.nochildleftbehind.gov. Washington DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1997). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (PL 105-17). Retrieved from www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS. Washington, DC: Author.
- Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209.