

***Thoughts, Perspectives, and Ideas Presented At
The Illinois Deans of Colleges of Education Symposium
On Inclusive Education of Students with Disabilities***

Edited by

*Sharon Freagon
Northern Illinois University*

and

*Donald S. Kachur
Illinois State University*

Spring 1994

Dr. Sharon Freagon is Professor of Special Education, Department of Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education, Northern Illinois University, Graham Hall 223, DeKalb, IL 60115-2896, (815) 753-0656.

Dr. Donald Kachur is Director of Special Program Services, College of Education, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790-5300, (309) 438-8294.

Illinois Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities, 830 South Spring Street, Springfield, IL 62704, (217) 782-9696; or 100 West Randolph 10-600, Chicago, IL 60601, (312) 814-2080.

This manuscript was developed in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Illinois Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities grant, "Deans' Symposium: Teacher and Administrator Preparation, Certification, and Training for Inclusive Education," awarded to Illinois State University. Opinions expressed in this manuscript do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the agency, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Dear Reader:

On March 11-12, 1993, a two-day symposium, known as the Dean's Symposium, was held at the Robert Allerton Park and Conference Center in Monticello, Illinois, to focus attention on what colleges of education must do to prepare teachers and administrators for inclusive education.

The planning for this symposium was handled by the colleges of education of Illinois State University (ISU), Northern Illinois University (NIU), and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIU-C). Funding for this symposium came to the three host institutions from a grant awarded by the Illinois Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities. In attendance were over thirty deans or other administrators representing all twelve state-supported universities, three representative private colleges, and three representative community colleges.

One of the goals of the grant was to develop and publish a "white paper" from the proceedings of that symposium. Included in this special publication are a number of papers written by presenters at the symposium. These papers provide varied perspectives on preparing future teachers and administrators for including and effectively educating learners from diverse backgrounds with various cognitive styles.

A special thanks goes out to Sharon Freagon, Professor of Special Education at Northern Illinois University, whose leadership, collaboration, and inspiration were instrumental to acquiring the grant, planning the symposium, and preparing this special publication. Recognition and thanks also goes out to the deans of the colleges of education at ISU, NIU, and SIU-C for their support and leadership throughout this effort. They were Dr. Charles Stegman, Dean of the College of Education at NIU; Dr. Donald Beggs, Dean of the College of Education at SIU-C; Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo, Interim Dean of the College of Education at ISU; and Dr. Sally Pancrazio, current Dean of the College of Education at ISU.

Finally, appreciation is expressed to the Illinois Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities. Through their foresight and effort, they made funds available through a grant competition for addressing the need by higher education institutions to examine their role and responsibilities in the preparation of teachers and administrators for inclusive education.

Dr. Donald S. Kachur
Professor of Education
Illinois State University

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Forward | |
| Rene Christensen Leininger..... | i |
| Definition | of |
| | Terms |
| | 1 |
| <i>Then, Now, and the Future of Inclusive Education for Children and Youth With Moderate, Severe, and Multiple Disabilities</i> | |
| Sharon Freagon, William Peters, Matthew D. Cohen, Al Smith..... | 5 |
| <i>Training to Teach Students with Disabilities: A Parent's Perspective</i> | |
| Donald Buell..... | 23 |
| <i>A Superintendent's View of Inclusion and the Preparation of Teachers</i> | |
| James Erickson..... | 27 |
| <i>A View of Inclusion</i> | |
| Robert Leininger..... | 31 |
| <i>The Role of Higher Education in Creating Inclusive Schools</i> | |
| Virginia Roach..... | 35 |
| <i>The Inclusive Education Challenge for Colleges of Education</i> | |
| Charles Stegman, Sally Pancrazio, Donald Beggs..... | 41 |
| <i>What's Next? Directions Institutions of Higher Education in Illinois Need to Take to Educate Students with Disabilities in their Home Schools and in General Education Classes</i> | |
| Donald Kachur, Sharon Freagon..... | 47 |

Forward

Rene Christensen Leininger
Illinois Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities

Because special education teachers and general education teachers are trained in separate programs, each group of teachers develops limited conception of their capabilities and competencies, the result is that many special education teachers feel they should only work with student populations that have been clearly identified as having a disabling condition, while many general education teachers hold that they are unable and incapable of working with students who have disabilities. (National Association of State Boards of Education Study Group on Special Education, 1992)

Dialogue cannot take place if the two groups watch each other from afar in fear and hostility. If the classroom is segregated, education becomes rehabilitation with a report card. . . . The common perception that people with disabilities are pathetic, suffering creatures lingers and poisons our effort to speak candidly about disability, and silence is the result. Fear acts on us as well. We are all, able-bodied and disabled alike, afraid of certain questions. But we do not need to fear this conversation. . . . (Bennett, 1994)

School inclusion has been a national conversation for over two decades. The notion of educating students with disabilities alongside their peers who do not have disabilities was discussed at length by the authors of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Act clearly establishes a strong preference for inclusion by requiring children to be educated in the environment least restrictive of interaction with each other. Additionally, the authors of the IDEA emphasized their intention by requiring a regular review of how students with disabilities are included (or not included) in general education. This insightful move has helped to keep school inclusion before the American public.

Ethically, educating students with special needs in segregated environments became questionable almost immediately following the establishment of a separate system of "special education" and the institutionalization of the "continuum" of placement options. Yet, in the absence of supporting literature, many remained mistakenly convinced that the best learning environment for children with special educational needs was away from the traditional classroom and other children. Children were caught up in a dichotomy between the negative aspects of segregation and a misconception that children with disabilities make better educational gains in isolated environments.

In years since the IDEA was passed, American universities and colleges have played a key role in removing the myth that children with disabilities cannot realize educational benefit in regular schools and classes. Many university professionals have been dedicated to demonstrating the benefits of inclusive educational practices through research and

demonstration projects. Today, the literature overwhelmingly demonstrates that all children learn best in natural environments where they have the benefit of interacting and learning from each other. The "educational benefit" myth has been removed. However, in Illinois, thousands of children continue to be removed from their home schools and classes, caught up in a system of classification and tracking well entrenched in the special education bureaucracy.

In more recent years, the dialogue regarding inclusive educational practices deepened as a generation of young adults with disabilities graduated from segregated schools. As a result, the self-advocacy movement has adopted school inclusion as an issue of primary importance. Self-advocates and parents of school-aged children with disabilities have joined together to bring a new vigor to the call for reform. They want reform from a system that has not demonstrated positive outcomes for children to a new system that will promote a truly integrated society in which people with and without disabilities are comfortable with each other.

The Illinois Planning Council on Development Disabilities has embraced school reform as its top priority in effecting societal change that will result in the realization of independence, productivity, and inclusion of all people in an integrated society. The Council recognizes the importance of the role of teacher preparation programs in current reform efforts. In concert with reforms within state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education are looking within to change practices that encourage a continuation of segregation and less than acceptable outcomes for children with disabilities. Universities and colleges are examining their roles and responsibilities in the larger scheme of social change and recognizing that decisions made in the training of teachers has impact on the lives of individuals and American society-at-large for generations to come.

The "Deans' Symposium" represents a first step in assisting Illinois in evaluating and changing how we teach our teachers. It is a collaborative exploration of barriers and options for change in Illinois' teacher preparation programs. On behalf of the members of the Council, a thank you is extended to personnel from Illinois State University, Northern Illinois University, and Southern Illinois University for proposing and carrying out a project of depth and meaning for thousands of Illinois schoolchildren. The Dean's Symposium project could not have been successful without the support and commitment of State Superintendent Robert Leininger and the Deans of the Colleges of Education in universities and colleges throughout the state. The participation of numerous local, state, and national experts was invaluable in assuring the Symposium carried productive messages and created a path toward positive outcomes. The contributions of the parents and individuals with disabilities who were willing to offer their expertise to the Symposium could not have been replaced.

REFERENCES

Bennett, E. B., HI. (1994, August 2). Build ramps to better understanding. Chicago Tribune.

National Association of State Boards of Education Study Group on Special Education. (1992). Winners all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA.

Definition of Terms

Following are definitions of terms that represent concepts that are used especially in the field of special education when parents and professionals talk about inclusion. Their understanding is important to the "hows" of implementing the tenants of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) especially the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and preference for "non-removal" from general education environments by providing the students with appropriate aids and services.

Inclusion

Inclusion involves placement in the home school and in the general education environments(s) with appropriate supports, aid(e)s, and curricular adaptations designed individually for each student eligible for special education services. Inclusion most closely follows the wording and intent of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requiring each public agency to insure,

that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who do not have a disability, and special classes, separate schooling or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environments occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (Section 612)

Another term for inclusion is *supported education* meaning one educational system for all students. Successful schools regard all students as rightful members of the school they would attend, and the class(es) in which they would participate if they did not have disabilities. Each student is provided instructional curricula to meet their individual needs and learning styles.

Experience tells us that where inclusion is successful there are no prerequisites for participation. Standards vary with each child and all educational staff share responsibility.

Least Restrictive Environment

This term appears in the language of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) formerly known as The Education of All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142). This term known as LRE applies to the placement of special education eligible students in the educational environment which least restricts their interactions with students not identified as eligible. For most students, this would be an age-appropriate classroom in the school (s)he would attend if not identified as eligible for special education. Moving to a more restrictive placement can only be done where there is documentation that the student's needs cannot be met in the regular classroom with necessary aids and supports.

Regular Education Initiative

The Regular Education Initiative (REI) was first referenced by Madeline Will, former U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) Director when President Reagan was in office. Often called REI, this term refers to the unification of what has become two separate educational systems—regular and special education. REI efforts generally take two forms. First, for students not yet identified as eligible for special education, pre-referral intervention strategies are used in the regular classroom to avoid a referral to special education. Second, for students already identified as eligible, services are delivered in a less restrictive way utilizing such methods as collaboration, consultation and in-general-education-class, rather than pull-out resource services.

Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming was a term popularized after the passage of PL 94-142 which has been generally used to describe the process of placing a student with mild to moderate disabilities into one or more regular academic classes. Students who are mainstreamed are usually expected to meet the same standards as non-identified students with minor modifications in curriculum or methodology. Prerequisite skills are generally felt to be necessary since the same standards for success are being applied for all students. This delivery model identifies the child as a "special" rather than a "regular" education student. This practice has not typically been associated with students who are identified as having severe disabilities.

Integration

Integration involves placement out of a special education environment for part of the school day. Integration is most frequently utilized with students who have labels of moderate and severe disabilities, as these students have been typically not associated with mainstreaming efforts.

If done for academic purposes, the practice has been that the student must generally meet certain prerequisites before s/he is felt to be appropriate for integration and the regular curriculum is used. If done for social purposes, the student does not necessarily meet the same standards as required of other students. While the student may receive necessary assistance and support when integrated, a problem often occurs when the student's case manager is a special education teacher for a self-contained classroom and who must remain there with the other students. This delivery model identifies the child as a "special" rather than a "regular" education student. This practice has not typically been associated with students who are identified as having mild disabilities.

Home School

The home school is the school the child or youth would attend if she/he did not have a disability, that is, the same school that brothers, sisters, neighbors and friends attend. For preschool-aged children with disabilities, the home school is the community daycare, preschool or other community environment the child would attend if (s)he did not have a disability.

Cluster Program

A cluster program involves the identification of a specific school and classroom for students with a specific disability label. When cluster programs are utilized, most or all of the students do not attend their home school and students are frequently transported long distances away from their homes.

Age-Appropriate Placement

An age-appropriate placement refers to the general education classroom for students who are the same chronological age. For preschool-aged children, age-appropriate placements are the settings in which other children of their same chronological age attend.

Natural Proportion

The proportion of all people with disability labels in the general population is about 10 to 15%. People with the most severe disabilities represent less than 1% of the general population. When students with disability labels attend their home school, there is generally a natural proportion represented. School buildings should consider the natural proportion when assigning students to classrooms. Classrooms which consider the natural proportion will not have more than 15% of its members who have disability labels and no more than one of these students will have a label of severe disabilities.

Inclusive Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Like the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), the Individualized Education Program (IEP) is one of the main tenants of the IDEA. The IEP annually guides the student's team as they provide educational support and services. IEP teams that are successful at including students with varying disabilities have taught us that once students are included, the teams' visions of students broaden and become farther reaching. Expressions of these visions in the IEP reflect the supports, aids, and services needed to be successful in an inclusive classroom and school.

Supplementary Services

"Supplementary aids and services," as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) at 20 U.S.C. 1412(5)(B), for a student to achieve educational benefit in the general education environment are supports. Supports are the accommodations made for students with disability labels in order to increase their independence and participation in general education classes. Experience working with successful inclusive classrooms tells us that supports can be as simple as the student's seating assignment in the classroom to reasonably accommodate a vision, hearing, motor, or attention need. The supports can also be as complex as an electronic augmentative communication system with trained paraprofessionals available to assist a student in all classes.

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) process assists the team members to determine supports by identifying each individual student's needs. After the needs are identified, the

possibilities for supports are seldom an exhaustive list. Carbon paper for a fellow student to take notes, special equipment and furniture, peer tutors (buddies), assistive technology, adapted curriculum, adapted tests and materials, individual assistants, certified staff consultants, or textbooks on audiotapes are but a few. Being creative is the key to generating, developing and implementing supports for a student's success and benefit in the educational system.

Sometimes difficult is the separating of "student supports" from "teacher supports" as most high technology or additional trained personnel; adaptations to curriculum or materials; and consultation or team teaching by staff with certain expertise, though written as specific aid(e)s for a student, inherently support and assist the teacher in providing instruction.

***Then, Now, and the Future of Inclusive Education
for Children and Youth with
Moderate, Severe, and Multiple
Disabilities***

Sharon Freagon
Northern Illinois University

William Peters
DeKalb County Special Education Association

Matthew D. Cohen
Monahan & Cohen, Attorneys at Law

Al Smith
Illinois State Board of Education

Twenty years ago, U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey from Minnesota introduced Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Addressing Congress, he said:

This bill responded to an awakening public interest in millions of handicapped children, youth, and adults who suffer the profound indignity and despair of isolation, discrimination and maltreatment. (118 Cong. rec. 9495)

The deliberate segregation of the handicapped and their resulting invisibility have led to their traditionally low rating on the priority list of educational community programs. . . . Many specialists in the field of educating handicapped children agree that children at the trainable or moderately retarded level do not need special classes. But...that the traditional approach of segregating these children in separate schools or isolated classes within regular school buildings . . . is wrong. (118 Cong. rec. 9498.9500-01)

In 1974, Senator Stafford, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Handicapped spoke about the Education of All Handicapped Children Act or Public Law 94-142 (now the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA):

I firmly believe that if we are to teach all of our children to love and understand each other, we must give them every opportunity to see what "different" children are like. . . . If we allow and, indeed, encourage handicapped children and nonhandicapped children to be educated together as early as possible their attitudes toward each other later in life will not be such obstacles to overcome. A child who goes to school everyday with another child who is confined to a wheelchair will understand far better in later life the limitations and abilities of

such an individual when he or she is asked to work with, or is in a position to hire, such an individual. (122 Cong. Rec. 10961)

Finally, Congressman Miller, a ranking member of the House Committee on Select Education in 1975 spoke to the implementation of Public Law 94-142:

Rather, I believe the burden of proof in terms of the effectiveness of a program ought to rest with that administrator or teacher who seeks for one reason or another to remove a child from a normal classroom, to segregate him or her from nonhandicapped children, to place him in a program of special education. (121 Cong. Rec. H7764)

Public Law 94-142, implemented in 1975, in Section 612 requires states to ensure each child with disabilities a "free appropriate public education" establishing procedures to:

. . . assure, that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Clearly the intent of Congress in the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Public Law 94-142 was nonremoval of children and youth with disabilities from the general education environment. Yet, twenty years later, many if not most, of these children and youth remain segregated from their brothers, sisters, neighbors and friends in self-contained classrooms and in self-contained schools where they do not have access to the same educational experiences and auricular content as do children and youth who are not labeled.

In 1992, the ARC: A National Organization on Mental Retardation released a "Report Card to the Nation on Inclusion in Education of Students with Mental Retardation." They found that Massachusetts and Vermont were the only two states that educate more than 50% of students labeled mentally retarded in general education classes (Massachusetts 59% and Vermont 54%). Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Florida, were assigned to the "Hall of Shame." This was because these states were among the 10 worst in including students with retardation in general education classrooms in addition to being among the 10 worst in highest usage of separate schools.

During the same month (October 1992) that the ARC findings were announced, the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) issued a report, *Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools*, calling for inclusive schools throughout America. They cite the following statistics related to the outcomes of the provision of 20 years of special education from the *Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of The Individuals with Disabilities Act* (1992) and the SRI International (1991), *National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students*:

- > Only 57% of students in special education graduate with either a diploma or certificate of graduation. [*Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress*];
- > 12% of youth with disabilities have been arrested at some time in their lives, compared with 8% in the general population. Students classified as emotionally disturbed have even higher arrest rates. Almost one in five students labeled as emotionally disturbed are arrested while still in secondary school. [*National Longitudinal Transition Study*];
- > Only 13.4% of all youth with disabilities [aged 15 to 20] are living independently up to two years after leaving secondary school, as opposed to 33.2% of the general post-secondary school population. [*National Longitudinal Transition Study*]; and
- > Only 49% of out-of-school youth with disabilities aged 15-20 are employed between 1 and 2 years after high school. [*National Longitudinal Transition Study*], (p. 8)

The NASBE report also cites Gartner and Lipsky (1989), who found that less than 5% of students identified for special education services ever fully left the system and returned to general education in 26 large cities they studied. Yet, most students identified for special education services, when seen outside of school, would not be considered by the general public to be disabled (NASBE, 1992).

Extrapolating from the above, one can easily see that the statistics for students with the most significant disabilities in relation to outcomes and segregation is even worse. The purpose of this paper, then, is to provide a historical perspective on the education of children and youth with moderate to severe disabilities, to discuss where we are now and where we are going in the future. We cannot, however, do that without briefly discussing educational services to students identified as having milder disabilities.

Then

Children and youth with mild disabilities were often served in the general education school building, but received their instruction in segregated resource or cross-categorical classrooms which many times were not in the schools they would attend if not identified as disabled (home school). They were based in special education rooms with special education teachers and "mainstreamed" into those general education classes where they were expected to achieve at or near grade-level. Grade and auricular modifications, and supports and aids in most instances were not provided. Reading and math were the subject areas upon which teachers most heavily concentrated. Children and youth with mild disabilities, then, experienced the cumulative effects of not participating with the same amount of time in other curricular areas as did their age-peers not identified as having disabilities. Students were often expected to engage in "repeated practice" exercises on "watered-down" curriculum materials in these self-contained classrooms.

Educational services in the past for children and youth identified as having moderate to severe intellectual and multiple disabilities can be characterized by segregated schools, facility-based

only instruction and the use of a developmentally-based curriculum. Prior to the implementation of Public Law 94-142 (now IDEA) these children and youth, if provided services, often received them on the grounds of institutions or in private agency facilities, but not in public schools.

With the implementation of Public Law 94-142 in 1975, local school districts had the responsibility to conduct child-find activities in order that those children and youth who had previously been denied an education by the public schools would have the opportunity for a "free appropriate public education" in the "least restrictive environment." State legislatures all across the nation passed laws where monies for new segregated, disability-only, publicly operated buildings could be acquired. Abandoned elementary or secondary buildings were also often designated "TMH" (Trainable Mentally Handicapped) centers. Many children and youth with the most significant disabilities were "tuitioned out" to private residential or day schools designed specifically to serve only individuals with disabilities. Illinois, as late as the winter of 1994, had a rule traced to 1977 that private agencies approved by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to provide educational services to children and youth with disabilities need only have 25% of their staff certified whereas the public schools must have 100%. Easy to realize is the cost-savings to public schools when children and youth with disabilities were, and still are placed in these facilities. Almost unheard of anywhere in the nation was of children and youth with the most severe disabilities being served in chronologically age-appropriate public schools much less chronologically age-appropriate general education classrooms in the schools they would attend if not disabled. The U.S. Office of Civil Rights just recently found the rule in Illinois to be discriminatory and ordered its change after a complaint was filed 3 years ago.

The segregated facility was where the children and youth with the most significant disabilities received all their services. The segregated facility was where the appropriately-certified teachers had their classrooms and where the related service professionals delivered their services. An isolated model of related services was most often implemented where students would leave their classrooms 3 times weekly for 30 minutes a time per related service to see a physical therapist, an occupational therapist, a speech/language therapist, and/or a vision or hearing itinerant teacher. The allowed chronological age-range of the students in a class was from 4 to 5 years across the nation. Many facilities operated a simulated sheltered workshop where students ages 6 through 21 went daily to learn how to sort by color, sort by shape, and assemble and disassemble nuts and bolts to prepare for the "benchwork" typically found in adult sheltered workshops. Students were often required to engage in activities that were "episodic" or associated with a holiday that occurred once a year. If they did leave the facility, they typically went in large groups and they often went to charitable events during school time. While most states monitor their schools for the amount of time students spend in direct instruction, school buses transporting students with disabilities to segregated facilities or schools that are not their home schools, dropped students off late and picked them up early. This is because the routes for students with disabilities were connected to the routes for students not identified. The result was that students with disabilities received less time in instruction than did their counterparts who were not identified when in fact the nature of their disabilities required (and still does) that they have more time in instruction.

When Public Law 94-142 was to be implemented, the colleges and universities had not been preparing teachers to work with students with the most severe disabilities. Often times, teachers who were certified to work with students labeled moderately mentally retarded were hired to be teachers of children and youth labeled severely and profoundly disabled and/or mentally retarded. Because they had no curricula preparation to work with these students, they worked from the developmental model expressed in intelligence tests such as the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler. This led to grouping these students by mental age instead of chronological age which in-tura led to instructional activities and materials used in preschool programs. If a student was 16 and had a mental age of 22 months, that student would be required to work on activities and materials most often used with children who were nondisabled and 22 months of age. Because students never mastered these activities and materials, they were required to repeat them year-in and year-out using a pre-requisite skill model. They were required to master one skill before they could pass to the next. Most often, if not always, the activities used to work on these infant and preschool skills had no meaning to the students' current or future functioning. When students refused to work on these activities and used some means to communicate such, they were often seen as noncompliant at which time behavior management programs would be instituted.

Regardless of the intent of Public Law 94-142, complex structural and financing systems were developed and/or maintained. Many states like Illinois developed cooperative or joint agreements between multiple school districts in an area in order to provide service to children and youth with more severe disabilities. These agreements had a separate administration and often times the participating school districts collectively purchased the segregated facilities. Though federal law requires that the local school district be responsible for the education of all the children with disabilities who reside within the district boundaries, many school districts who participated in joint agreements relinquished that responsibility to the joint agreements. This often caused problems with communication with the family, student records, locus of responsibility, school-year beginnings and endings, holidays, bussing, teacher strikes and such. While local boards of education would hear follow-up reports of graduates who attended the local schools, they heard none for students with disabilities who attended joint agreement classes. In looking at special education funding in Illinois, Hemp, Freagon and Leininger (1991) found that every formula was a disincentive to labeled children and youth attending the schools and the classes they would attend if not identified as disabled. Funding was attached to special education class size, to disability label, to severity of disability, to specific teacher certifications and to the amount of time spent in general or special education.

Teacher trainers of general and special educators were often isolated from one another in separate departments in the colleges and universities. This provided models of separation for young teachers in preparation (Freagon, 1993). The cycle of segregation for children and youth with disabilities was only perpetuated when student teachers had their only "hands-on" experiences in segregated classrooms and schools.

Now

While mainstreaming is a term generally used to describe the placement of students with mild disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE) of the general education classroom, integration is the term used when students with more severe disabilities are moved from segregated schools to self-contained classrooms in chronologically age-appropriate public schools where they participate in the nonacademic portion of the school day—namely homeroom, lunch, and recess. If placed in general education classrooms, these are typically art, music, and physical education. Neither the terms mainstreaming or integration are concepts in Public Law 94-142. They have come, however, to be the terms referred to for these two populations identified as disabled when referring to the least restrictive environment construct that is in the law.

Two national organizations have been primarily responsible for how educational services are currently delivered to students with disabilities. These are the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), which is most closely identified with students with mild to moderate disabilities, and The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH), which is most closely identified with students with the most severe disabilities. While CEC is a professional organization mostly associated with the public school years, TASH has strong parental involvement as well as that of professionals and is associated with the full life-span of individuals with severe disabilities. The two organizations have been "at-odds" with one another in their interpretation and implementation of the least restrictive environment requirements of the law. TASH is the more fledgling organization and has always had policy related to the integration and inclusion of persons with severe disabilities in all aspects of community life. Both organizations have state chapters. Each organization is consulted on federal policy issues and each join coalitions when concerns or initiatives being addressed are consistent with their individual direction and mission. Finally, both hold annual conventions in the United States.

Lou Brown, his doctoral students at the University of Wisconsin, and his associates in the Madison Metropolitan School District (Brown et al., 1983; Brown et al., 1991) have used the work of Stokes and Baer (1977) on generalization to lay the framework for current instructional technology related to the education of students with severe disabilities. From their work we know that the closer the instructional environment is to the natural environment where the skills have to be utilized and maintained, the higher the probability is that they will. Because students with severe intellectual disabilities have more problems with generalization (Brown et al., 1991), require more instructional trials (Mercer & Snell, 1977), and have more problems with retention and recoupment (Snell, 1982) than do their peers who are not identified as disabled, the what, where, and how they are taught is of extreme importance. With this information, professionals developed the strategy of teaching students with severe disabilities in current and subsequent natural domestic, community at-large, recreation and leisure, vocational and school environments. Teachers conduct environmental or ecological inventories of how adults without disabilities perform in these natural environments. Students with severe disabilities are then taken into the environments to see how they perform and teachers analyze the discrepancy and form hypotheses regarding adaptations and instructional

strategies to achieve competence within the specific environment. Related service personnel, instead of pulling students out of the classroom, work with students in the natural environments and consult and collaborate with the special education teacher (Sternat, Messina, Nietupski, Lyon, & Brown, 1977). As students get older, they spend more time in natural environments, especially vocational environments, and less time in the school environment. The public school environment is not seen as a chronologically age-appropriate environment for young adults ages 19 to 21.

Transition from school to adult life whether that be work or continuing education is seen as important for both students with mild disabilities and severe disabilities. Illinois law requires that formal transition planning begin for all students requiring special education services at age 14 1/2. Federal law requires formal planning beginning at age 16.

Services to students with mild disabilities has changed very little over time. In some instances, the resource room has been replaced with collaboration strategies between general and special educators. Students who are in self-contained classes for learning disabilities still have to earn their way into the "mainstream" of general education.

The number of students identified as behavior disordered is on the increase. If students currently identified as having Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) become eligible for special education services under IDEA, informal projections are that up to 50% of the school-age population could be identified as disabled. Many recognize that this speaks more to what is occurring in classrooms than it does to the children who are being identified and labeled.

During this time frame that is constituted as "now," parents of young children with Down Syndrome have worked hard to have their children identified as having mild disabilities in order to have them served in self-contained "high incidence" classrooms in regular schools. In the past, Down Syndrome was synonymous with trainable mental handicaps, and following, with segregated TMH centers. This phenomenon illustrates the panic many parents experience when segregation, negative attitudes and low expectations are associated with disability labels. The current system of evaluation leading to categorical labels and consequent placements have "pitted" parents legally against school districts incurring astronomical financial and emotional costs to both families and educators.

Finally, the preparation of general and special education teachers has remained separate. Some universities and/or states require dual certification, but very little collaboration between the two has been evidenced. Ganschow, Weber, and Davis (1984) felt that Public Law 94-142 would have required that general education teachers be prepared differently. This has not, however, occurred. Freagon (1993) points out that no specific pedagogy for instructing students with disabilities has emerged over the years. Only 42% of state education agencies require at least one course on working with students identified as disabled (Ganschow et al., 1984). Only 30% of states have certification requirements for general educators working with students with disabilities (Smith & Schindler, 1980).

The Future

Kunc (1992) revisited Maslow's hierarchy of needs to make the point that as a society we have put individual achievement ahead of our need to belong. School dropouts, gangs, perfectionism and suicide, and segregated classes where children are forced to earn the right to belong, are all casualties of the inversion of Maslow's hierarchy. Maslow's hierarchy of human needs teaches us that belonging (after food, water, shelter, warmth and safety) is a prerequisite to, first, self-esteem and, then, self-actualization. Kunc writes:

Despite the wealth of research and personal experience that gives validity to Maslow's position, it is not uncommon for educators to work from the premise that *achievement and mastery rather than belonging are the primary if not the sole precursors for self-esteem*. . . . The current education system, in fact, has dissected and inverted Maslow's hierarchy of needs so that belonging has been transformed from an unconditional need and right of all people into something that must be earned, something, that can be achieved only by the "best" of us. . . . Students, upon entering school, are immediately expected to learn curriculum. Successful mastery of school work is expected to foster the children's sense of self-worth which in turn will enable them to join the community as "responsible citizens." Children are required, as it were, to *learn* their right to belong, (p. 31)

Kunc (1992) goes on to explain that viewing school inclusion of children with disabilities as a way to teach them skills to make them more "normal" legitimizes a world where uniformity and perfection are valued versus diversity where belonging is a human right and legally, a civil right.

Biklen (1992) sees phrases in Public Law 94-142, now IDEA, like "free appropriate public education" and "to the maximum extent appropriate" as "civil rights with escape clauses" (p. 85). These are the words that have put parents of children with disabilities and school districts at-odds if parents interpret "appropriate" as services (supports, aid(e)s and auricular adaptations) in the schools and classes their children would attend if nondisabled (inclusion).

The movement to serve children and youth with disabilities in the general education environments they would attend if nondisabled, has gathered a momentum that neither professionals nor parents anticipated. Parents have become tired of a system of education that segregates their children with disabilities rather than welcoming them as full members of the school community. They believe it is their children's' civil right to go through the same school building doors as do their brothers, sisters, neighbors and friends who are not labeled.

Several movements have become associated with parental unrest and with the undesirable outcomes of nearly 20 years of special education services. The Regular Education Initiative (REI), first referenced by Madeline Will who was President Reagan's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) Director, advocates pre-referral intervention strategies and services such as collaboration and consultation between special and general

educators versus "pull-out" resource services. REI has typically been associated with students with mild or "high-incidence" disabilities. Inclusion, meaning placement in the child's school and classes they would attend if not disabled with appropriate supports, aid(e)s, and auricular adaptations, began with students considered to have moderate to severe intellectual and/or multiple disabilities (Monahan & Cohen, 1993). Inclusion is sometimes referred to as "supported education." Standards are individually determined and there are no prerequisites.

School districts which are implementing REI and inclusion realize that the two concepts are not mutually exclusive. To have all children participate in the schools and classes they would attend in not identified as disabled, schools must collapse resources and create educational environments where responsibility for all students is shared. Students with "high-incidence" disabilities need supports, aid(e)s, and curricular adaptations just as students with "low-incidence" disabilities can benefit from teacher collaboration and consultation. Therefore, inclusion, has come to be the common-practice term.

The paradigm for separate schooling of children with disabilities is obviously strong. States have invested multi-millions annually in an infrastructure for its support. The state of Illinois annually spends \$110,000,000 to transport children away from their home schools. Projections are that if Illinois used a building-based cost resource model like that of Pennsylvania's where 10 to 15% of the children in a building are considered eligible for special education services, 1% of those children have severe disabilities and the State allocates additional money for unusual cases, Illinois would only spend 60% of what is currently being used. The additional 40% could then be reallocated for additional supports, aid(e)s and curricular adaptations (Kane, 1993).

General and special educators as well as parents are concerned with how much time a student with intellectual disabilities should spend in the general education classroom. Brown et al. (1991) refer to the 0% Club and the 100% Club when addressing this question for students with severe intellectual disabilities. Those that believe that students with disabilities should spend no time in general education classes belong to the 0% Club, and those that think they should spend all their time in general education classes belong to the 100% Club. Somewhere between 0% and 100% is the answer. One hundred percent, however, would be much better than 0%. Brown et al. recommend that for students with severe intellectual disabilities, the following be accounted for when determining the amount of time in the general education classroom:

1. The number of skills that can be learned by the student with intellectual disabilities compared with the number that can be learned by the students who are not labeled.
2. The concrete versus abstract nature of class experiences understanding that the student with intellectual disabilities benefits most from concrete learning.
3. The number of instructional trials needed by the student with intellectual disabilities to learn a construct and the rate of curricular progression used by the teacher.
4. The opportunities available for the student with intellectual disabilities to practice then-skills in the natural environments where they can use them.

5. The opportunities available for the student with intellectual disabilities to receive instruction in nonschool natural community environments for purposes of generalization to adult-living environments.
6. The range of difficulty of the skills being taught in the general education classroom realizing that the student with an intellectual disability will acquire less as the information provided increases in complexity.

Brown and his colleagues (1983, 1991) advocate that home schools are imperative and that every child be "based" in the general education classes he or she would attend if not disabled. While a child may not spend 100% of their time in the general education classroom, it would be inconsistent with inclusion if that child were to spend any time of the school day in special-education-only environments. A school that practices inclusion does not have any space where only children with disabilities go for academics, nonacademics or extracurricular activities.

While Brown et al. (1991) advocate the above considerations for the learning of students with severe intellectual disabilities, others would say they also apply for all students including those identified as gifted. Noted Harvard educator, Howard Gardner (1993) cites researchers at John Hopkins University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) who asked students who had gotten A's in physics classes basic questions regarding how the world works. They found that the students they questioned did not know how to apply, in the "real" world context, what they had learned in class. The majority of students answered the questions the same way 5-year-olds would answer them. He describes three types of understanding: (a) the intuitive understanding of the young child, (b) the understanding of the scholastic learner who has knowledge in a very explicit context and is able to feed back specific information read in a text when the right type of question is asked, and (c) the understanding of the individual who possesses knowledge and knows when and how to use it. Most schools, if not all, have taught to the scholastic learner with expectations and standards for both special and general education students which do not constitute understanding.

Gardner (1993) explains:

To learn to think well as a physicist is to learn to think in a way that's very different from thinking like a literary critic. . . . I believe there are no such things as critical thinking skills in general. If you want to think critically, you must learn to think critically in different disciplines. You can't count on knowing that if you think critically in biology, that's going to make you a better critical thinker in the arts. It won't hurt, but it won't solve the transfer problem for you either, (pp. 22-23)

. . . educate for understanding . . . having a sufficient grasp of concepts, principles, or skills so that you can bring them to bear on new problems and situations. That might sound simple, and nearly every teacher I know—myself included—would claim to teach for understanding. . . . There's ample evidence in every corner of the curriculum that schools aren't achieving this all-important goal. Curiously this failure is not so much deliberate as unwitting. Knowing how kids learn is the key. (p. 21)

Gardner, in an interview with Brandt (1993), explains that,

We've got to do a lot fewer things in school. The greatest enemy of understanding is coverage. As long as you are determined to cover everything, you actually ensure that most kids are not going to understand. You've got to take enough time to get kids deeply involved in something so they can think about it in lots of different ways and apply it—not just at school but at home and on the street and so on. (p. 7)

Increasingly, we are finding out how kids learn. We are finding they learn the same way whether labeled or not. This will necessitate a rethinking of the traditional classroom to a classroom that includes instruction in natural community environments for all children. Gardner in his interview with Brandt (1993) discusses apprenticeships and children's museums as effective educational strategies to also achieve understanding. If Gardner's ideas are implemented, the inclusion of children with disabilities will be significantly enhanced.

An issue of concern when children with disabilities are included is the perceived "slowing-down" or detrimental effects on the education of children not labeled if children who are labeled are included. Vandercook et al. (1991) cite schools in Colorado, Michigan, New York, and Minnesota that examined the academic, and in some instances behavioral, achievement of students not labeled when students identified as having mild, moderate, and severe disabilities were included in general education classes. Findings from the four studies were that the academic achievement of students without labels were not adversely affected when students with disabilities were included.

Of significant importance to the future of school inclusion for children with disabilities are conclusions of law determined by the federal courts. Three such recent cases are Oberti v. Board of Education of Borough of Clemontton School District (1993); Greer v. Rome City School District (1991); and Board of Education. Sacramento City Unified School District v. Holland (1992). In each case, the parents fought to have their children included in general education environments. In Oberti, the court concluded that in the IDEA (formerly Public Law 94-142), "[i]nclusion is a right, not a privilege for select few" (p. 29). The court also concluded that "success in special schools and special classes does not lead to successful functioning in integrated society, which is clearly one of the goals of the IDEA" (p. 29). In Greer, the Eleventh Circuit noted:

[B]efore the school district may conclude that a handicapped child should be educated outside the regular classroom, it must consider whether supplemental aids and services would permit satisfactory education in the regular classroom. The school district must consider the whole range of supplemental aids and services, including resource rooms and itinerant instruction, for which it is obligated under the Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder to make provision. Only when the handicapped child's education may not be achieved satisfactorily, even with one or more of these supplemental aids and services, may the school board consider placing the child outside of the regular classroom. (950 F.2d at 696)

In an unprecedented move, the United States filed an *amicus curiae* brief (Brief for the United States as *Amicus Curiae* Supporting Appellees, 1992) on behalf of Rachel Holland, a child with Down Syndrome seeking inclusion in the Sacramento City Unified School District. Rachel's parents won a state-level due process hearing on her behalf. The hearing officer ordered the school district to place Rachel in a general education classroom with specific supplementary support services. The Sacramento school district appealed this decision to the federal District Court. The school district argued that the court should adopt an evaluation of a district's compliance with the mainstreaming requirement of the IDEA where placement is made based on the category of disability that a child "suffers" and the cost of that placement based on the State's funding formula for special education and general education classes. The school district further argued that the IDEA required that only teachers with special education requirements could provide educational services to eligible children.

The District Court affirmed the hearing officer's decision, and the school district appealed the lower court's ruling to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals which in turn affirmed the District Court's findings in January of 1994. The Ninth Circuit is where the United States filed the *amicus curiae* brief. The United States presented four arguments on Rachel's behalf. These were that:

1. The District Court correctly recognized IDEA'S presumption in favor of mainstreaming and not placement based on categorical label.
2. The District Court considered the appropriate factors in applying the mainstreaming presumption to the specific fact of the case.
3. The provision of supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment must be based on individual needs—not funding formulae.
4. The IDEA contemplates involvement by both regular and special education personnel in achieving the goals and objectives described in a child's IEP.

In the *amicus curiae* brief (Brief for the United States as *Amicus Curiae* Supporting Appellees, 1992), the United States said:

The school district's brief is replete with mischaracterizations of the mainstreaming requirement of the IDEA, and of the Department of Education's policy on educating children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Despite the school district's assertions to the contrary, the district court's decision correctly recognized the IDEA'S strong presumption in favor of mainstreaming children with disabilities into regular education classrooms. In applying the presumption to the specific facts of this case, the district court appropriately applied many of the factors that the federal appellate courts have identified as relevant in evaluating whether the mainstreaming requirement has been complied with by a public educational agency.

As the agency charged with responsibility for administering the IDEA, the Department of Education has an obvious and substantial interest in assuring that the provisions of the Act are properly implemented by the states. We are therefore submitting this brief as *amicus curiae* to urge affirmance of the district court's

judgment, and to address the school district's misstatements of the law, and of the Department of Education's position, (pp. 8-9)

Monahan and Cohen (1993) provide parents with 10 practical steps to achieve inclusion for their child prior to going to due process and ultimately the courts. These are:

1. The identification and "highlighting" of what the child can do versus cannot do.
2. Bring to the IEP meeting to be discussed, goals and objectives that can be achieved in the general education environment.
3. Conduct a critical review of all components of the case study evaluation and where necessary, have an independent evaluation.
4. Become familiar with the curricular options available to same-age children who do not have labels.
5. Be aware that most school staff are not familiar with how inclusion will look for individual children and that they will benefit from a vision or picture of how it could be accomplished.
6. Identify advocates who are familiar with inclusive schooling and staffing arrangements.
7. Provide the district with names of school districts which are successfully including students with disabilities and encourage visitations.
8. If the school district resists inclusion, inquire as to what specific goals and objectives on the IEP cannot be implemented in the general classroom with supports and aids.
9. Prior to the IEP meeting, identify staff who are in concert with your views and discuss your desires informally.
10. Be pragmatic and try to achieve inclusion that works for the family, the child and the school.

If parents can't be successful doing the above, Monahan and Cohen (1993) recommend consultation with outside evaluators and educational consultants, joining parent support groups and procuring legal counsel.

Finally, Biklen (1992) describes effective, inclusive schools as having three characteristics: (a) commitment, (b) organizational framework, and (c) elements of schooling. In the area of commitment, all persons comprising the educational community share a democratic philosophy, purpose, and educational values. A sense of community exists, and all school leaders assume responsibility for the success of all students learning together. The schools' organizational framework and procedures reflect the components of the commitment made including financial priorities. Students with disabilities are served within the same administrative structure as are students without labels. The adults in the school are integrated and function in teams in a collaborative and problem-solving mode. In the area of effective elements of schooling, students are grouped heterogeneously and not by ability and they work as co-participants on projects. All students participate in the full range of activities offered and instruction incorporates learning-by-doing or experiential learning into all aspects of the curriculum. Adults model social skills and educational approaches related to student supports. Feedback to students on their performance is frequently provided and accommodations for students with disabilities are natural to the environment and nonobtrusive. Students with disabilities have opportunities to fill leadership roles just as do their peers who do not have

labels. Students are encouraged to get to know and support one another. Independence is rewarded and interdependence is realized. The school uses a common language to describe all students and the community of parents, teachers and students view themselves and one another as critical thinkers. High expectations are set and continually evaluated with revisions based on the outcomes.

Summary

The future of inclusive schooling will ultimately rest in the preservice preparation of both special and general education teachers and administrators. Inservice training will always be necessary as technology changes and expands over the teaching and administration careers of those involved in schooling on a daily basis. Inservice training, however, does not provide sufficient immersion in learning to produce change in a timely and effective way. Albert Shanker (1993), President of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), in a considerably negative article on inclusion in the *New York Times*, talks about a teacher who described her training to work with children with disabilities as "one video that showed a couple of mildly retarded students." Kearney and Durand (1992) surveyed chairpersons of 58 postsecondary schools of education in New York State as to the sufficiency of their preparation of regular educators to work in mainstream settings. Thirty-five schools responded. Findings were that only a minority of the programs offered dual certification in general and special education or provided preparation in collaborative teaching and education. They cite authors who have suggested that parent groups and childcare professionals organize to provide pressure on state legislators to mandate adequate teacher preparation to work with children with disabilities in mainstream schools. Kearney and Durand summarize with the following observations:

The failure of education programs to compensate for deficiencies in state education requirements regarding mainstreaming may lead to serious consequences. . . . If postsecondary schools of education fail to improve the curricula necessary for teachers to maintain successful integrated classrooms, then it is likely that state education agencies will be instructed to impose more stringent criteria. We recommend, therefore, that schools revise their current requirements regarding mainstreaming to avoid forced curricula changes that they may not be able to implement, (p. 10)

Imperative, then, is that schools of education in the colleges and universities preparing teachers and administrators for the future begin serious dialogue concerning the diversity that is fast becoming commonplace in the American school. Children with disabilities need to be viewed as part of the diverse school population rather than an "add-on" to teacher and administrator responsibilities. Children with disabilities have the right to walk through the same school doors as do their brothers, sisters, neighbors and friends. They have the right to "civil rights without escape clauses" (Biklen, 1992). We need to set our sights on the celebration of diversity, not its condemnation.

REFERENCES

- Biklen, D. (1992). Schooling without labels: Parents, educators, and inclusive education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Holland, 786 F. Supp. 874 (E.D. Cal. 1992).
- Brandt, R. (1993, April). On teaching for understanding: A conversation with Howard Gardner. Educational Leadership. 50, 4-7.
- Brief for the United States as *Amicus Curiae* supporting appellees. United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, No. 92-15608. Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Holland. 786 F. Supp. 874 (E.D. Cal. 1992).
- Brown, L., Nisbet, J., Ford, A., Sweet, M., Shiraga, B., York, J., & Lomis, R. (1983). The critical need for nonschool instruction in educational programs for severely handicapped students. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 8, 71-77.
- Brown, L., Schwarz, P., Udvari-Solner, A., Kampschroer, E. F., Johnson, F., Jorgensen, J., & Gruenewald, L. (1991). How much time should students with severe intellectual disabilities spend in regular education classrooms and elsewhere. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 16(1), 39-47.
- Freagon, S. (1993, August). Testimony on professional training in inclusionary education. National Council on Disability hearings on making inclusionary education work: Overcoming barriers to quality, Chicago.
- Ganschow, L., Weber, D. B., & Davis, M. (1984). Preservice teacher preparation for mainstreaming. Exceptional Children. 51, 74-76.
- Gardner, H. (1993). Educating for understanding. The American School Board Journal. 180(7). 20-24.
- Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. (1989). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review. 57(4), 367-394.
- Greer v. Rome City School District, 950 F.2d 688 (11th Cir. 1991).
- Hemp, R., Freagon, S., & Leininger, R. C. (1991). Classification and funding: Illinois disincentives to home school inclusion. Springfield, IL: Illinois Advisory Council on Developmental Disabilities.

- Kane, D. (1993, August) Testimony on financial disincentives to inclusive education in Illinois. National Council on Disability hearings on making inclusion education work: Overcoming barriers to quality, Chicago.
- Kearney, C. A., & Durand, V. M. (1992). How prepared are our teachers of mainstreamed classroom settings? A survey of postsecondary schools of education in New York State. Exceptional Children. 59(1), 6-11.
- Kunc, N. (1992). The need to belong: Rediscovering Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In R. A. Villa, J. S. Thousand, W. Stainback, & S. Stainback (Eds.), Restructuring for caring and effective education: An administrative guide to creating heterogeneous schools (pp. 25-39). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Mercer, C. D., & Snell, M. E. (1977). Denny's elicitation theory and incidental learning of the retarded. In C. D. Mercer & M. E. Snell (Eds.), Learning theory research in mental retardation: Implications for teaching (pp. 142-177). Columbus OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Monahan, J., & Cohen, M. D. (1993). Health, human services, and disability law. Update. 1-2.
- National Association of State Boards of Education Study Group on Special Education. (1992). Winners all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA.
- Oberti v. Board of Education of Borough of Clemonton School District, 801 F.Supp. 1392 (3d Cir. 1993).
- Shanker, A. (1993, September 19). Where we stand: A rush to inclusion. The New York Times. Sec. 4, p. 9.
- Smith, J. E., & Schindler, W. J. (1980). Certification requirements of general educators concerning exceptional pupils. Exceptional Children. 46, 394-396.
- Snell, M. (1982). Characteristics of the profoundly mentally retarded. In P. T. Cegelka & H. J. Prehm (Eds.), Mental retardation: From categories to people (pp. 291-308). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- SRI International. (1991). National longitudinal transition study of special education students. Menlo Park, CA.
- Sternat, J., Messina, R., Nietupski, J., Lyon, S., & Brown, L. (1977). Occupational and physical therapy services for severely handicapped students: Toward a naturalized public school service delivery model. In E. Sontag, J. Smith, & N. Certo (Eds.), Educational programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped (pp. 263-278). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Stokes, T., & Baer, D. (1977). An implicit technology of generalization. Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis. 10, 349-367.

Vandercook, T., York, J., Sharpe, M., Knight, J., Salisbury, C, LeRoy, B., & Rozleski, E. (1991). The million dollar question. IMPACT. 4(3), 20-21.

Training to Teach Students with Disabilities: A Parent's Perspective

Donald Buell

Parent and President of People for Inclusive Communities

I am a parent of a 13-year-old boy with Down Syndrome and a 9-year-old girl with no diagnosed disability. I am not a "professional" in the field of disabilities or education; I'm a businessman. I am also the unpaid president of a consumer advocacy organization known as People for Inclusive Communities (PIC). I have experienced various approaches to teaching my son: in-home-tutoring, small classes with other students with disabilities, one-on-one or one-on-two "pull out sessions," and inclusion (when Don goes to the school he would attend if he did not have a disability and he is a member of general education classes that have "natural proportions;" special educators work with the regular education teacher to develop and administer a modified curriculum).

What I would like to do here is describe to you the goals I desire for my child with a disability, and the training and characteristics of teachers who, in my experience, have the greatest likelihood of helping my child reach those goals. Hopefully you, as preparers of teachers, can use this information to improve the selection of trainees for your programs, share their expectations and design training programs to produce the kind of teachers students with disabilities need.

Goals

I want my child with a disability to have the opportunity to reside, work, recreate and socialize, with whom, where and when he (and his friends) chooses, with minimal reliance on paid support. I want him to develop his abilities as fully as possible, and have the opportunity to be exposed to as much of life as possible, so he knows the choices available to him. I want that for my child who does not have a disability as well.

Ninety-nine percent of those opportunities are in the "regular" world. My children, when they have been exposed to the things in the "regular" world and to those set up especially for persons with disabilities, choose those in the "regular" world. And that's where 99% of the good paying, full benefit jobs are. Therefore, I firmly believe that the greater the participation and exposure of students with disabilities to the "regular education world," and the greater the exposure of the "regular education world" to students with disabilities, the greater will be the chances of students with disabilities achieving these goals.

The best way to prepare my son for that world, and that world for him, is to have him spend as much time as possible with "regular" peers, and for them to do the same. By doing that, both he, a student with a disability, and those students without disabilities, gain experience on a daily basis, working and playing with each other as kids, that will enable them to do the same as adults. I have never understood how people can separate these two populations

throughout their formative years, and then expect to "throw" them together after age 21 and have everything work just fine.

The only way I can see this happening from the educational system is to do it through "inclusive education" - where he goes to the same school and attends the same classes, with the necessary aids and supports, as his age-appropriate neighborhood peers.

Characteristics of Teachers for Inclusive Education

My experience and that of other PIC members, is that our children with disabilities will be best prepared to reach their goals by teachers who value every child and want to teach them. Inclusion will flourish under such teachers, and their attitudes will be noticed and adopted by their students.

We must adopt a philosophy in the education of teachers that they will welcome into their classrooms all students in the community, no matter their level of ability or disability. With a cadre of such teachers moving through "the system," the parents will not be taunted by the comments made to me by the Director of Pupil Services of a wealthy North Shore (of Chicago) district: "What if the teachers don't want to teach your son?" My reply was, "What if I don't want to pay the taxes that support their salaries?"

Along with that value, we need teachers who are committed and will try their best, to teach all students. The concept needs to be instilled that the teacher is responsible for each of the students, and that the removal of any student from the classroom is a failure on the part of all concerned. Another characteristic we need is a willingness to reach out to, and cooperate with specialists when a child is not learning to his or her maximum potential. Therefore, all teachers need to be trained in the assessment of student learning styles and alternate forms of teaching. All teachers also need to understand the role of specialists and to be taught how to team with the specialists and parents to maximize the role of the student. Classroom teachers should welcome specialists into the room. This means we need to be on guard for candidates for teaching programs who want to "own" their rooms and students. Responsibility is appropriate, but ownership to the point where "s/he won't let anyone else into his/her room" is unacceptable.

Clearly, there is a major role in assisting the regular education teacher for specialists in the education of students with disabilities. However, that role should not be to diagnose those with disabilities, for "culling out." Nor should we encourage those candidates to be "specialists" whose aspirations are focused on teaching small classes of only students with disabilities. Rather, the role and aspiration of the specialists should be to work with the classroom teacher and the parents as a team, to assess learning styles and provide consulting services and curriculum modifications to ensure that all students in the class are learning at their maximum potential. Therefore, it is critical that the special education teachers be taught not only the technology of alternative teaching strategies, but the art of teaming so that they can work with others to share their skills.

Clearly, this means a major change in the roles of both special and regular education teachers. That says something about the selection process for teachers who want to go into "special education." In many conversations I have had with special education teachers, they said one of the reasons they entered special education was because they wanted to have small classes of students with disabilities, where they could work intensively with those students to "make a difference." That is a noble thought, but one that is based on a model that has proven incapable, in most instances, of helping the student reach the goals outlined above. The goal must be what is best for the student, not what meets preconceived needs of the prospective teachers. Therefore, in the screening process of accepting prospective teachers into "special education," we must be able to communicate clearly the best ways to help the students, and have such prospective teachers want to continue under those guidelines.

In a book co-authored by Marilyn Friend and Lynne Cook (1992), they wrote, "... [s]pecial service providers sometimes fear they will be used as classroom aides, a demeaning and inappropriate role shift for them" (p. 168). I submit to you that this phrase typifies some of the present problems in the education of students with disabilities. Such statements reveal a focus more on the needs of the "special educator" for status and control than the needs of the students for inclusion as the appropriate way to meet their goals. We must have special educators whose goal is in fact to do whatever it takes to help the students succeed in the regular education setting. With that goal in mind, the special educator will find the requests for their services growing, as regular education classroom teachers begin to see them as valuable resources for improving the ability of that teacher to deal with every student in the class.

Furthermore, in the training of persons to teach students with disabilities, we must train them to assess results. That is, just as regular education takes great pride in the number of students that go on to college and get jobs, special educators should take pride when students no longer need special education and/or an Individualized Educational Program (*SEP*) and when they get accepted into college or other post-high-school settings, and when they get full-time paying jobs with benefits.

We also need teachers with a sense of perspective and humor. One year, a goal for my son was to have him stop "talking to his hand." He had developed the habit of using his hand as a puppet, using it to deflect criticism, or, sometimes, to administer self-criticism. We had made great progress. Then, one day as my wife was picking up our son at school, she asked the teacher, "How did it go today?" The teacher responded: "The hand is back!" at which point everyone (including my son) had a great laugh - knowing it was back to work on the "hand thing" the next day.

And finally, have all your prospective teachers student teach in inclusive settings.

With teachers with such characteristics and training, I know we will end up with all students having higher levels of achievement and prepared to be better citizens in our pluralistic society.

REFERENCES

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

A Superintendent's View of Inclusion and the Preparation of Teachers

James Erickson
Former Superintendent,
Illinois Elementary District #20, Keeneyville

Public Act 87-1103, State of Illinois was amended in 1992 to include the following phrase:

The General Assembly finds and declares that principals and teachers of students with disabilities require training and guidance that provide ways for working successfully with children who have difficulties conforming to acceptable behavioral patterns in order to provide an environment in which learning can occur.

It is no longer an issue "if" we will include students in regular education classrooms, but "when" and "how well." Regular educators will face new challenges to their effectiveness in delivering instruction to a wider range of students with varying needs and learning styles.

The pre-service (college training) programs for classroom staff and ongoing inservice training for teachers in regular education present two opportunities for helping to improve the educating of today's students.

The basic issue is that of commitment to the philosophy contained in the draft Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE, 1993) position statement:

Children belong together, regardless of their ability or disability. By being together during their school years, they have an opportunity to learn, to grow, to model appropriate behaviors; to improve language and communication skills to form friendships and learn community values, and to plan for the future together. Separating any child from his or her neighborhood classmates is appropriate only when it is individually advantageous for that student for the delivery of appropriate instruction, (p. 1)

That kind of commitment will require a philosophical paradigm shift. The universities and colleges, therefore, should provide educators the needed description of past efforts to educate special students in pull-out programs. The discontinuity, fragmented schedules and locations, inconsistent approaches and lack of engaged time would show that self-contained programs have not achieved the intended effects of improved achievement, social-emotional adjustment, and social acceptance (Gartner & Lipski, 1987; Idol, West, & Lloyd, 1988). It is my contention that we cannot initiate change without understanding the status quo or past practice.

Next, a review of reform efforts that are underway in general education should be discussed with special regard to special education.

Three questions may provide a framework for teacher education as it relates to inclusive practice.

1. What are the roles and responsibilities of the staff? (How do we deal with time and planning constraints?)
2. How should we modify the curriculum and measure progress? (How do we provide for curriculum accommodations and measuring progress?)
3. How can we build acceptance of inclusion and professional community? (How do we promote acceptance?)

Higher education has the unique role of training and providing opportunities for preparing regular educators to cope with the following:

Roles and responsibilities

- Writing IEP's in integrated settings
- Using peer coaching, flexigrouping, team teaching cooperative learning
- Teaching in collaborative, team approaches (co-teaching)
- * Shared decision making (ownership)
- * Integration of subject areas
- * Using varied teaching approaches (interactive learning)
- * Mentoring, peer achievement
- * Working in a school within a school configuration
- * Using behavioral interventions (management plans)
- * Learning non-aversive, behavioral intervention techniques

Curriculum, modification and measurement

- Modification of the curriculum, use of alternative, intervention strategies (curriculum adaptation)
- Use of different learning/teaching styles and how are they applied
- * Use of multi-age grouping
- * Use of continuous progress measure
- * Use of curriculum based assessment techniques
- Application of differentiated curriculum for a variety of students needs, (personalizing or individualizing the program)
- Use of a variety of techniques for monitoring progress (portfolios, teacher-made assessment)

Acceptance of inclusion (Use of committees)

- Use of parent-teacher (advisory)
- Preparation of policies, purpose statements
- Agreement and adoption of common practice

- Provision of resource, lower class sizes and shared ownership among all groups involved
- Inservice of teachers, TA's, supportive service staff, parents, administrators
- Cooperative development of District philosophy, mission and identification of factors critical to achievement of the mission
- Cooperative development of methods to reallocate resources to support inclusion

These three areas are fertile field for higher education to help administrators, staff and other adult learners to assist in servicing students with disabilities in their regular home school.

REFERENCES

- Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review. 57(4), 367-395.
- Idol, L. J., West, F., & Lloyd, S. R. (1988). Organizing and implementing specialized reading programs: A collaboration approach involving classroom, remedial, and special education teachers. RASE. 9(2), 54-61.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (1993, April 5). Draft position statement on the inclusion of students with disabilities.

A View of Inclusion

Robert Leininger
Former State Superintendent,
Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)

What is the status of inclusive education in Illinois today? It is not yet where I would like it to be. Yes, we have some wonderful examples of where it is occurring but that is the exception rather than standard practice.

My point of view comes from being the State Superintendent, a lifelong Illinois educator, a parent and a grandparent. I believe that *kids belong with kids*. To me, the rationale for inclusive education is simple. Kids are kids, and should be with other kids. They should have opportunities in their home schools and home communities. That includes, not excludes, youngsters with disabilities. Inclusion is also more than a schooling issue. A community needs to have an inclusive perspective, and relate that to jobs, to housing, to recreation and to other aspects of local activities. I'd say that also means *teachers belong with teachers, from a higher education viewpoint, to learn from one another*.

Kids teach each other, and challenge each other. We have too much evidence that shows low expectations produce low outcomes. If we are serious about schools serving all populations, and about following the Illinois Goals for World-Class Education, preparing all students to live and produce in a global society, we cannot afford to continue the labeling and separation.

Children see it the same way. Ask any kid where the "slow learner" class is. They will tell you. From the earliest years tracking seems to occur, no matter what we call it. Attitudes and expectations of and for children are formed. I see inclusive education as a "win-win" proposition for us all, for children with and without disabilities. It is not "dumping," when done correctly. Supports and services must be in place for success.

Let me explain what inclusion is, and isn't. From there I'll address what we have done and what we have yet to do.

What is inclusion?

Inclusion is not a federally- or state-defined term. It is a state-of-the-art term, meaning that:

- all students attend the school they would attend if not identified as disabled;
- age-and grade-appropriate school and general education placements are made, with no self-contained classes operative at the school site; and
- special education supports and services are provided within the context of the general education class and in other integrated environments.

In an inclusive education model, students are not assigned to any setting other than the general education class and are a regular member of that class. In short, they have no other classroom assignment. Further, there are no prerequisites for performing at or near grade level academically or socially to be a part of the class. This can be viewed as the "spirit of the law," of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), while the least restrictive environment mandate, known as LRE, can be conceived of as the "letter of the law."

Inclusion does not mean several things. It doesn't mean:

- dumping kids into classrooms without the necessary supports and services;
- cutting back on special education services;
- ignoring unique needs;
- making all children learn the same thing, the same way and at the same time;
- expecting regular education teachers to teach children with disabilities without support; or
- sacrificing the education of "typical"¹¹ children so that children with disabilities can be included.

In summary, inclusion works only with an individual student determination, through the IEP process with the family, on what is the appropriate site for delivering the specialized instruction and related aids and services the child needs that year. Students need to be educated in their community, unless that team decides an appropriate alternative is necessary for that year.

What Has Been Done?

How has the State Board of Education promoted the point of view of an inclusive education being of value? We have in several ways to date, with more to be done in the future. To date, we have put our money where our mouth is:

- We pay attention to the critical importance of the early years of schooling. Attitudes are formed then, and disabilities are easier to address and ameliorate when noted early.
- We are creating inclusive systems of early education, particularly for infants, toddlers and their families, through Local Interagency Councils on Early Intervention being funded as the infrastructure in communities. The ISBE is the lead agency in this endeavor, and uses federal and state funds for it.
- We have provided funding for at-risk programs, addressing the needs of three-and four-year-old children at risk of school failure, rather than expecting them to go on and fail at the kindergarten or first grade level and possibly having to then receive specialized instruction due to those failure experiences.
- We have provided a Statewide Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Initiative through Project CHOICES (Children Have Opportunities For Inclusive Community Environments) since 1988-89 and Early CHOICES (for 3- and 4-year olds) since 1990-91. These sites promote the Least Restrictive Environment requirement through federal

discretionary dollars to districts on a voluntary basis. These sites receive inservice training and on-site consultation. Some of the sites have not only returned students from segregated environments to integrated school environments, but have taken this requirement to its ultimate conclusion and created inclusive settings in the home school. In FY 93 that meant about \$500,000 in IDEA Part B dollars for Project CHOICES and another \$650,000 in IDEA Preschool dollars for Early CHOICES.

- We have funded, with federal dollars during several years and with state dollars commencing in FY 93, activities to promote the Regular Education Initiative (REI). These actions encourage and support special education and regular education personnel in working together cooperatively to provide a total education program for all students. This is helping the regular educator to expand his or her envelope of skills and serve a broader spectrum of learning needs than has been met before, working with children prior to a referral "out" for specialized instruction when possible.
- In FY 93, about \$1.2 million in state funding was expended for awareness and in-depth training for building-based teams, for five regional workshops, for two higher education faculty institutes, for *The Initiator* newsletter which went to all school buildings in Illinois, for a clearinghouse on resources and materials, and for grants to school districts.
- We've also been working with some federally-funded discretionary projects in communities, seeking to return adolescents with behavior and emotion problems closer to home if not to their home school. We prefer to educate the child or youth within Maine Township, for example, rather than the State of Maine, if we can do it by creating community-based public/private partnerships and assisting with what is called "wrap-around services" locally.
- We are also looking at our current state special education rules to see which ones can be modified, clarified, added or deleted. The purpose of this task is to make them more flexible and remove the barriers that have been identified, some of them being barriers to services being offered in a more inclusive setting than is currently done.

What Needs To Be Done?

The ISBE is reviewing a draft position statement, really a statement of values, on inclusive education. The statement has received extensive public comment, and will be brought back before the Board later in 1994 for discussion and action.

With these values in place at the schoolhouse level, we need to begin to address attitudes and expectations towards persons with disabilities. We need to address training issues, both of a preservice and inservice natures. We need to assure that our monitoring system addresses inclusive education settings so that the necessary supports and services will be in place for children receiving specialized instruction in that manner. Resources need to be in place, and appropriately focused as well.

Our teachers need to know more than they do about the range of student diversity and learning styles. All educators need information and skill development on how to provide and accept consultative services, adaptations and accommodations that will be needed by youngsters with disabilities in the inclusive classroom. Teachers will also need help with assistive devices and medical equipment that may come with some of the children. We need to begin to eliminate barriers to inclusive education by refocusing and changing college courses to meet these needs.

Perhaps a corollary to *kids belong with kids*, speaking to higher education, is *teachers belong with teachers*. Institutions of higher education in teacher training will need to train their teachers for inclusion from both ends - new instructors and experienced teachers. They'll need to work to change attitudes, expand the knowledge base on student and learning style diversity, and constantly encourage collaboration and consultation.

To reach the goal of inclusive education, we have a long way to go on this road, but we've got the tools and the ability to build the pavement and smooth it out. The Dean's Symposium is a great start. Let this be just the beginning for inclusive education from a higher education perspective.

The Role of Higher Education in Creating Inclusive Schools

Virginia Roach
Deputy Executive Director,
National State Boards of Education

In October 1992, the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) released the results of a two-year study of special education reform. The report, *Winners all: A Call For Inclusive Schools*, recommends that the dual special education/general education system be replaced by a new inclusive system in which students with disabilities, to the maximum extent possible, attend regular classes and learn alongside their regular education peers. Such a system would be part of a broader initiative to restructure schools; it would emphasize student-centered learning and would call for regular and special educators to work side-by-side in the same classrooms. In inclusive schools, general education and specialized services would complement and support each other. Special educational services would be provided in the regular classroom as a support for all students who might need them in order to achieve expected outcomes. Emphasis would be placed on improved instruction for all students, rather than on the processes of classifying, labeling, and segregating students.

Winners All thus calls for creating a unitary system to improve instruction for all learners. The report describes in greater detail how an inclusive system can be created. Recommendations in the report center around three areas: 1) creating education goals for ALL children; 2) developing collaborative partnerships and joint training programs between general and special educators; and 3) severing links between funding, placement, and student labeling, so that funding requirements do not drive programming and placement decisions for students.

The capacity of teachers and other educational personnel to create an inclusive environment rests largely on specific training and education. Currently, teachers are trained and socialized to expect that there are two types of students and teachers - regular and special. Because of this, many general education teachers feel that they are incapable of teaching students with special needs. And, as long as they have placement options, teachers will seek to place away those children who do not "fit" into the regular program. Yet, many times it is not special education, but regular classroom instruction that needs to be changed. Teachers, the report recommends, should focus their attention on school deficiencies rather than student deficiencies.

At the same time, though, special educators often lack adequate training to develop curricula or to adapt the general education curriculum. Thus, a handicapping label often dictates the curriculum for a student in special education (e.g., the "learning disabled" student will receive the "learning disabled" curriculum). Nor do the problems lie solely in the curriculum. Ironically, special educators often narrowly define with whom they will work, even while they are teaching in exactly the same manner as their general education counterparts.

The goal of training for both special and general educators should be to create a greater capacity for both types of teachers to teach a diverse student population. One way to do this is to foster

partnerships and joint training programs between general and special educators. NASBE suggests three broad actions in this area. First, training programs for both in-service and pre-service teachers should be merged to abolish the "two camp" mentality that currently exists where teachers narrowly define with whom they should work. Second, states should reduce and consolidate the categories of teaching certificates they offer, because certificates also narrowly define the students with whom the certificated teachers will work. Finally, state departments of education and local school districts should place a high priority on ongoing professional development to enhance veteran teachers' capacity to work with a diverse array of students.

Winners All Recommendations on Personnel Development

The NASBE report recommends merging general and special education training programs at both the pre-service and in-service level. To effect this change, state boards of education could use their teacher education program approval authority as leverage; the report recommends, however, that state boards instead employ incentives to encourage districts to merge special education and general education programs.

In addition, state boards and other policy leaders can assist teacher educators by convening groups to discuss what teachers need to know and be able to do to effectively teach in inclusive environments. In Massachusetts, for example, a state task force on teacher professionalism made a series of recommendations that were then adopted by the state board of education. Pursuant to these recommendations, which are now in place as policy, all colleges in Massachusetts must abide by a two-state model for education which includes: 1) a solid foundation in the liberal arts and sciences; and 2) an integration of subject matter, pedagogy, and knowledge of culture and *individual differences*, along with clinical experiences prior to and during the first year(s) of teaching.

Some teacher education programs allow students to complete a dual major in special education and general education. Often these programs simply layer special education on top of the general education curriculum. In merged training programs, however, the approach is entirely different from that of the traditional teacher education course of study. For example, the elementary and special education program at La Salle University uses "developmental theory and its applications as theoretical orientation;" in other words, it uses patterns of development common to all children as central points of reference. In the merged training program at Lesley College, the faculty collaborate in four major areas: multiculturalism; special and general education; philosophy and history of education; and learning and cognition. These four common themes are now part of every teacher education program at Lesley.

Merged training programs place a high priority on training teachers to work with a wide array of students. And, these programs place a high priority on student field experiences. The Inclusive Elementary and Special Education Program (IESEP) at Syracuse University, for example, provides a "series of supervised field experiences in...[a]rea schools [that] are in the forefront of inclusive schooling." The program at La Salle University requires one entire academic year of student teaching, with specific methods delivered in module form. These programs seek to provide classroom experiences with both typical and special needs learners.

Teacher licensure also has a direct bearing on how classrooms are organized. In most states, teachers are required to hold licenses for the specific types of classes that they teach. That leaves little room for broadening those teachers' scope of the curriculum or, in the case of special education, broadening the types of students with whom they work. For teachers teaching an integrated curriculum or in inclusive environments, narrowly defined certification categories may thus pose barriers to restructuring the school.

State boards have an important role to play in reducing those barriers. State board-established licensure categories have contributed to the "hyper-professionalism" of the teaching profession. In some states, not only are licenses issued for each specific disability label, but the licensure categories may also have been layered upon one another over the years. For instance, a teacher may be licensed in "mental retardation 7-12," thus limiting in two dimensions the types of children he may teach. While state licenses should reflect the areas of specialized training that qualifies teachers to teach specific subjects or age-ranges of students, some state licensure categories have become overly restrictive in how they have defined whom teachers may work with. As one researcher explained, if there is "no educational justification for categories Educationally Mentally Retarded, Chapter 1, and Learning Disabled, then there is no justification for different teacher licenses" reflecting these categories.

Winners All recommends that, at a minimum, the number of licenses issued in special education be reduced and that in some instances the entire licensure scheme be redesigned. Many state boards have reduced the types of special education licenses that they issue, while some have completely abolished the use of handicapping labels in their licensure schemes. For example, several states, including Hawaii, Maine, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Utah, issue semi-generic, noncategorical credentials based on the severity of the disability. The District of Columbia, Montana, New Mexico, South Dakota and Washington all issue some form of a generic special education license for all or nearly all conditions and degrees of handicap. Other researchers have suggested new licensure schemes, with specific emphasis on behavior, communication assessment, adaptive instruction, and academic subject matter. Along these same lines, the preliminary recommendations of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards suggested a licensure framework based on two primary dimensions - the developmental level of instruction, and the subject taught - with instruction for students with disabilities as a third, complementary dimension of that framework.

Finally, in the area of professional training, *Winners All* recommends a strong emphasis on continuing professional development. Consistent with the literature on professional development, NASBE recommends that teacher training programs be on-going and tailored to the individual needs of teachers and schools. In this way, teacher education programs can take into account the specific needs of teachers, principals, and the schools in which they work. Some states are promoting this type of focused professional development through their certification renewal requirements: some states and districts are promoting this through their other staff development activities. For instance, Maine has created an individualized and highly flexible staff development program for all teachers seeking their full professional license, and Toledo, Ohio has had a long-standing professional development program for teachers based on an individualized peer-support team.

Implications for Higher Education

Creating inclusive schools will only be a piecemeal, incomplete process unless parents, students, educators and policy makers embark upon systemic reform of all parts of the system - including local districts, state departments of education, and higher education institutions. For institutions for higher education, preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms will require the following:

Redesigning teacher education programs

The assumptions upon which teacher education is based will have to shift in order to achieve inclusive education. Currently special education is a separate department or section within general teacher education. In those programs where special education and general education are combined, special education is typically layered on top of the general teacher education program, and student teachers are required to complete the requirements for *both* programs. Critics have argued that "artificially divided teacher-training programs seems to encourage an overly methodological approach to educating teachers that puts too much stress on 'how to' courses and too little on understanding how all children develop and learn."

Inclusion presupposes that students with disabilities are more alike than unlike their peers, and assumes that cognition is essentially the same for students with disabilities as for their typical peers. To the extent these assumptions are a break from the past, inclusion will bring changes not only in methods courses and field experiences, but also in the "foundations" courses in teacher education. In merged programs *all* teacher candidates read the literature of special *and* general education. Child development and cognitive theory take precedence over developing generic lesson plans for future classroom instruction. A handicapping label, to the extent that that artifact still exists, is seen as only a source of general information and "inadequate for developing an instructional program." Prospective teachers are taught to adapt instruction to individual student needs rather than learning about mental retardation, orthopedic impairments, learning disabilities, and behavioral disorders in medical, descriptive terms.

Varied and extended clinical experiences

Teachers must have practice with a wide variety of students in different settings to prepare for the diversity of the inclusive classroom they will face in the future.

New working relationships among faculty

The courses taught at Lesley College are team-taught by faculty with different areas of focus - such as special education and multiculturalism. Moreover, inclusion in the classroom and school depends on collaboration among special and general education teachers. Faculty members must offer a model of this collaboration in their instruction, research, and service to the field.

Developing new capacities among faculty

Most teacher educators - general and special - have had no direct experience with inclusive schools and classrooms. Nor have most teacher educators worked collaboratively across the fields of general and special education. College faculty will need specific training in inclusion.

Developing appropriate clinical sites

Goodlad, in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*, discussed the inadequacy of many clinical sites for pre-service teachers. He noted that administrative ease and convenience and "maintaining the goodwill and cooperation of school districts" often take precedence over creating high quality field experiences for student teachers. Developing clinical sites for inclusive programs is even more difficult. Foremost is the difficulty in locating practicing classroom teachers who are able to model the kind of skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed for inclusive education. In response to this, some teacher educators only place student teachers with graduates of their program who have been prepared in inclusive education.

Negotiating state regulation

Another barrier to creating appropriate clinical sites is state regulation that requires those doing student teaching to complete a certain number of "contact hours" with a practicing teacher who is licensed in the area for which the student teacher is seeking a license. Because both special and general education teachers may be deployed very differently in inclusive schools than they typically are today, the specific license of the cooperating teacher may not be as relevant as that teacher's actual day-to-day work. Without thinking through the issues associated with state regulation of teacher education programs and then coordinating their efforts with state departments of education, teacher education faculty can run into roadblocks when creating appropriate student teaching experiences for pre-service inclusive teachers.

Thinking broadly about training

Preparing personnel for inclusive schools extends beyond teacher training. All personnel, from the principal to the janitors in a school, create an inclusive environment. Training for inclusion must include administrators, educational specialists, teacher aides, school psychologists, and social workers as well as teachers.

Inclusion calls for fundamentally restructuring the teaching and learning process. While creating a unitary system will require that all parts of the educational system make adjustments for the array of students who currently come through the schoolhouse door, clearly *teacher capacity will play a major role in developing inclusive schools*. State boards of education will need to work closely with teacher education programs - at both the pre-service and in-service stages - to ensure the development of teachers who truly believe that all children can learn and who are equipped with the resources to bring about that learning.

The Inclusive Education Challenge for Colleges of Education

Charles Stegman, Dean, College of Education
Northern Illinois University

Sally Pancrazio, Dean, College of Education
Illinois State University

Donald Beggs, Dean, College of Education
Southern Illinois University

We have been asked to highlight some of the challenges facing deans, faculty, and programs as higher education addresses the reforms needed in teacher and administrator preparation for inclusive education. While many still debate the parameters of inclusion in the schools, the fact that inclusion is here can no longer be denied. The demographic, legal and societal forces being exerted at the national, state, and local levels mean that we must prepare teachers, administrators, and other professional educators who are knowledgeable about the issues. They must be able to make informed decisions about what happens with all the children in their classrooms and schools. We must move beyond the reality where "All children can learn" to a vision of education where "All children maximize their learning" in each domain of their lives. For example, the National Center on Educational Outcomes (1993) suggests eight domains of academic and life skills that are applicable to all children in school. These are:

Presence and participation: Students should be mainstreamed, maintain solid attendance records and understand the benefits of finishing school.

Accommodation and adaptation: Students should be able to read, communicate and relate with family members and peers.

Physical health: Students should abstain from drugs and tobacco, eat healthful foods and stay fit.

Responsibility and independence: Students should be able to organize daily business transactions, take care of personal needs and move freely through the community.

Contribution and citizenship: Students should volunteer, know the significance of voting, and adhere to basic school rules.

Academic and functional literacy: Students should be able to communicate, solve problems and learn basic academic skills, such as reading and writing.

Personal and social adjustment: Students should have a good self-image, deal effectively with frustration and get along with others.

Satisfaction: Students should enjoy school, and their parents should appreciate their children's education, (p. 6)

Part of the demographic picture is given by Gurganus and MacPhail-Wilcox (1993). They report that "During the 1990-1992 school year, over 4.8 million children and youth with disabilities were served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B, and Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act" (p. 7). They also gave some trend data that show this represents a 30% increase since 1976. When subgroups are considered, results from research report that the greatest changes have been in the high incidence areas of learning disabilities (51% of total disabled student population), speech or language impairment (23% of total), serious emotional disturbance (10% of total), and mental retardation (12% of total). According to these data, the high incidence of subgroups account for approximately 96% of the special education population, and Sloan et al. (1992) argue that these are the children most likely to be included in any inclusion programs. However, some school districts utilizing an inclusion model are beginning to include all or almost all special education students.

Given the reality of what is happening in the public schools, one of the first challenges of higher education is to create a vision of how quality programs for teacher education and administrator preparation for inclusive education should look. A key point here is the emphasis on quality programs-plural. Just as the North Central Association of Teacher Education (NCATE) and other accrediting agencies have recognized there is no single knowledge base for the preparation of professional educators, we must remember that our challenge is not to come up with a vision for a single program to be implemented in all universities. We need to develop and disseminate exemplary models based upon a synergy between the latest research and practical experience. A second key point to programs (plural) is that the preparation of professional educators such as teachers, administrators, and counselors, are all part of the task. Part of our heritage of designing our universities on a German model is the creation of isolated specializations within departments and programs. In most colleges of education, we have not created the linkages among different professional preparation programs needed to prepare personnel for educational reform in our schools. Inclusion will not work without making sure that educational administrators, counselors, regular education and special education teachers are all prepared to work for its success.

In Illinois, when we talk about teachers, we must be careful to interpret this to mean both regular education teachers and special education teachers. As long as current state laws and certification rules prescribe different professional roles, universities will be pressured to prepare teachers differently for these roles. Currently, regular education and special education programs are categorical in nature. Students complete programs in the areas in which they wish to be certified and many obtain multiple state endorsements. In fact, we encourage students to do this to increase their chances for securing a teaching position.

Since 1981, candidates for teacher certification in Illinois must pass course work that includes the instruction of children with disabilities (Brulle & Kern, 1992). Meeting this legislative challenge has focused discussion on the single course model versus the multidisciplinary infusion model. Most universities in Illinois have utilized the former, while some prefer the

latter. The building blocks for the multidisciplinary infusion model are already in place since most teacher education students have clinical experiences and take core courses in a number of areas that could and should include appropriate discussions of inclusion issues. These courses include foundations of education or social forces in education, educational psychology (including learning theory and child development), classroom management, motivation and discipline, curriculum design, measurement and assessment, and educational technologies. Similarly, our educational administration programs include course work and clinical experiences that should deal with the need for professional development opportunities for teachers, resource allocation for meeting the needs of all students, team building for designing and implementing educational change in the schools, means to involving families and community leaders in educational decision making, developing school policies to facilitate achieving educational goals, and presenting data showing schools are accountable for the education of all students (Sloan et al., 1992). However, there is a particular challenge to those who choose a multidisciplinary infusion model. The implementation and documentation of such models can be very difficult, especially when reviewed by an outside accrediting agency. Far easier is have a single course syllabus that delineates a fixed set of topics to be covered.

Many barriers and obstacles will need to be overcome to create quality programs. In discussing whether colleges can afford curriculum change, Paul LeClerc (1993), President of Hunter College, said that, "Part of the opposition, I believe stems from the perception that in a no-growth era of dwindling resources, we are trapped in a zero-sum game. To add to one area means you must subtract from another, because there is only so much pie to be divided" (p. 5).

His words are particularly meaningful for Illinois universities. As we face continued scrutiny of the educational professoriate from the public, lack of meaningful budget increases, state mandates and program restrictions, pressure for full-time students to graduate within four years, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education's PQP initiatives, it is very difficult to convince faculty that another educational initiative must be addressed in an already overcrowded curriculum. Developing and fostering the will to change is not easy. Faculty advocates, administrators, and state agency leaders will need to work together to build a shared vision of inclusion that will be necessary for effective change.

Our foremost challenge is to create comprehensive teacher and administrator preparation and certification programs that insure current and future educators in Illinois will possess the competencies, dispositions, and skills necessary to implement an inclusion any system of education. Some insights into what competencies and skills are needed are given by a survey of what superintendents listed as major problems in placing students with severe disabilities in the regular classrooms (Institute for Educational Research, 1993). Each of these problem areas has implications for what we do at the university level, regardless of the severity of the disability of the child involved. We should prepare future educators to deal with these types of problems. The areas listed by the superintendents included:

- Helping regular education teachers become comfortable with a student in class who has physical disabilities;
- Identifying and/or obtaining appropriate personnel to assist the student in the classroom;
- Helping regular and special education teachers to work together as a team;

- Providing staff with relevant in-services;
- Allowing time for team planning and adapting instructional materials and techniques;
- Changing teachers' attitudes that only special education teachers are adequately prepared to teach students with disabilities;
- Addressing the reluctance of regular education classroom teachers to assume the position of primary teacher of students with disabilities.

Clearly, we must prepare professional educators and administrators who value every child in their school and who are committed to the education of all children. These professionals must be able and willing to reach out and work with others to meet the individual needs of each child. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (1992) has launched an ambitious project to address "the knowledge, dispositions and performances deemed essential for all teachers regardless of their specialty area." The consortium is setting standards for professional teaching and, if we graduate teachers who meet these standards, they will be prepared to deal effectively with inclusive education models.

In moving toward inclusive education models, the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE, 1992) recommends that the deans of education endorse the theme of inclusion and move to abolish categorical training programs. Similarly, the Association recommends that state boards of education encourage the merger of special education and general education departments in institutions of higher education. Faculty are charged with the responsibility to determine the content of the merged programs, and the state agencies should waive regulations that hinder their development and implementation. In addition, NASBE recommends that states should provide funding for the new programs.

As we work to meet these challenges, we should again keep in mind the words of President LeClerc from Hunter College (1993), "In a climate of austerity, initiating curricular change is a major challenge. Any university leader committed to reform . . . is going to have to navigate through the most complex educational and political terrains imaginable. Yet, navigate one must, because education demands it" (p. 5).

Our challenges are before us. Our creative minds are ready—LET US BEGIN.

REFERENCES

- Brulle, A., & Kern, M. (1992). The regular education initiative: Implications for teacher educators. Critical Issues in Teacher Education. 2, 8-17.
- Gurganus, S., & MacPhail-Wilcox, B. (1993). Special education crossroads: Population trends and implications for administrators and policymakers. Educational Considerations. 21(1), 7-11.
- Institute for Educational Research. (1993). Inclusion model for placing special education student. IRE Quick Quarterly Questionnaire Bulletin.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- LeClerc, P. (1993). Can colleges afford auricular change? Higher Education & National Affairs. 42(4), 5-6.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). Winners all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA.
- National Center on Educational Outcomes. (1993). Educational outcomes and indicators for students completing school. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Sloan, L., Alberg, J., Denny, R., Hasazi, S., McLaughlin, M., Repp, A. (1992). Integration of practices in the United States: A composite case study. Paper sponsored by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France.

***What's Next? Directions Institutions of Higher Education
in Illinois Need to Take to Educate Students with Disabilities
in their Home Schools and in General Education Classes***

Donald Kachur
Illinois State University

Sharon Freagon
Northern Illinois University

On March 11-12, 1993, over 30 deans and other administrators from the state institutions of higher education and selected private schools and community colleges attended a two-day symposium. The purpose of this symposium was to address what colleges of education should be doing to prepare general and special education teachers and administrators for educating students with disabilities in the general education schools and classrooms in which they would participate if they were not labeled (inclusion). Those individuals in attendance increased their awareness of the philosophy and value of inclusive education and worked in small and large groups to create a vision of quality preparation of teachers and administrators for inclusive education.

Participants¹ vision included assisting teachers and administrators in creating their own vision of inclusive education. Essential is new forms of collaboration and cooperation between special and general education teachers and administrators. They saw the merging of the differentiated programs for teacher and administrator preparation aimed at modeling the types of collaboration needed in elementary, middle, and secondary schools where inclusive education would work successfully. In the same vein, participants envisioned no distinction between special or general education teachers and administrators. Instead, they envisioned the preparation of educators certified to teach and work with all students representing all forms of diversity. Participants regarded all educators as advocates for the principles that all children can learn and that all children can work together. To accomplish this, the need for redesigning the present preparation programs, practices, and clinical experiences was recognized by all.

After creating the vision, the participants addressed the barriers to overcome if colleges of education are to change teacher and administrator preparation and certification programs to accomplish inclusive education. The way state certification now exists would be a prime barrier to merged and redesigned programs of preparation. Participants expressed faculty resistance to changes because of their own turf protection, capacities to change, and/or inadequacies as major barriers. Those in attendance at the Dean's Symposium were particularly concerned over the lack of resources to create the necessary change among teachers and administrators. More importantly, they believed the on-going arguments between and among general and special educators over their philosophies and beliefs about inclusive education were the major barriers.

The participants attending the two-day symposium were asked to identify the strategic directions that needed to take place in order to change teacher and administrator preparation and certification to accomplish inclusive education. Recommended are the following fifteen directions:

1. Conduct an inventory of how inclusion is already being addressed by higher educational institutions in Illinois.
2. Redirect Illinois House Bill 150 towards inclusion.
3. Seek a statement from the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) defining "inclusion" and allowing institutions to build off of that definition.
4. Examine the state certification program to recommend to the ISBE changes necessary to stimulate higher education institutions to create new and innovative programs to prepare educators for inclusive education.
5. Develop among the teacher and administrator education faculty an awareness and a "shared vision and philosophy" regarding inclusive education.
6. Establish collaborative efforts between schools and colleges for staff development aimed at preparing and enhancing the skills and knowledge of all educators to address inclusion.
7. Establish among the Illinois institutions preparing teachers and administrators networking opportunities so they may share ideas, programs, practices, and policies.
8. Identify resources (people, places, programs) to support the planning and implementation of programs for preparing educators for inclusion.
9. Redesign present preservice and inservice programs preparing classroom teachers and school administrators.
10. Promote cross-institutional cooperation and collaboration in the design of new programs for preparing all educators.
11. Model co-teaching through teacher preparation courses taught jointly by special and general education faculty.
12. Modify the university or college reward system for faculty to foster collaboration and co-teaching between special and general education faculty.
13. Focus on preparing all classroom teachers as "instructional leaders."
14. Provide early-on inclusive clinical experiences for teacher candidates.
15. Help individuals preparing to become school administrators and teachers understand the process of change and how to implement change.

Not easy, is prescribing the way in which colleges, universities, and community colleges in Illinois should go about making the necessary changes to better prepare all educators for including children and youth with disabilities in general education classrooms. However, there appears to

be certain steps which should be considered in any effort to change. Although they are not necessarily presented in a required order, the following steps need to be considered if an institution asks itself, "What is it that we should do next?"

These steps include:

1. Increase the teacher and administrator education faculty awareness of the issues surrounding inclusive education.
2. Increase the teacher and administrator education faculty awareness of what the public schools are doing and have done relative to including students with disabilities in their general education classrooms.
3. Establish means for faculty to identify their own values as they relate to diversity and inclusion of students with disabilities.
4. Provide opportunities for special and general education teacher and administrator faculty to collaborate on research efforts, curricular and program design and redesign, course delivery, supervision of clinical experiences, etc., which prepare educators for inclusive education.
5. Design and/or redesign the preservice and inservice preparation programs of educators which provide them with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by educators who include the diverse population of students in the schools today.
6. Plan for a wide variety of clinical experiences including student teaching in high quality inclusive education settings which are provided to educators early and frequently throughout their preparation program.
7. Strengthen the linkages with the public schools in the delivery of both preservice and inservice opportunities for all educators in inclusive education.
8. Develop clearinghouses of information, best practices, and successful programs which can be used in preservice and inservice preparation for inclusive education.

In conclusion, the challenge which lies before colleges, universities, and community colleges in addressing the needs of all students is quite clear. The movement toward inclusive education is happening in the public schools in Illinois. The institutions preparing teachers and administrators have a moral and professional obligation to bring their preservice and inservice programs into sync with the practices occurring in the educational settings where graduates will seek employment. The challenge will become increasingly successful as the general and special education teacher and administrator faculty across all of the public and private institutions in Illinois as well as the ISBE network and collaborate on behalf of better preparation of all educators for inclusive education.