

APPENDIX A METHODOLOGY

This study used a two-phase descriptive design: a web site data collection phase and a key informant interview phase.

Phase 1: data collection

For phase 1, conducted May–August 2007, a stratified random sample of 36 elementary education teacher preparation programs in the Southeast Region was drawn.¹⁵ Three variables were used for stratification. The first was state, with the number of programs included for each state proportionate to its share of the region's total.¹⁶ The sample frame excluded community colleges and alternative certification programs. These are important sources of teacher preparation, but including them would have introduced additional intervening variables and conditions that could not be adequately considered in the study while maintaining the focus and specificity of a Fast Response Study. The criteria for inclusion were programs that award bachelor's degrees (as identified in MacMillan Reference 2006), have an elementary education preparation program (MacMillan Reference 2006), graduate a minimum of 18 students,¹⁷ and have no missing data for number of graduates based on available data sources.

The second stratification variable was program size based on the number of bachelor's degrees conferred in the most recent year for which data were available. Although setting a minimum program size somewhat biased the sample toward larger programs, it ensured that the programs included would have sufficient activities to be informative.

The third stratification variable was whether a program was part of a historically black college or university. Inclusion of historically black colleges and universities in the sample ensured that teacher preparation programs that train many minority teachers, who often take positions in hard-to-staff and urban schools, were represented.

Although the unit of analysis for sampling was the elementary education program, the larger data collection and analysis effort also related to the institution, college, or department of education of which the elementary education program was a part.

Overall, 117 programs met the four criteria and were included in the sample frame: 23 programs in Alabama, 17 in Florida, 13 in Georgia, 12 in Mississippi, 29 in North Carolina, and 23 in South Carolina (see tables A4–A9 at the end of this appendix for a complete list of the programs). The number of historically black college and university programs randomly selected per state was based on their proportional representation in each state, with at least one per state. For Georgia and South Carolina, this meant that historically black colleges and universities were over-represented.

To determine the scale for program size, programs in each state were arrayed by number of graduates cited in the most recently available source. Creating cutpoints for the scale based on even distributions within each state would have resulted in inconsistencies in the scaling across states (for example, a large program would have been defined as having a minimum of 346 graduates in Florida, but 96 in North Carolina). So, absolute cutpoints were applied across states to define small, medium, and large programs based on aligning the distributions of the number of graduates as much as possible.

Program size was scaled at three levels: small, at 60 or fewer graduates; medium, at 61–200 graduates; and large, at 201 or more graduates. Since the number of programs drawn for each state varied, the number could not always be evenly distributed across the three program size strata. For example, Alabama and South Carolina had seven programs in the sample and Florida had five (table A1). When the three strata for program size could not be distributed evenly within a state, the decision was made to oversample large programs (1 small, 1 medium, and 2 large for Georgia and 2:2:3 for South Carolina) and medium programs (1:2:2 for

TABLE A1

Number of elementary education teacher preparation programs in the sample by state, size (number of graduates), and historically black colleges and university status, 2007

State	Number of programs	Program size distribution (number)			Number of historically black colleges and universities
		Small	Medium	Large	
Alabama	7	2	2	3	2
Florida	5	1	2	2	1
Georgia	4	1	1	2	1
Mississippi	4	1	1	2	1
North Carolina	9	3	3	3	2
South Carolina	7	2	2	3	1
Total	36	10	11	15	7

Source: Authors' analysis based on application of criteria to data from course catalogues, syllabi, and related program documents obtained from institution web sites.

Florida). Small programs were therefore slightly under-represented.

During phase 1 data collection four replacements were made using random selection from the original sample. In two cases this was due to web site construction, in one case to the absence of an elementary teacher preparation program, and in another case to a Christian-oriented program that was not preparing candidates to seek mainstream state certification.

Phase 1 data collection involved searching college and university as well as program web sites for information, following a structured information-gathering protocol. Information was sought on institution and program mission, course requirements, course descriptions and syllabi, faculty expertise and credentials, organizational arrangements, and fieldwork requirements. When information was missing, a second data collector repeated the web search. When key data sources could still not be obtained, researchers followed up with phone calls, including two seeking required course listings, one seeking course descriptions, and five seeking syllabi.¹⁸

Phase 1 data collection was guided by a conceptual framework developed through a review of literature on general education teacher preparation

for working with students with disabilities. Three strategies were used to identify relevant literature. Wilson Web was searched for peer-reviewed studies published in the last 15 years using the following keywords: teacher preparation + students with disabilities + “mainstreaming in education”¹⁹ + “teacher education.” Hand reviews of abstracts excluded international studies and studies not dealing with teacher preparation and not focusing on academic subjects. This search yielded five publications. A second search was conducted on Wilson Web using the following search terms: teachers colleges/curriculum + special education + mainstreaming in education. Hand reviews of abstracts excluded publications focusing exclusively on special education. This yielded two more publications.

The second search strategy involved searching the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) database for publications in the last 15 years using the following keywords: regular and special education relationship + preservice teacher education + disabilities + elementary. This yielded 85 publications. Hand reviews of abstracts excluded international studies, those that did not focus on preservice undergraduate education, works previously identified, program descriptions and position statements, and works focused on practice/application. This yielded 18 publications. Because of the low numbers of relevant studies, no methodological

criteria were applied, but one study with only a 20 percent response rate was excluded.

The third search strategy involved obtaining and reviewing works recommended through internal and external peer reviews, including review articles and highly relevant publications cited in these items. This yielded seven additional publications.

The following key variables were identified for data collection in phase 1 based on the literature review: institution and program mission, number and content of required courses focused on working with students with disabilities, the infusion of disability content into other required courses, fieldwork and practicum requirements, shared courses between general and special education, and evidence of faculty collaboration. An Excel spreadsheet was created as a repository for indexing the relevant data collected in phase 1, although source documents were also saved. For example, the source document containing a program’s mission statement was saved, but only the relevant narrative was extracted and placed in the Excel file. Data indexing included entering verbatim material as well as material from multiple sources when relevant to a variable. Several rounds of interrater reliability checks were conducted at the outset of indexing. Researchers also reviewed each other’s work.

The study took a broad approach to operationalizing occurrences of references to students with disabilities in mission statements and curriculum materials. The original study proposal limited investigation to content relating to working with students with learning disabilities, but the researchers soon realized that to capture sufficient information they needed to take an expanded approach. They therefore indexed any content relating to preparing candidates to work with students with disabilities, special needs, learning differences, exceptionalities, multiple abilities, and the like and presented this variability as a finding in the report. Similarly, the study did not exclude information pertaining to any disability and therefore expanded data collection in this regard beyond the original plan.

Data analysis for phase 1 data combined thematic and content analysis of qualitative data as well as tallies and cross-tabulations of quantitative data. Data on qualitative items were extracted from the Excel spreadsheet into Word files. The qualitative data were analyzed manually rather than with a qualitative data analysis software program because of the limited amount of text on each item. Data on quantitative items were tallied and in some cases further analyzed using SPSS. Two researchers independently reviewed qualitative material and identified consistent themes and categories, which were compared and discussed. Similarly, codes identified for content analysis of course content were independently generated by two researchers, and differences were reconciled through discussion. Sometimes data on particular quantitative items—for example, how many disability courses include field components—were embedded in qualitative items (such as course descriptions) and could be tallied.

Confidence intervals on percentages reported in the text can be calculated by finding the row percentage closest in value to the sample percentage (table A2). For example, a sample percentage of 23 percent would have a 95 percent confidence interval of ±10.9 or 12.1–33.9 percent.

To analyze how programs use a combination of integration strategies, a composite measure was developed of the extent of disability integration. The maximum score on the final composite measure scale is 9. To develop this measure, key

TABLE A2
Ninety-five percent confidence intervals for sample percentages, 2007

Sample percentages based on population percentages	95 percent confidence interval for population percentage (percentage points)
10	± 8.1
20	±10.9
30	±12.4
40	±13.3
50	±13.6

Source: Statisticians’ analysis.

factors representing the strategies included in the analysis were selected, and the following decisions were made:

1. Incorporating disability priorities into mission statements (0–2 points).

One point was assigned for incorporating disability content into the college, university, or department mission, and one point for incorporating disability content into the elementary education department mission. Assigning one point for each ensures representation of programs within different governing structures (a program in an institution with no elementary education department or a program in an elementary education department with no institution-level entity). Institutions with missions incorporating disability content at both the institution and department levels could receive two points to reflect the apparent commitment throughout the organizational structure and the potential for coherence of disability as a priority in the program. A check was conducted to ensure that assigning two points would not penalize small programs with flat organizational structures.

2. Requiring disability-focused courses (0–3 points).

One point was assigned for each required disability-focused course.

3. Embedding disability content in required courses (0–2 points).

One point was assigned for incorporating disability content into a core reading course and one for incorporating disability content into a core math course. These subjects were chosen because they were common to all programs in the sample and are priority areas under the No Child Left Behind Act.

4. Incorporating experience with students with disabilities into fieldwork (0–2 points).

One point was assigned for field experience in the core disability course, and one for evidence of fieldwork relating to students with disabilities in other courses or practicum.

5. Aligning mission and coursework requirements.

No factor was selected to represent this strategy because its core pieces are already represented in the measure, and analysis of the core pieces would result in redundancy.

Factors were not incorporated into the measure for the final two strategies—shared course experiences between general and special education and collaborative program design—to avoid bias. Many of the programs in the sample were part of institutions without special education programs. Assigning points to factors representing these strategies would result in systematic bias against institutions without special education programs. Factors representing faculty expertise and faculty research interest related to students with disabilities were also omitted because of considerable missing data.

Phase 2: key informant interviews

Phase 2 of data collection, conducted August–September 2007, consisted of key informant interviews with the chair (or equivalent) of the elementary education teacher preparation program. The interviews were conducted to gain greater detail about program activities and processes for incorporating content to prepare teacher candidates to work with students with disabilities. These interviews were also intended to gather information on plans that might not be represented on web sites and to gain insight into impediments to these efforts.

Phase 1 data were examined to develop the sampling frame for phase 2 data collection. A subsample of six programs was purposely selected to maximize representation according to four factors: presence or absence of a special education

department, greater or lesser extent of disability content integration, state representation, and program size based on number of graduates. Four programs originally selected for phase 2 investigation were replaced because of nonresponse. Table A3 shows the selection scheme for phase 2 using two of the four criteria.

In addition to the criteria of the extent of integration and presence of a special education program, state and program size were considered. These additional criteria were used to avoid bias toward a particular state context or type of program.

Data collection for phase 2 involved semistructured interviews with representatives of the six selected programs. Web sites were searched for contact information for the chairs of the elementary education programs, who were then contacted by email and phone. Program chairs were selected as key informants because of their programmatic and leadership positions. Participation was voluntary and confidential. An interview guide was developed to collect more detailed information about the key variables, including information not available in program documents, such as details about faculty collaboration, expertise, and interaction across general and special education. Questions were also included to verify and probe the limits of data collected in phase 1. Responses to

an interview question about faculty collaboration, for example, confirmed that the level of program collaboration could not confidently be inferred from evidence collected solely from web sites. The questions included in the interview guide were as follows:

1. Can you describe generally if—and if so how—those involved in the elementary education degree program have approached or considered preparing preservice candidates to work with students with disabilities?
 - 1a. Specific skills, knowledge, and beliefs are prioritized?
 - 1b. Why this approach? What precipitated it? When did it begin?
2. In our beginning work for this study, we reviewed course requirements and descriptions looking for content that directly relates to working with students with disabilities. It seemed to us that there were [n] courses like this in your elementary education program: [name them]. Is this accurate? Are there others?
 - 2a. How was the content of this course(s) developed?
 - 2b. Who teaches this/these course(s)?
3. Are there faculty in the elementary education program with expertise or research interest in anything pertaining to students with learning or other disabilities? What areas?
 - 3a. If so, how has this influenced the program?
 - 3a. If not, has this been a limitation program development?
4. [If there is a special education program] How much formal or informal interaction or coordination is there between the elementary and

TABLE A3
Phase 2 selection scheme for extent of disability integration by presence of special education program, 2007

Rating on extent of disability integration	Is there a special education program? (number of programs)	
	Yes	No
Lower	1	1
Higher	3 ^a	1

a. This category included one fully merged program, which while sharing some characteristics of programs in this category was selected because it was the only program in the sample that represented the only route to certification in either special or elementary education at the university.

Source: Authors' analysis based on selection approach described in appendix.

- special education programs and faculty? What kinds of interaction?
- 4a. If I understand correctly, there are [n] courses that are shared by both candidates in the elementary and special education programs. How did this come about? (Was this intentional?)
- 4b. Is there any coteaching, collaborative course development, or other kinds of collaboration?
- 4c. What, if any, impediments have there been to formal interaction?
5. [If there is a special education program]:
- 5a. [If unknown] Has there been any discussion of creating a dual certification or endorsement option between elementary and special education?
- 5ai. Who has been involved?
- 5a.ii. Will this result in candidates being able to have two licenses?
- 5b. [If known that they have a dual certification program]: What was the impetus behind creating the dual certification endorsement option between the elementary and special education programs?
- 5bi. Is it the only option?
- 5bii. Who was involved in its development?
- 5biii. Will this result in candidates being able to have two licenses?
6. One issue that we are trying to understand through this study is how elementary education teacher preparation is addressing the relationship between diversity and disability/exceptionality among students. Has this entered into any internal discussions?
- 6a. Has the issue of disproportionality of minority students in special education ever come up in discussions or program or course planning?
- 7a. [If there is a special education program]: How similar or different are the field placements and clinical experiences of general education and special education candidates?
- 7b. [If there is not a special education program]: In either fieldwork components of courses or in student teaching, do candidates have the experience of working with students with learning problems or disabilities?
8. Another issue that we are trying to understand through this study is if—and if so in what ways—elementary education teacher preparation programs are incorporating content related to Response to Intervention or similar tiered intervention approaches into coursework or field experiences. Has this entered into any internal discussions? Specifically how?
9. [If there have been questions the interviewee has not been able to answer] Is there anyone else in the institution/department that you recommend that I should speak with?
- Seven interviews were conducted with key informants representing six programs (one program had two representatives). Interviews were conducted by one researcher over the phone and lasted about half an hour. Detailed notes were taken, with an effort to record responses as close to verbatim as possible. Content relating to the one program that is named in the report (North Georgia College and State University) was reviewed for accuracy by a key informant.
- Key informants' responses to questions were compared. Interview data were not intended to

represent the larger sample but to enrich depictions of how teacher preparation programs are integrating disability content into elementary education teacher training. Interviews provided information about collegiality and interaction across disciplines, but, as the self-reports of only a single program representative, the usefulness of these data for gauging collaboration was limited. Interview data were also analyzed to verify data

collected from web sites and to gain insight into planned activities not included on program web sites.

Tables A4–A9 list the colleges and universities for the 117 elementary education teacher preparation programs and their number of graduates.

TABLE A4

Alabama sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2003/04

	Institution of higher education	Number of graduates ^a	Historically black college or university
1	Alabama A&M University	224	Yes
2	Alabama State University	436	Yes
3	Athens State University	361	
4	Auburn University Montgomery	214	
5	Auburn University	278	
6	Birmingham–Southern College	22	
7	Jacksonville State University	781	
8	Miles College	42	Yes
9	Oakwood College	32	Yes
10	Samford University	71	
11	Spring Hill College	43	
12	Stillman College	34	Yes
13	Troy University	157	
14	Troy University–Dothan Campus	87	
15	Troy University–Montgomery Campus	20	
16	University of Alabama at Birmingham	198	
17	University of Alabama in Huntsville	44	
18	University of Alabama	236	
19	University of Mobile	73	
20	University of Montevallo	102	
21	University of North Alabama	114	
22	University of South Alabama	336	
23	University of West Alabama	99	

a. It is not clear from the source whether number of graduates also includes those with advanced degrees. Six bachelor's degree–granting institutions were dropped because they did not meet the minimum program size criterion of 18 graduates.

Source: Alabama Department of Education 2006.

TABLE A5

Florida sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2002/03

	Institution of higher education	Number of graduates ^a	Historically black college or university
1	Bethune–Cookman College	41	Yes
2	Florida A&M University	148	Yes
3	Florida Atlantic University	545	
4	Florida Gulf Coast University	133	
5	Florida International University	436	
6	Florida Memorial University	46	Yes
7	Florida State University	423	
8	Nova Southeastern University	192	
9	Rollins College	30	
10	Stetson University	37	
11	University of Central Florida	868	
12	University of Florida	346	
13	University of Miami	59	
14	University of North Florida	281	
15	University of South Florida	1,029	
16	University of West Florida	143	
17	Warner Southern College	31	

a. Undergraduate completers only. Twenty-two bachelor's degree–granting institutions were dropped because of missing data on number of program graduates. To align the two data sources, 2002/03 data on graduates were used.

Source: For state-approved initial educator preparation programs in the state university system, State University System of Florida (2003). For some of Florida's private and nonapproved universities and colleges, American Council on Education (2004).

TABLE A6

Georgia sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2005/06

	Institution of higher learning	Number of graduates ^a	Historically black college or university
1	Armstrong Atlantic State University	54	
2	Augusta State University	91	
3	Clark Atlanta University	45	Yes
4	Covenant College	22	
5	Emmanuel College	32	
6	Georgia Southwestern State University	94	
7	Georgia State University	269	
8	Kennesaw State University	372	
9	Mercer University	173	
10	North Georgia College and State University	135	
11	Shorter College	38	
12	University of Georgia	404	
13	University of West Georgia	275	

a. It is not clear from the source whether number of graduates also includes those with advanced degrees. One bachelor's degree-granting institution was dropped because of missing data on number of program graduates. Two were dropped because they did not meet the minimum program size criterion of 18 graduates.

Source: Georgia Professional Standards Commission (2006).

TABLE A7

Mississippi sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2002/03

	Institution of higher learning	Number of graduates ^a	Historically black college or university
1	Alcorn State University	33	Yes
2	Belhaven College	28	
3	Blue Mountain College	40	
4	Delta State University	125	
5	Jackson State University	72	Yes
6	Mississippi College	82	
7	Mississippi State University	408	
8	Mississippi University for Women	66	
9	Mississippi Valley State University	54	Yes
10	University of Mississippi	222	
11	University of Southern Mississippi	408	
12	William Carey College	85	

a. It is not clear from the source whether number of graduates also includes those with advanced degrees. Three bachelor's degree-granting institutions were dropped because they did not meet the minimum program size criterion of 18 graduates.

Source: Mississippi Department of Education (2004).

TABLE A8

North Carolina sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2004/05

	Institution of higher education	Number of graduates ^a	Elementary school teacher preparation program graduates	Historically black college or university
1	Appalachian State University	450	196	
2	Barton College	43	23	
3	Campbell University	88	57	
4	Chowan College	19	14	
5	Duke University	19	13	
6	East Carolina University	375	184	
7	Elizabeth City State University	19	11	Yes
8	Elon University	89	54	
9	Fayetteville State University	55	29	Yes
10	Gardner-Webb University	40	28	
11	High Point University	33	23	
12	Lees-McRae College	65	62	
13	Lenoir-Rhyne College	31	9	
14	Mars Hill College	55	43	
15	Meredith College	55	20	
16	North Carolina A&T State University	32	15	Yes
17	North Carolina Central University	105	57	Yes
18	North Carolina State University	113	0	
19	Pfeiffer University	30	20	
20	University of North Carolina at Asheville	40	25	
21	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	96	65	
22	University of North Carolina at Charlotte	218	132	
23	University of North Carolina at Greensboro	365	160	
24	University of North Carolina at Pembroke	87	38	
25	University of North Carolina at Wilmington	264	161	
26	Wake Forest University	28	17	
27	Western Carolina University	123	56	
28	Wingate University	27	14	
29	Winston-Salem State University	28	13	Yes

a. Undergraduate completers only. Three bachelor's degree-granting institutions were dropped because of missing data on number of program graduates. Seventeen were dropped because they did not meet the minimum program size criterion of 18 graduates.

Source: North Carolina Institutes of Higher Education (2005).

TABLE A9

South Carolina sample population of institutions with elementary education programs, 2005/06

	Institution of higher education	Number of graduates ^a	Elementary program graduates	Historically black college or university
1	Anderson University	55	9	
2	Bob Johns University	147	50	
3	Southern Wesleyan University	217	41	
4	Charleston Southern University	91	16	
5	Clemson University	525	103	
6	Coastal Carolina University	169	47	
7	Coker College	36	27	
8	Columbia International University	20	0	
9	Columbia College	288	18	
10	Converse College	257	110	
11	Erskine College	23	4	
12	Francis Marion University	112	33	
13	Furman University	189	28	
14	Lander University	105	52	
15	Limestone College	29	26	
16	Newberry College	22	11	
17	North Greenville University	48	28	
18	South Carolina State University	212	24	Yes
19	College of Charleston	297	106	
20	USC–Aiken	102	31	
21	USC–Columbia	457	70	
22	USC–Upstate	176	55	
23	Winthrop University	292	49	

a. It is not clear from the source whether number of graduates also includes those with advanced degrees. Two bachelor's degree-granting institutions were dropped because of missing data on number of program graduates. Three were dropped because they did not meet the minimum program size criterion of 18 graduates.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2006.

APPENDIX B
THE INTERSTATE NEW TEACHER ASSESSMENT
AND SUPPORT CONSORTIUM 2001 MODEL
STANDARDS FOR LICENSING GENERAL
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS
OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, is a consortium of state education agencies and national education organizations dedicated to reforming the preparation, licensing, and ongoing professional development of teachers.

In 1992 INTASC developed model core standards for what every new teacher should know and be able to do. These standards are being translated into model licensing standards for various subject areas and for elementary and special education.

With the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act emphasizing inclusion and the role of the general education teacher in instructing students with disabilities, INTASC drafted a new set of standards in 2001 that articulate for the first time what all general and special education teachers should know and be able to do to effectively teach students with disabilities: Model Standards for Licensing General and Special Education Teachers of Students with Disabilities (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium 2001). Specifically addressing the collaborative relationship between general and special education teachers, the standards represent the only public national document that attempts to clarify and differentiate the roles of general and special education teachers. The document is meant to guide states, professional organizations, and teacher preparation programs in developing their standards and practices. The effort was funded by the Office of Special Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education.

The document states:

The INTASC Special Education Committee endorses a collaborative framework for the

teaching of students with disabilities, one in which general and special education teachers work together as members of a team who bring their respective strengths to the task at hand. While general education and special education teachers possess much knowledge and skills in common, they also have differing areas of expertise. One of the purposes of these standards is to articulate similarities and differences in roles, knowledge and skill (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium 2001, p. 54).

The 10 principles outlined in the 2001 standards are listed here with the corresponding implications for students with disabilities.

Principle #1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Implications for students with disabilities: Both general and special education teachers demonstrate an understanding of the primary concepts and ways of thinking and knowing in the content areas they teach as articulated in INTASC subject matter principles and other professional, state, and institutional standards. They understand the underlying values and implications of disability legislation and special education policies and procedures as they relate to their roles and responsibilities in supporting the educational needs of students with disabilities. All teachers provide equitable access to and participation in the general curriculum for students with disabilities.

Principle #2: The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of each learner.

Implications for students with disabilities: Both general and special education teachers understand that all children have similar patterns of

learning and development that vary individually within and across cognitive, social, emotional and physical areas. They recognize that children with disabilities may exhibit greater individual variation in learning and development than students without disabilities, and that a disability often influences development and functioning in more than one area. Teachers use knowledge of the impact of disabilities on learning and development to optimize learning opportunities for each student.

Principle #3: The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Implications for students with disabilities: Students with disabilities come from a variety of cultures, languages, classes, and ethnicities. Disability, like other aspects of diversity, may affect a student's approach to learning and a teacher's approach to teaching. Teachers understand students with disabilities within the broader context of their families, cultural backgrounds, socioeconomic classes, languages, communities and peer/social groups.

Principle #4: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Implications for students with disabilities: Ensuring that students with disabilities can participate successfully in the general curriculum requires teachers to tailor their instructional strategies to the particular learning needs of individual students. General and special education teachers use a variety of instructional strategies and technologies and know how to modify and adapt the general curriculum to accommodate individual students' needs. Students with disabilities who have goals related to an expanded curriculum will also need specialized instruction to achieve those goals.

Principle #5: The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Implications for students with disabilities: Students' affiliation and acceptance within a community is an important basis for developing social responsibility, self-esteem and positive peer relations. Students learn more effectively when they are valued members of a learning community in which everyone can grow and learn. Teachers welcome students with disabilities and take deliberate action to ensure that they are included as members of the learning community. Teachers may also need to structure activities that specifically foster engagement, self-motivation and independent learning in students with disabilities.

Principle #6: The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication technologies to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Implications for students with disabilities: Students with disabilities often have communication or language delays or disorders associated with their disabilities. They may require multiple and alternative modes of communication. Teachers set a high priority on establishing a safe and comfortable environment in which students with disabilities are encouraged and supported to use language and contribute their ideas. They teach language and communication skills, make accommodations to promote effective communication, and encourage and support the use of technology to promote learning and communication.

Principle #7: The teacher plans instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Implications for students with disabilities: While students with disabilities often pursue the same

learning goals within the general curriculum and benefit from instruction in a manner that is similar to that of their non-disabled peers, they may require adjustments in goals, teaching strategies or supports. Some students with disabilities may require an expanded curriculum that may include areas such as functional life skills, communication skills, or behavior/social skills. Planning for students with disabilities requires an individualized plan of instruction and is a collaborative process that involves general and special educators, the student (when appropriate), families, and other professionals.

Principle #8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Implications for students with disabilities: Individualized comprehensive assessments are required for students with disabilities and are used to determine eligibility for special education services, to plan individualized instruction, and to monitor and evaluate student performance. It is also expected that students with disabilities will participate in the overall assessment programs of the classroom, school district, and state, and that they may require accommodations to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. In addition, some students with disabilities may require assessments related to achievement in an expanded curriculum (i.e. alternate assessments).

Principle #9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Implications for students with disabilities: Teacher reflection is essential for designing, monitoring and adapting instruction for all students, including students with disabilities. Teachers reflect on their knowledge of the learning strengths and needs of individual students with disabilities, and question and evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of their instructional choices and practices for building on those strengths and meeting those needs. Based on their data-based reflections, teachers engage in actions that consistently support and promote the achievement of students with disabilities.

Principle #10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, families, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being.

Implications for students with disabilities: Families, schools and communities are important contexts for teaching, learning, and development. Teachers advocate for students with disabilities to receive the support they need to be successful in the general curriculum and to achieve the goals of their individual education plans. They collaborate with each other, with other professionals, and with families to ensure that students with disabilities are valued members of the classroom, school, and larger communities.

APPENDIX C COURSES SHARED BY ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Table C1 lists the courses shared by elementary and special education programs at each of the

colleges, universities, and departments of education in the sample that offered both programs and for which there were no missing data. The one fully merged program in the sample is excluded, resulting in a total of 17. Each institution is numbered and identified by state.

TABLE C1

Courses shared by elementary education and special education departments in institutions included in the study, by state, 2007

College, university, or department of education identification number	State	Number of courses	Course title
1	Alabama	5	Microcomputing Systems in Education
			Human Growth and Development
			Education for Exceptional Children and Youth
			Education in a Diverse Society
			Foundations of Reading Instruction
2	Alabama	13	Math for Elementary Education Teachers
			Introduction to Teacher Education
			Introduction to Instructional Technology
			Human Growth and Development
			Introduction to the Study of Exceptional Children
			Tests and Measurements
			Foundations of Education
			Educational Psychology
			Materials and Methods of Teaching Social Studies
			Multicultural Issues
			Management of Classroom Behavior
			Materials and Methods for Science, Health and Nutrition
			Materials and Methods for Teaching Mathematics
3	Florida	6	Nature of the Learner
			Assessment of Learning and Behavior
			Field Lab I
			Field Lab II
			Principles and Issues in TESOL
			TESOL Methods and Curriculum
4	Florida	8	Introduction to Education
			Teaching Diverse Populations
			Introduction to Educational Technology
			Learning and the Developing Child
			Social Foundations of Education
			Measurement for Teachers
			Teaching Writing
Teaching Elementary School Mathematics			

(CONTINUED)

TABLE C1 (CONTINUED)

Courses shared by elementary education and special education departments in institutions included in the study, by state, 2007

College, university, or department of education identification number	State	Number of courses	Course title
5	Florida	12	Introduction to Education
			Teaching Diverse Populations
			Introduction to Educational Technology
			Student Teaching
			Language Skills and Literature in the Elementary School
			Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School
			Teaching Developmental Reading in the Elementary School I and II
			ESOL Principles and Practices
			Empowering Teachers to Teach English to ESOL Students
			Teaching Science in the Elementary School
			Social Studies for Elementary Teachers
6	Georgia	5	Educational Psychology
			Children's Literature
			Teaching Content and Process: Reading Education
			Assessment and Correction Reading Education
			Reading, Writing Connection
7	Mississippi	2	Professional Knowledge and Skills for Education
			Tests and Assessments of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities
8	Mississippi	7	Math Elementary I
			Math Elementary II
			Foundations of Professional Growth
			Human Development and Diversity
			Introduction to Special Education
			Planning and Teaching: Strategies for Effective Classroom Practice
			Effective Classroom Management for Teachers
9	Mississippi	10	Foundations of Education
			Vocabulary Development
			Psychology for Exceptional Children
			Early Reading Literacy 1
			Educational Psychology
			Measurement and Evaluation
			Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Disabilities
			Teaching Practicum/Technology
			Early Reading Literacy II
			Managing Classroom Behavior
10	North Carolina	4	An Introduction to Education and Diversity in Schools
			Introduction to Students with Special Needs
			Modifying Instruction for Learners with Diverse Needs
			Teaching Reading to Intermediate Grade Learners

(CONTINUED)

TABLE C1 (CONTINUED)

Courses shared by elementary education and special education departments in institutions included in the study, by state, 2007

College, university, or department of education identification number	State	Number of courses	Course title
11	North Carolina	8	Teacher School and Society
			Field Studies
			Psychological Foundations of Teaching
			Instructional Design and Evaluation
			Instructional Technology
			Lifespan and Human Development
			Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction
			The Teaching of Science
12	North Carolina	8	Technology in Education
			Introduction to American Education
			Educational Psychology
			Fundamentals of Reading
			Introduction to Exceptional Children
			Mathematics Methods Pre-K-2 and Field Experience
			Mathematics Methods Grades 3-6
			Teaching Science in Elementary School
13	North Carolina	11	Psychology of Development in Education
			Education Practicum I
			Introduction to Special Education
			Special Education Practicum I
			Technology in Education
			Literature and Learning I
			Literature and Learning II
			Methods of Teaching Mathematics
			Psychoeducational Intervention
			Technology Integration
			Senior Education Practicum IV
14	South Carolina	3	Introduction to Education
			Human Growth and the Educational Process
			Technology for Teachers
15	South Carolina	6	Computer Technology and Instructional Media
			Schools and Diversity
			Introduction to Human Growth and Development
			Educational Psychology
			Mathematics for Early Childhood/Elementary Education I and II

(CONTINUED)

TABLE C1 (CONTINUED)

Courses shared by elementary education and special education departments in institutions included in the study, by state, 2007

College, university, or department of education identification number	State	Number of courses	Course title
16	South Carolina	12	Introduction to Education
			Human Growth and Development
			Principles of Learning
			Music Education
			Measurement and Evaluation
			History and Philosophy of Education
			Art Education
			Seminar I: Generic Teaching Methods
			Math Education
			Senior Education Seminar
			Black Issues and Historical Figures in Education
			Professional Clinical Experience I
17	South Carolina	12	Orientation to Education
			Math for Elementary School Teachers I
			Principles of American Education
			Introduction to Special Education
			Mathematics for Elementary Teachers II
			Educational Psychology
			Child Growth and Development
			Teaching Social Studies in the Elementary School
			Elementary Methods in Science Teaching
			Health Education Methods for the Classroom Teachers
			Teaching Reading in the Elementary Grades 2–6
			Instructional Technology Strategies

Source: Authors' analysis based on data from course catalogues, syllabi, and related program documents obtained from institution web sites.

APPENDIX D

TEACHER PREPARATION LICENSING OPTIONS IN THE SOUTHEAST REGION STATES

Table D1 shows teacher preparation licenses and their grade spans for graduates from elementary education programs or special education programs (focusing on learning disabilities in Southeast Region states).

TABLE D1

Teacher preparation licensing options in the Southeast Region states, 2007

State	Elementary education license	Special education license
Alabama	Elementary, K–6 Elementary–Secondary, P–12	Special Education, P–12 Collaborative Special Education, K–6 Collaborative Special Education, 6–12
Florida	Elementary Education, K–6 Prekindergarten/Primary Education, age 3 through grade 3	Exceptional Student Education, K–12
Georgia	Early Childhood Education, P–5 Middle Childhood, 4–8	Special Education, P–12 Interrelated Special Education/Early Childhood: Learning Disabilities, P–5 ^a
Mississippi	Teacher Education Route License: five-year educator license	Specific five-year educator license: Special Education Birth to Kindergarten (Early Intervention) Special Education K–12 (Mild/Moderate Disability)
North Carolina	Elementary Education, K–6 Elementary Second Language Endorsement (must attach to full licensure in an elementary area)	Cross-Categorical (mildly/moderately disabled), K–12 Learning Disabled, K–12
South Carolina	Early Childhood, PreK–Grade 3 Elementary, 2–6	Special Education, PreK–12

a. Requires a program in both interrelated special education and early childhood education.

Source: Authors' analysis of state education agency web sites.

NOTES

The authors extend special thanks to the following individuals: Marleen Pugach at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, who drew on her vast expertise on this topic to provide vital advice and guidance as well as editorial feedback; Michele Rovins at the Academy for Educational Development (AED) for her work in conceptualizing the study; Richard Sawyer at AED for helpful feedback and general oversight; Loretta Mason at the University of Maryland for assistance with data collection; and the teacher preparation program leaders who took the time to discuss their programs and experiences with us. They would also like to thank their collaborator at the SERVE Center, Wendy McColskey, who provided and facilitated valuable editorial feedback.

1. The report uses the phrase *students with disabilities* to refer to students with special learning needs for consistency with the language used by the U.S. Department of Education and federal legislation, although the term *students who have disabilities* is becoming more common.
2. The report generally refers to *colleges* and *universities* (or *institutions*) when a finding or issue relates to the organizational environment (whether a school, college, or department of education) and to *program* when referring to a course of study.
3. The report uses the phrase *disability content* to refer to content relating to working with students with disabilities, including special education content. Content includes courses, curriculum, priorities and goals, field experiences, and the like.
4. The report uses the term *mission* to include mission statements or conceptual frameworks.
5. For a summary of this research, see National Center on Early Development and Learning (2005).
6. The examples of displayed text throughout the report are verbatim excerpts.
7. Diversity in terms of ability or disability is addressed in a practitioner brief by the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (2006).
8. This analysis is based on 35 of the 36 programs, as one program had missing data on required courses that could not be obtained through follow-up contact.
9. The data in these analyses differ slightly from those in figure 3 because figure 3 presents the number of programs requiring each type of course, while the analysis in this paragraph refers to the number of times a course type is required. Some programs require more than one type of course or more than one course of a certain type.
10. The literature on collaborative teacher preparation highlights the importance of the background and expertise of the faculty member who teaches the disability coursework. Generally, it is considered better when the teacher is a full faculty member rather than an adjunct and has special education expertise or coteaches with someone who does (Blanton and Pugach 2007).
11. Content analysis of assessment and evaluation courses is based on five syllabi. The initial data collection scheme did not anticipate that this type of course might be important to examine, and so no effort was made to collect course descriptions or other data. After programs requiring this type of course were identified, five syllabi were obtained online.
12. Course descriptions mention primarily whether field experience is required, but few mention what it entails. When available, descriptions of field experience in syllabi or on student teaching web pages were reviewed.

13. Six of the ten colleges and universities with disability-related missions that embed disability content also require more than one disability course.
14. Eighteen programs with no missing data would have met the criteria of shared courses if the program at North Georgia College and State University had been included. But that program was excluded from this analysis because, as a fully merged program, it offers one set of classes to one set of students—and therefore technically does not have shared courses between two sets of students. Thus, the total number of programs with shared courses was 17.
15. Georgia has an early childhood license that is generally aligned with the grade spans of the elementary education licenses in the other five states, so the early childhood teacher preparation programs in Georgia were examined along with the elementary education teacher preparation programs in the five other states.
16. Another approach would have been to include the same number of programs for each state. This would not have resulted in a sample that was representative of the Southeast Region, since some states have considerably more colleges and universities than others. Also, since all of the Southeast Region states are parties to an interstate licensing reciprocity agreement, this regional approach seemed warranted (Kaye 2006).
17. The original proposal set a minimum of 25 graduating students for inclusion in the sample frame, but the distributions suggested that this might be too stringent a cutoff point, especially given the year-to-year variation in number of graduates for any given program. In addition, the initial proposal set a minimum size for the elementary education program, specifically, that it graduate at least 15 new elementary teachers. But these data were available for only two of the six states and the criterion was therefore excluded from the sampling scheme.
18. Ultimately, only one of the two course listings and three syllabi were received within the time frame necessary to include them in the analysis.
19. This was a preset subject term on Wilson Web.

REFERENCES

- Alabama Department of Education. (2004). *Teacher prep report cards 2003–2004*. Montgomery, AL: Alabama Department of Education. Retrieved April 2007, from <http://www.alsde.edu/AllReportCards/CollegeReportCards2004/>.
- American Council on Education. (2004). *Teacher education programs in the United States: a guide*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger.
- Arthaud, T.J., Aram, R.J., Breck, S.E., Doelling, J.E., and Bushrow, K.M. (2007). Developing collaboration skills in preservice teachers: a partnership between general and special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 30*(1), 1–2.
- Artiles, A.J., and Trent, S.C. (1997). Forging a research program on multicultural preservice teacher education in special education: a conceptual scheme. In J.W. Lloyd, E. Kameenui, and D. Chard (Eds.), *Educating Students with Disabilities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blanton, L.P., and Pugach, M.C. (2007). *Collaborative programs in general and special education: an action guide for higher education and policymakers*. Washington, DC: Center for Improving Teacher Quality, Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved June, 2007, from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/CTQ%20Action%20Guide%20060507LB.doc>.
- Blanton, L.P., Griffin, C.G., Winn, J.W., and Pugach, M.C. (1997). *Teacher education in transition: collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.
- Brigham, F.J. (1993). *Cross-training: faculty-sharing between general and special teacher education programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Federation, Council for Exceptional Children, Indianapolis, Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358088).
- Chang, F., Early, D.M., and Winton, P.J. (2005). Early childhood teacher preparation in special education at 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education. *Journal of Early Intervention, 27*(2), 110–24.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2007). *Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)*. Retrieved November 2007, from http://www.ccsso.org/projects/Interstate_New_Teacher_Assessment_and_Support_Consortium/.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., and Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In J. Bransford (Ed.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.
- deBettencourt, L.U. (1999). General educators' attitudes toward students with mild disabilities and their use of instructional strategies: implications for training. *Remedial and Special Education, 20*(1), 27–35.
- Dice, M.L., Diederich, R., Gammon, N.W., Schultze, B., and Starr, R. (1996). *Including general and special education: initiatives of one small historically black college*. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Donovan, M.S., and Cross, C.T. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Research Council. Retrieved August, 2007, from http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=10128&page=R1.
- Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. (2008). Education Counts Database. State has special education coursework/degree requirements for general education teachers. Retrieved February 28, 2008, from <http://www.edcounts.org/createtable/step1.php?categoryId=24>
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2006). *The Georgia educator workforce 2006: a report of the supply, demand, and utilization of teachers, administrative and student services personnel in Georgia public schools* (Status report November 2006). Atlanta, GA: Division for Educator Workforce Recruitment, Research and Development. Georgia Professional Standards Commission. Retrieved April 2007, from http://www.gapsc.com/Workforce/Data_research.asp.

- Goe, L., and Coggs, J. (2007). *The teacher preparation-teacher practices-student outcomes relationship in special education: missing links and new connections* (Teacher Quality Research and Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Howey, K. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, and E. Guyton, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2001). *Draft for comments: model standards for licensing general and special education teachers of students with disabilities: a resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2002). *Frequently asked questions: model standards for licensing general and special education teachers of students with disabilities*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/SPEC-BROCHURE.pdf>.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (n.d.). *Draft: model standards for the review and accountability of teacher preparation programs: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Jenkins, A.A., Pateman, B., and Black, R.S. (2002). Partnerships for dual preparation in elementary, secondary, and special education programs. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(6), 359–71.
- Jones, S.D., and T. Messenheimer-Young. (1989). Content of special education courses for preservice general education teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 12*, 155–59.
- Kaye, E. (Ed.). (2006). *Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators for Elementary and Secondary Schools, Seventy-first Edition, 2006–2007*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kirk, R.H. (1998). The link between university course work and pre-service teachers' attitudes toward students with special learning needs. *College Student Journal, 32*(1), 153–60.
- Kozleski, E. B., Pugach, M., and Yinger, R. (2002). *Preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities: possibilities and challenges for special and general teacher education*. White Paper. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved April 23, 2007, from http://www.aacte.org/pdf/Publications/Reports%20_Studies/Sped%20White%20Paper%202002.pdf
- Lambert, C., Curren, C.M., Prigge, D.J., and Shorr, D. (2005). *Addressing inclusion in an era of education reform: dispositions of secondary and elementary pre-service educators in the pipeline*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Lesar, S., Benner, S.M., Habel, J., and Colman, L. (1997). *Preparing general education teachers for inclusive settings: a constructivist teacher education program*. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 20*(3), 204–20.
- Lombardi, T.P., and Hunka, N.J. (2001). Preparing general education teachers for inclusive classrooms: assessing the process. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 24*(3), 183–97.
- MacMillan Reference. (2006). *The College Blue Book, 34th Edition*. New York: MacMillan Reference Books.
- Marston, D. (2002). A functional and intervention-based assessment approach to establishing discrepancy for students with learning disabilities. In R. Bradley, L. Danielson, and D. Hallahan (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: research to practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Marston, D., Muyskens, P., Lau, M. and Canter, A. (2003). Problem-solving model for decision making with high-incidence disabilities: the Minneapolis experience. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 187–200.
- Miller, P.S., and Stayton, V.D. (1998). Blended interdisciplinary teacher preparation in early education and

- intervention: a national study. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 18(1), 49–58.
- Miller, P.S., and Stayton, V.D. (2006). Interdisciplinary teaming in teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 29(1), 56–68.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2004). *Performance report of teacher education programs*. Jackson, MS: Office of Teacher Licensure, Mississippi Department of Education. Retrieved April 2007 from http://board.mde.k12.ms.us/SBE_November_2005/Tab%2003%20-%20TC%20Performance%20Report%20on%20Teacher%20Education%20Programs%20-%20backup%20A.pdf
- National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems. (2006). *Becoming culturally responsive educators: rethinking teacher education pedagogy* (practitioner Brief). Retrieved April 15, 2007, from <http://www.nccrest.org/publications/briefs.html>.
- National Center on Early Development and Learning. (2005). *Teacher Programs Surveyed for Special Ed Preparation* (NCEDL Spotlights 39). Retrieved April 23, 2007, from <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/ncedl/PDFs/spot39.pdf>.
- National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (1997). *Learning disabilities: preservice preparation of general and special education teachers*. Retrieved March 7, 2007, from www.ldonline.org/?module=uploads&func.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002). Pub. L. No. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425.
- North Carolina institutes of higher education. (2005). *Undergraduate teacher education programs, 2004–2005*. Retrieved April 2007, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/ihe/reports/2004-05/full/undergraduate.pdf>.
- Nowacek, J.E., and Blanton, L.P. (1996). A pilot project investigating the influence of a collaborative methods course on preservice elementary education teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 19(4), 298–312.
- Pugach, M.C. (2005). Research on preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities. In M. Cochran-Smith and K.M. Zeichner (Eds.) *Studying teacher education: the report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*. Washington, DC: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc., for the American Educational Research Association.
- Pugach, M.C., and Seidl, B.L. (1998). Associate editors' exchange responsible linkages between diversity and disability: a challenge for special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 21(4), 319–33.
- Rademacher, J.A., Wilhelm, R.W., Hildreth, B.L., Bridges, D.L., and Cowart, M.F. (1998). *A study of preservice teachers' attitudes toward inclusion*, 62, 154–63.
- Shippen, M.E., Crites, S.A., Houchins, D.E., Ramsey, M.L., and Simon, M. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of including students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 28(2), 92–9.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2006). *Educator preparation ratings for South Carolina institutions of higher education*. Charleston, SC: Office of Educator Preparation, Support and Assessment, South Carolina Department of Education. Retrieved April 2007 from clicking on the Fact Sheet link for each Approved educator preparation program accessed through the drop down list on <http://www.scteacheers.org/educate/edprog.cfm>.
- State University System of Florida. (2003). *State University System of Florida Facts and Figures*. Tallahassee, FL: Board of Governors, State University System of Florida. Retrieved April 2007, from http://www.flbog.org/fact-book.teacher_ed.asp.
- Strawderman, C., and Lindsey, P. (1995). Keeping up with the times: reform in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(2), 95–100.
- Van Laarhoven, T., Munk, D.D., Lynch, K., Wyland, S., Dorsch, N., Zurita, L., Bosman, J., and Rouse, J. (2006). Project ACCEPT: preparing pre-service special and general educators for inclusive education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 29(4), 209–12.
- VanDerHeyden, A.M., and Witt, J.C. (2005). Quantifying context in assessment: capturing the effect of base rates

on teacher referral and problem-solving model of identification. *School Psychology Review*, 34, 161–83.

VanDerHeyden, A.M., Witt, J.C., and Gilbertson, D. (2007). A multi-year evaluation of the effects of a response to intervention (RtI) model on identification of children

for special education. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45, 225–56.

Voltz, D.L. (2003). Collaborative infusion: an emerging approach to teacher preparation for inclusive education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 25(1), 5–13.