

# **OHIO DEANS COMPACT ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN**

**APRIL 15, 2013 9:30 AM TO 3:00 PM**

*University of Dayton School of Education and Allied Professions Grant Center Offices*

## **PRIORITY/FOCUS AREA SYNOPSES**

*based on common themes/issues identified by small groups during  
the January 9, 2013 meeting of the Compact*

## PRIORITY/FOCUS AREA #1 SYNOPSIS: Identifying and Infusing Targeted Knowledge/Skills/Dispositions into Preservice Coursework

### SUMMARY OF ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY COMPACT MEMBERS

At the initial meeting of the Ohio Deans Compact on Exceptional Children, Compact members identified issues (**see sidebar**) related to several focus areas believed to be essential in preparing all educators to better meet the needs of all children.

The focus area of *identifying and infusing targeted knowledge, skills, and dispositions into preservice coursework* was designated as Priority/Focus Area #1. Four issues were identified and discussed by Compact members working in two small groups. The first issue involved strengthening preparation in specific areas (e.g., use of data, understanding response to intervention, differentiating instruction, etc.) designed to increase access to grade-level content aligned with common core standards, and prepare all students to be successful in postsecondary endeavors. The second issue centered on addressing the dispositions of candidates in teacher and administrator preparation programs, and the candidate selection process. The last two issues (i.e., #3 and #4) entailed preparing all teachers, paraprofessionals, and others (e.g., related services personnel, principals, superintendents) to be

effective collaborators, as reflected in effective co-teaching (in the case of teachers), and effective members of collaborative learning teams, such as Ohio's teacher-based teams (TBTs) or building or district leadership teams (BLTs or DLTs).

#### IDENTIFYING AND INFUSING TARGETED KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS/DISPOSITIONS INTO PRESERVICE COURSEWORK

##### 1. Strengthen preparation in:

- a. Literacy, focus on reading and writing as cross-content, cross-cutting area of emphasis;
- b. Effective behavior management and use of positive behavior supports (PBS) to maximize learning;
- c. Understanding that common core standards are for all children;
- d. Understanding assessment (developing assessment items, understanding assessment as part of the instructional process);
- e. Use of data (particularly to inform instruction and for monitoring progress/performance);
- f. Differentiation of instruction to meet diverse learner needs;
- g. Understanding RtI as part of the instructional process for all children;
- h. Delivering instruction to children with autism, and English Language Learners (ELL);
- i. Understanding the transition process and how to best prepare students with disabilities for postsecondary opportunities;
- j. Understanding the effective use of instructional technology, including how to effectively deliver instruction in on-line environments; and
- k. Understanding the mental health needs of all students.

##### 2. Address dispositions (from "I'm here to teach biology" to "I'm here to teach kids") and the development of empathic educators (consider impact of selectivity measures being developed by OBR).

##### 3. Prepare all teachers and paraprofessionals in **effective co-teaching** models.

##### 4. Prepare all teachers and paraprofessionals to be **effective members of collaborative learning teams** [(e.g., district leadership teams (DLTs), building leadership teams (BLTs), teacher-based teams (TBTs)] – see OLAC modules.

## PRIORITY/FOCUS AREA #1 SYNOPSIS: Identifying and Infusing Targeted Knowledge/Skills/Dispositions into Preservice Coursework

### DRAFT WHITE PAPER

**This initial draft white paper is intended to set the stage for the articulation of the Compact's core beliefs and the identification of associated actions regarding priority/focus area #1: *identifying and infusing targeted knowledge/skills/dispositions into preservice coursework.***

#### FOUNDATION FOR COMPACT DISCUSSION AND DECISION-MAKING

Assumptions underlying issues identified by the Compact are supported by research and authoritative opinion, and include the following:

- All students can learn to higher levels when held to high expectations and provided the necessary services and supports.
- Student learning improves when adults learn, and adult learning is most effectively fostered through peer-to-peer feedback and support that is provided through structured collaborative learning teams.
- Effective implementation of targeted instructional practices is necessary for meaningful improvements in adult professional practice and student learning to be sustained.
- Some instructional practices are more effective than others.
- Effective implementation requires the development of collective capacity of adults at all levels of the system.
- Declining budgets in education, coupled with the frequent turnover of district leadership, increase the need for shared leadership structures to sustain core work in teaching and learning.
- Our nation's ability to compete successfully in the global community depends on the meaningful inclusion of all citizens in our educational system, including students with disabilities (USDoe, OSEP, 2010).

#### SUGGESTED READING:

Fixsen, D., Blasé, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children, 79*(2), pp. 213-230.

Cook, B.G., & Odom, S. L. (2013). Evidence-based practices and implementation science in special education. *Exceptional Children, 79*(2), pp. 135-144.

#### SUPPORT FOR IDENTIFIED ISSUES: *WHAT MATTERS MOST*

According to the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (USDoe, OSEP), almost 30 years of research and experience have demonstrated that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by having high expectations and ensuring their participation and progress in the general education curriculum in inclusive settings<sup>1</sup> to the maximum extent possible (IDEA, 2004).

---

<sup>1</sup> Inclusive or inclusion means an active commitment to equity for all students so as to maximize the participation of all learners, by making learning opportunities relevant and high-quality (National Institute for Urban School Improvement (NIUSI) Leadscape, 2011).

***Sustaining implementation through collective capacity.*** Fixsen, Blasé, Metz, and Van Dyke (2013) note, “exceptional children will benefit when programs are defined and operationalized; effective implementation supports are available to all teachers and staff; private-policy communication loops are in place to defragment, de-silo, and align education system components with effective practices.” (p. 227). Recognizing the need to address fragmentation of the education system, Michael Fullan (2010) proposed the “big ideas” necessary for whole system reform in *All Systems Go*. One such idea is **collective capacity**, which Fullan calls the “hidden resource we fail to understand and cultivate,” (p. 4). He notes that with “focused collective capacity building, accountability to a large extent gets internalized in the group and in its individuals,” (p. 44). Fullan (2011) further outlines crucial elements for whole system reform, suggesting they be used as criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of a driver or set of drivers (i.e., “policy and strategy levers that have the least and best chance of driving successful reform”). These necessary elements for whole system reform, which are similar to the implementation drivers identified by Blasé, Fixsen, and Duda (2011), include: (1) fostering intrinsic motivation of teachers and students; (2) engaging educators and students in continuous improvement of instruction and learning; (3) inspiring collective or team work; and (4) affecting **all** teachers and students (“allness”).

Ohio’s work to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and other marginalized learners is supported by a statewide system of support (SSoS) that is both systemic in nature and statewide in scope. This SSoS, designed to provide high-quality support and technical assistance to all districts and their schools, is facilitated through a strong regional infrastructure focused on sustained implementation of a structured process (i.e., the Ohio Improvement Process or OIP) with an embedded set of aligned tools. This process is used by the majority of districts in Ohio to support higher levels of learning for all students, all adults in the system, and the district as a continually improving learning organization. The sense of *allness* described by Fullan can only be cultivated when *all* adults – including general and special education teachers, administrators (central office personnel such as directors of student services, principals, assistant principals), related services personnel, parent/family members, and others – believe that their responsibility, regardless of role or position, is to work together to build each other’s capacity to ensure the success of all students. Building the collective capacity of adults across the system requires moving away from structures that perpetuate longstanding isolated practice, and has clear implications for teacher and administrator personnel preparation programs.

***Evaluating the implementation and effect of instructional practices.*** In *Visible Learning* (2009) and *Visible Learning for Teachers* (2012), John Hattie’s synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement yields important information on instructional practices shown to have the greatest effect sizes. Hattie (2012) urges educators to evaluate the effects of what they do to make learning visible. Specifically, Hattie states that making learning visible “...refers not to the presence or otherwise of an initiative, *but to the evaluation of its effect*. He notes, “...feedback was most powerful when it is from the *student to the teacher*...When teachers seek, or at least are open to, feedback from students as to what students know, what they understand, where they make errors, when they have misconceptions, when they are not engaged – then teaching and learning can be synchronized and powerful. Feedback to teachers helps make learning visible.” (p. 173)

There is an increasing recognition that to sustain real improvement in teaching and learning, school districts must create the expectations and a culture of inquiry and learning to support effective instructional practice across the district. They must use data collected at the district, school, and classroom level as feedback to the system on the effect of adult professional practice on student learning, and create structured opportunities for teachers and others to learn from each other. Districts and their schools that demonstrate sustained improvement in instructional practice and achievement for all students establish these structures

and provide the supports necessary to foster shared leadership and internal or authentic accountability (Elmore, 2006; Reeves, 2011, 2006; Schmoker, 2006). They facilitate professional collaboration and the effective use of relevant data at all levels of the system.

**Redefining leadership.** An increasing number of authors and researchers (e.g., DuFour & Marzano, 2011; McNulty & Besser, 2011; Darling-Hammond, L., 2010; Wahlstrom, K., et al., 2010; Wahlstrom, K. & Louis, K., 2008; Leithwood, K., and Jantzi, D., 2008; Schmoker, M., 2006; David, 2008-09; Gallimore, et al., 2009; Seashore Louis, et al., 2010) advocate for the use of team structures to facilitate shared learning for instructional improvement. They note that no single person has all the necessary knowledge, skills, and talents to meet the needs of all children. This finding is reflective of the growing body of evidence in support of teachers working together to inform each other's instructional practice, as well as the importance of stable school-based settings and distributed leadership, using explicit protocols, and having coherent and aligned district policies and practices (Gallimore, et al., 2009). This shift is evident in the work of the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council, which provides a foundation for the state's improvement process and associated structures.

**RELEVANT FACTS:**

- More than 60 percent of students with disabilities are educated in general education settings for 80 percent or more of the school day (USDoe, 2011a).
- Across the states, the population of public school students in special education across the 13 nationally recognized disability categories ranged from less than 10% to 19%. While one way to describe the characteristics of special education students is by their disability category, students within a single category have diverse needs. Most of the 6.5 million special education students (except for a portion with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may fall in such categories as intellectual disabilities, autism, and multiple disabilities) participate in the general state assessment; they do not participate in an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.
- The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at or above proficiency in both reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress has been persistently lower than the percentage of students without disabilities scoring at or above proficiency (USDoe, 2011b), highlighting the significant gaps between the performance of students with and without disabilities.
- In a recent AASA survey of school superintendents, only about half (51%) of the respondents said that they planned to still be a superintendent in 2015, suggesting the likelihood of significant turnover in the next few years (*The American School Superintendent: 2010 Decennial Study*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators).
- The National Governor's Assoc and National Association of State Budget Officers reported that In fiscal 2012, the primary program areas where many states made mid-year general fund expenditure cuts were K-12 education, higher education, and corrections (The Fiscal Survey of States).

**Establishing structures that support inclusive practices.** Research shows that developing effective inclusive practices on a school-wide basis includes multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS)<sup>2</sup>, practices that support the participation of students with disabilities with their non-disabled peers in academic and extra-curricular activities of the school, school-wide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS), and culturally responsive and universal design for learning principles, hold promise for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. All of these approaches require adults to work together across departmental and positional functions.

All students, including those with significant disabilities, benefit academically, behaviorally, and socially from practices that support inclusion (Copeland & Cosbey, 2009; Jameson, McDonnell, Johnson, Riesen, & Polychronis, 2007; Rea, McLaughlin, & Walther-Thomas, 2002), particularly when such practices are implemented within an MTSS context (Wanzek & Vaughn, 2010). The USDoe, OSEP cites the following as examples of successful practices that support inclusion:

- (1) Using collaborative teaching models (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010);
- (2) Providing time for consultation between general and special education teachers (Wallace, Anderson, & Bartholomay, 2002);

<sup>2</sup> MTSS refers to a continuum of evidence-based, system-wide practices to support academic and behavioral needs, with frequent data-based monitoring for instructional decision-making (Kansas State Department of Education, 2012).

- (3) Promoting university-school partnerships (Causton-Theoharis, Theoharis, Bull, Cosier, & Dempf-Aldrich, 2011; Kozleski, Pugach, & Yinger, 2002);
- (4) Differentiating instruction (Hall, Strangman, & Meyer, 2003); and
- (5) Clearly defining roles for support staff to support inclusion (Giangreco, Suter, & Doyle, 2010).

Recent research on school-wide positive behavior supports (SWPBS) indicates the need to apply culturally responsive principles within the context of MTSS and in conjunction with practices that promote inclusion. For example, SWPBS has been shown to reduce the overall number of office discipline referrals in a school, but not for African American students (Skiba, 2012). Culturally responsive principles promote the development and success of all students and can be incorporated in learning environments by communicating high expectations; reshaping the curriculum to reflect all students' experiences; and engaging students in activities that value their background, knowledge, and experiences (Gay, 2000; King, Artilles, & Kozleski, 2010). Applying universal design for learning principles within the context of MTSS in

conjunction with practices that promote inclusion can also improve outcomes for students with disabilities (Hehir, 2009; Rose & Gravel, 2010). The key principles of universal design for learning include presenting information and content in various ways, promoting multiple ways in which students can express what they know, and stimulating interest and motivation for learning (Rose & Meyer, 2006).

*From NCATE's Vision of the Professional Teacher of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

- All children can and should learn.
- High quality education is a fundamental right of all children.
- Accredited institutions should ensure that new teachers attain the necessary content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills to teach both independently and collaboratively;
- Accredited institutions should commit to preparing teachers for a diverse community of learners;
- Accredited institutions should encourage collegiality, reflective practice, continuous improvement, and collaboration among educators, learners, and families;
- Accredited institutions should prepare candidates who can integrate technology into instruction to enhance student learning;
- The new professional teacher who graduates from a professionally accredited institution should be able to help all pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade (P-12) students learn;
- Administrators and other school specialists should be able to apply professional knowledge and skills of their disciplines to create a supportive environment to help all students learn.

### **RELEVANT STANDARDS SUPPORTING COMPACT APPROACH**

A merger of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), the new Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was charged with developing “the next generation of accreditation standards based on evidence, continuous improvement, innovation, and clinical practice” (CAEP, 2013). Draft standards address five areas: (1) content and pedagogical knowledge; (2) clinical partnerships and practice; (3) candidate quality, recruitment, and selectivity; (4) program impact; and (5) provider quality, continuous improvement, and capacity.

Aspects of the draft standards particularly relevant to Compact priority/focus area #1 follow:

**Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.** Providers are held accountable for ensuring that “candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to *advance the learning of all students*<sup>3</sup> toward attainment of college and career-readiness standards.” This standard builds on the 2008 NCATE standards foundational belief that all children can and should learn” and that “high quality education is a

<sup>3</sup> All students is defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including students with disabilities or exceptionalities, who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and geographic origin (Draft Recommendations for the CAEP Board, 2013, p. 19).

fundamental right of all children.” It recognizes that the “development of pedagogical content knowledge involves a shift in a teacher’s understanding *from* comprehension of subject matter for themselves, *to* advancing their students’ learning through presentation of subject matter in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations...so that it can be grasped by students.” (p. 18). It also calls for candidates to “facilitate learning for students with varying capacities, strengths, and approaches to learning” (p. 18) and “adapt their practices to meet the needs of each learner.” (p. 19)

**Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice.** Providers are held accountable for ensuring that “effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to **demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning.**” Clinical experiences should ensure that “candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning.” (p. 19)

**Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity.** Providers must document their efforts to recruit diverse candidates (e.g., candidates with disabilities, exceptionalities, and diversity based on race or other factors as delineated in the definition of “all students”), and they must demonstrate “efforts to know and address community, state, national, or regional or local needs for hard to staff schools and shortage fields,” including for example, students with disabilities. (p. 22) The draft standards note that examples of evidence related to nonacademic factors at admissions or during the preparation experience could include cultural competency, collaboration, and beliefs that all children can learn. (p. 25)

**Standard 4: Program Impact.** Providers must demonstrate the impact their program completers have on P-12 learning, classroom instruction, and schools. (p. 27)

## EFFORTS TO PREPARE ALL EDUCATORS TO ADVANCE THE LEARNING OF ALL STUDENTS

In *Preparing General Education Teachers to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities* (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, L., 2011), assumptions about the content and organizational structure of preservice preparation are questioned, and challenges associated with teacher education program and licensure structures are described. In proposing a vision for the future – *one where all educators are ready, willing, and able to meet the needs of all learners in today’s diverse classrooms* – the authors contend that “Preparation programs must equip teachers with the essential skills to counteract the effects of the “silos” by which schools are organized and students are separated.” (p. 12)

Among the skills needed by teachers to support the learning of all students is the ability to work collaboratively and as part of a team.

*“When general educators take primary responsibility for the learning of their students, they should do so as a part of a professional learning community alongside their special education colleagues...These models can include co-teaching, in which general and special education teachers share responsibility for instruction, as well as creating instructional teams in middle and high schools in which the special education teacher is a permanent member of the team of subject specialist teachers.” (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, 2011, p. 16).*

### A Vision for the Future

1. All teachers are prepared to act on the belief that all students, including students with disabilities, belong in general education classrooms.
2. All teachers are prepared to teach all students, including students with disabilities, as capable learners who are entitled to high-quality instruction and access to challenging content that fully prepares them for careers and postsecondary education.
3. All teacher candidates complete their initial preparation with the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully enter the profession and meet the instructional needs of students with disabilities.
4. State and federal policy invest in high-quality teacher preparation for all candidates, while assuring that every new teacher is qualified with demonstrated skill to educate students with disabilities.
5. All providers of teacher education embrace preparation for diverse learners as a core component of their mission, prioritizing it, strengthening it, and funding it accordingly.

Prepared for AACTE and NCLD by Linda P. Blanton, Marleen C. Pugach, and Lani Florian, April 2011. Available for download at [www.aacte.org](http://www.aacte.org).

For all students to learn at higher levels, and to effectively respond to the CAEP standards, preparation programs must be structured in ways that provide both general and special education teacher candidates with “**shared base of professional knowledge for teaching that is anchored in the general education curriculum.**” (p. 16). Despite this need, the majority of teacher preparation programs in general and special education can be categorized as discrete (i.e., separate, often unrelated programs), a model that “tends to perpetuate the false separation between general and special education.” (p. 20).

Consider the following:

- Seventeen (17) states require individuals preparing to become a special education teacher (AKA *intervention specialist*) to hold a general education license first;
- Only 20 percent of preservice programs require courses or coursework to prepare teachers to work with English Language Learners (ELL);
- Requiring a single course in special education is the most prevalent approach to providing coursework in special education for students preparing to become general education teachers (i.e., 73% of elementary teacher education programs and 67% of secondary teacher education programs have this requirement);
- In the *2010 MetLife Survey of the American Teacher*, 91 percent of respondents reported that strengthening programs and resources to help diverse learners who have greater needs should be a priority;
- In the same survey, 65 percent of respondents cited increased time for collaboration as something that would have a major impact on their ability to address the learning needs of individual students;
- In the United Kingdom, teacher preparation for special education at the undergraduate level was abolished in the 1980s, because it was seen as an “institutional, organizational barrier that inappropriately freed the rest of the education system from taking responsibility for all children’s learning;”
- Some teacher education programs described as providing dual certification require candidates to complete two heavily siloed programs – one in general education and one in special education.

The authors call for a “simultaneous reframing” of the roles of both general and special education teachers and describe two alternatives to the discrete model of preparation (p. 20). In both models, teacher educators work together to develop and deliver a curriculum that prepares all teachers to work with all learners, including those with disabilities.

□ **Integrated Programs:** Prospective general and special education teachers study a redesigned, common core curriculum together to become general education teachers, and only those who want to become advanced specialists go on for additional studies to develop specialization expertise and an additional license in special education build on this common base of knowledge. Two examples follow:

- **University of Utah**

All teacher candidates for general and special education complete a shared, common core of professional course work (including field experiences) prior to any specializations (i.e., early childhood, primary, secondary, special education) students may elect to complete. Candidates learn to develop an integrated curriculum, the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as it relates to RtI. Strong school-university partnerships are a key component of the program and faculty work with partnering school districts to study program impact. See Hardman, M. (2009). Redesigning the preparation of all teachers within the framework of an integrated program model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 583-587.

- **Teachers College, Columbia University**

Masters level candidates in the *Elementary Inclusive Preservice Education Program* complete the same core program for elementary certification for Grades 1-6 and participate in intensive field experience in the NY City public schools, preparing them for inclusive teaching. Candidates can elect to obtain dual licensure

by adding an intensive semester (i.e., the Critical Special Education or CSE semester). The program prepares all candidates for three core roles: inquiry, curriculum making, and social justice, and has an intentional focus on equity and multicultural education. A new inclusive education program for middle and high school teachers has recently begun. See Hamre, B., & Oyler, C. (2004). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms: Learning from a collaborative inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(2), 154-163.

☐ **Merged Programs:** All graduates obtain both a general and a special education license by completing a single, completely unified curriculum; there is no distinction between a special and general education teacher. Two examples follow:

- **Syracuse University**

Candidates in the *Inclusive Elementary and Special Education* program earn an elementary and special education license for Grades 1-6. This is a fully merged curriculum and the only option for elementary certification, and emphasizes differentiated instruction, collaboration, and a social justice perspective on meeting the needs of all students, including students with special needs and students from culturally diverse backgrounds. See Meyer, L.H., Mager, G. M., Yarger, G., Sarno, M., & 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* (pp. 18-38). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

- **University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center**

Candidates in this professional development school model have the option of pursuing a dual-licensure program leading to licensure in general and special education with a focus on either elementary or secondary education. All teacher candidates are prepared in the areas of teacher as scholar, teacher as instructor, teacher as student advocate, teacher as professional, and teacher as leader. Candidates pursuing dual licensure are also prepared in the areas of teacher as school and community collaborator, and teacher as case manager. All candidates take a core set of courses – designed to infuse issues of special education, technology, and cultural/linguistic diversity across coursework – regardless of whether they seek general education, special education, or dual licensure. See Sobel, D.M., Iceman-Sands, D., & Basile, C. (2007). Merging general and special education teacher preparation programs to create an inclusive program for diverse learners. *The New Educator*, 3, 241-262.

## INCENTIVIZING EFFECTIVE PREPARATION MODELS IN OHIO

- I. In developing and implementing a request for application (RFA) process to incentivize the development of educator preparation programs that prepare all educators to more effectively support higher levels of learning for all children, the Compact's work will involve:
  1. Identifying and agreeing on foundational/core beliefs;
  2. Identifying **funding priorities** related to priority/focus area #1: *identifying and infusing targeted knowledge/skills/dispositions into preservice coursework*, which will include absolute priorities and may include competitive priorities;
  3. Identifying additional information that may be needed for decision-making purposes.
- II. In planning for and hosting a Fall/Winter 2013-2014 conference for higher education faculty and other interested parties, the Compact's work will involve identifying **conference priorities** related to priority/focus area #1: *identifying and infusing targeted knowledge/skills/dispositions into preservice coursework*; and additional information that may be needed for decision-making purposes.

## REFERENCES

- Blanton, L.P., Pugach, M.C., & Florian, L. (2011). Prepared for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the National Center for Learning Disabilities. Available for download at [www.aacte.org](http://www.aacte.org).
- Blasé, K.A., Fixsen, D.L., & Duda, M. (Feb. 8, 2011). *Implementation science: Building the bridge between science and practice*. Presentation made at Institute of Education Sciences.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013). Draft recommendations for the CAEP Board. Available from [www.caepnet.org](http://www.caepnet.org).
- Causton-Theoharis, J., Theoharis, G., Bull, T., Cosier, M., & Dempf-Aldrich, K. (2011). Schools of promise: A school district-university partnership centered on inclusive school reform. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 192-205.
- Cook, B.G., & Odom, S.L. (2013). Evidence-based practices and implementation science in special education. *Exceptional Children, 79*(2), pp. 135-144.
- Copeland, S.R., & Cosbey, J. (2009). Making progress in the general curriculum: Rethinking effective instructional practices. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 33-34*(4-1), 214-227.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- David, J. (December 2008/January 2009). Collaborative inquiry. *Educational Leadership, 66* (4).
- Fixsen, D., Blasé, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children, 79*(2), pp. 213-230.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-Teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20*, 1-27.
- Fullan, M. (2011). *Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform*. Center for Strategic Education Seminar Series 204, East Melbourne Victoria.
- Fullan, M. (2010). *All systems go: The change imperative for whole system reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R.J. (2011). *Leaders of learning: How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement*. Solution Tree Press: Bloomington, IN.
- Elmore, R.F. (2006). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Education Press.
- Gallimore, R.R., Ermeling, B.A., Saunders, W.M., & Goldenberg, C.C. (2009). Moving the learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher education implications of school-based inquiry teams. *The Elementary School Journal, 109* (5).
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Giangreco, M.F., Suter, J.C., Doyle, M.B., (2010). Paraprofessionals in inclusive schools: A review of recent research. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20*, 41-57.
- Hall, T., Strangman, N., & Meyer, A. (2003). *Differentiated instruction and implications for UDL implementation*. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum. Retrieved from [www.aim.cast.org/learn/historyarchive/backgroundpapers/differentiated\\_instruction\\_udl](http://www.aim.cast.org/learn/historyarchive/backgroundpapers/differentiated_instruction_udl).
- Hardman, M. (2009). Redesigning the preparation of all teachers within the framework of an integrated program model. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 583-587.
- Harme, B., & Oyler, C. (2004). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms: Learning from a collaborative inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(2), 154-163.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Hehir, T. (2009). Policy foundations of universal design for learning. In D.T. Gordon, J.W. Gravel, & L.A. Schifter (Eds.), *A policy design for learning* (pp. 35-45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jameson, J.M., McDonnell, J., Johnson, J.W., Riesen, T., & Polychronis, S. (2007). A comparison of one-to-one embedded instruction in the general education classroom and one-to-one massed practice instruction in the special education classroom. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30*, 23-44.
- King, A., Artilles, A.J., & Kozleski, E. (2010). Professional learning for culturally responsive teaching. Retrieved from [www.equityallianceatasu.org/sites/default/files/Website\\_files/exemplarFINAL.pdf](http://www.equityallianceatasu.org/sites/default/files/Website_files/exemplarFINAL.pdf).

- Kozleski, E.B., Pugach, M., & Yinger, R. (2002). *Preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities. Possible challenges for special and general teacher education* (White Paper). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44 (4).
- Louis, K.S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K.L., & Anderson, S.E. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement/University of Minnesota and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto.
- McNulty, B.A. and Besser, L. (2011). *Leaders make it happen! An administrator's guide to data teams*. Englewood CO: Lead + Learn Press.
- MetLife. (2011). *MetLife Survey of the American Teacher: Preparing Students for College and Careers (2010)*. Part 2: Teaching Diverse Learners. New York: Author.
- Meyer, L.H., Mager, G.M., Yarger, G., Sarno, M., & 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* (pp. 18-36). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.
- Ohio's Leadership Development Framework* (2008). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education and the Buckeye Association of School Administrators.
- Rea, P.J., McLaughlin, V.L., Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children*, 68, 203-222.
- Reeves, D.B., (2011). *Finding your leadership focus: What matters most for student results*. NY, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Reeves, D.B., (2006). *The learning leader: how to focus: improvement for better results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Rose, D.H., & Gravel, J.W. (2010). Universal design for learning. In E. Baker, P. Peterson, & B. McGaw (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Rose, D.H., & Meyer, A. (2016). *A practical reader in Universal Design for Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Schmoker, M. (2006). *Results now*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Skiba, R. (2012, February). *Interventions for reducing disciplinary disparities and the problem of race neutrality*. Paper presented at 2012 National Center on Response to Intervention Disproportionality Technical Workgroup.
- Sobel, D.M., Iceman-Sands, D., & Basile, C. (2007). Merging general and special education teacher preparation programs to create an inclusive program for diverse learners. *The New Educator*, 3, 241-262.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R.H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-side positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality*, 17(4), 223-237.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2011a). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2010* (NCES 2011-015), Chapter 2. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2011b). *National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2011 Mathematics and Reading Assessments*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. (2010). *Thirty-five years of progress in educating children with disabilities through IDEA*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Wahlstrom, K.L. & Louis, K.S. (2008). *How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44 (4).
- Wahlstrom, K., Seashore, K., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Research Report Executive Summary. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement. University of Minnesota.
- Wallace, T., Anderson, A.R., & Bartholomay, T. (2002). Collaboration: An element associated with the success of four inclusive high schools. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 13, 349-381.
- Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2010). Tier 3 interventions for students with significant reading problems. *Theory Into Practice*, 49, 305-314.

NOTE: A portion of the background information for this synopsis was adapted from the USDoe, OSEP application package for CFDA 84.326Y: Technical Assistance Center for Inclusive School-wide Reform, June 2012.