6-1-2007

Preparing Special Educators to Assume Collaborative and Consultative Roles

Thomas J. Long

Carole Brown

Agnes Nagy-Rado

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce

PREPARING SPECIAL EDUCATORS TO ASSUME COLLABORATIVE AND CONSULTATIVE ROLES

THOMAS J. LONG
CAROLE BROWN
AGNES NAGY-RADO
The Catholic University of America

The incidence of children with disabilities is growing in both the private and public school sectors. As a result of this trend and efforts to place children in inclusive settings, there is an increasing need for special educators who can provide instruction within the context of a regular education classroom, develop individualized education plans (IEPs), support parents, and be consultants to teachers on behalf of children.

The consultative special education teacher will be increasingly in demand in the future if children with disabilities are to be successfully included in public, private, and Catholic schools. The Catholic University of America utilizes a consultative, collaborative model for preparing Master's candidates in its special education program. The results of the first 4 years of this program demonstrate that the candidates in this program have acquired the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are needed to be effective consultative, collaborative special educators in the field.

This article provides a detailed description of the elements that make up this personnel preparation program. Particular focus is placed on the skills and knowledge to carry out consultative planning, including a rubric to evaluate the candidates' performance. The article offers guidance to universities who may choose to create special education programs that prepare consultative special educators.

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to improve services provided for children with special needs, the Catholic Schools Staff of the Archdiocese of Washington created a 5-year strategic plan for the period from 1998 to 2003 (Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute, 1999) to develop an inclusion model in all of its schools. Each Catholic school found itself admitting children with documented and undocumented disabilities; most schools found that these children constituted at

least 5% of their total school population, and that this percentage could, at times, amount to as much as 20%. Nationally, in Catholic schools "68 percent of all students currently receiving special needs services receive those services in resource rooms or pullout programs" (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops [USCCB], 2002, p. 18) or continue in the general education classroom with accommodations (28%).

It became clear to the superintendent of Catholic schools for the archdiocese that unless better educated personnel could be found and employed to offer professional support within the schools, servicing children with special needs would, in many cases, prove untenable. The problem, as is often the case, was disposition, the lack of well prepared personnel, and finances. This is the need that The Catholic University of America's Special Education Program was designed to address.

THE IMPORTANCE OF A COLLABORATIVE AND CONSULTATIVE ROLE

Many people have identified the need, in both private and parochial schools, for collaboration skills to bring about effective inclusion of children with special needs in schools (Dettmer, Thurston, & Dyck, 2002; Lawrence-Brown & Muschaweck, 2004). There is a strong presumption in the literature that the consultative role is required to ensure that inclusive placements are effective for children (Halvorsen & Neary, 2001; Salend, 2005). Inclusion, as reflected in a decreasing number of self-contained special education placements and an increasing number of regular education placements, has steadily risen over the past decade (U.S. Department Education, 2002), so it is expected that there will continue to be a need for consultative special education personnel.

Changes in national legislation that directly affect public education and indirectly affect Catholic schools make the role of a collaborative and consultative special educator both more challenging and more needed. For example, the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) has created the national standard of adequate yearly progress (AYP) against which all U.S. public schools are to be measured. Schools have to show that all of the children in their classrooms are making progress toward developmentally appropriate levels of performance. Ninety-five percent of all (public school) children in Grades 3 through 8 starting in school year 2005-2006 have to be assessed annually. Further, the achievement test results have to be disaggregated so that it is clear that subgroups, such as linguistically diverse children or children with special needs are also making AYP benchmarks (Popham, 2005). These standards and testing requirements are making the role of the collaborative and consultative teacher more demanding. All children have to

take these tests with accommodations, if needed, as determined by the Individualized Education Program teams. NCLB allows only 1% of all children to be given any kind of alternate assessment. However, current Department of Education Secretary, Margaret Spellings, recently announced that some states may request up to 2% in certain circumstances (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Consulting teachers will be directly involved in determining when and how alternate assessments should be given in public schools and will work to develop modified achievement standards as needed. Assuring that accommodations are given will also be a critical part of the increased testing workload of special educators in both public and private schools. At the same time, the responsibilities of individual testing for diagnostic and curriculum purposes will continue to be a part of this role. If public schools fail under NCLB 2 years in a row, supplementary educational services can be provided. These services can be specifically offered by faith-based organizations including Catholic schools and could also be a part of the role of a collaborative and consultative special educator (Wright, Wright, & Heath, 2004).

Adding to the changes that the special education field is undergoing, Congress has passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA), reauthorizing and amending the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). There are several new provisions designed to be coordinated with NCLB related to meeting the standards for teachers to be highly qualified. Overall, there are now several routes for becoming recognized as being highly qualified in special education (Brown & Celeste, 2006); one is obtaining special education teacher certification under circumstances in which NCLB does not apply.

Among the different options, the collaborative and consultative role is a clear option for special education certification without having to meet additional NCLB content certification (i.e., being dually certified; IDEIA, 2004).

HIGHER EDUCATION RESPONSE TO COLLABORATIVE AND CONSULTATIVE ROLE

The National Association for State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) houses a Personnel Center containing data about personnel preparation programs in special education throughout the nation. A recent search of the database of the National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Service Providers (http://www.personnelcenter.org) revealed that there are 356 personnel programs nationally that prepare individuals to be collaborative and consultative special educators at the elementary or secondary level, granting either a Bachelor's or Master's degree. In contrast, nationally 1,120 personnel preparation programs grant either Bachelor's or Master's degrees

to work as special education teachers in elementary and secondary classrooms.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PROGRAM

Eight years ago, the president of the Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Institute, which since its foundation in 1959 had become a dynamic organization providing services in the metropolitan Washington region for people of all ages with developmental disabilities, approached The Catholic University of America (CUA) to discuss the possibility of collaborating on issues of common interest. Shortly after these initial discussions began between the Kennedy Institute and the CUA, one of the faculty members from the CUA decided to spend a sabbatical working with staff at the Kennedy Institute to see in which ways a practical collaboration could develop. From this initial collaborative effort emerged a proposal to re-establish the CUA's special education program that had lain dormant for 15 years.

Faculty from both the CUA and the Kennedy Institute collaborated and designed a program that made use of the resources from both institutions. By combining a community-based institution that specialized in providing services for children with special needs and a university known for its educational rigor, the faculty believed that Master's candidates could obtain the best of both the academic and practical worlds.

This new program was designed to prepare special educators who would focus on providing quality care in inclusive settings for children in the high incidence categories of disability (learning disabilities, mental retardation, speech and language difficulties, and those with emotional or behavioral impairments). The instructional approach these special educators would learn was developed on the research-based, cognitive learning, and reflective practice model already used by the CUA in its general education programs. Most of these CUA graduates would be dually certified, that is, enter the program with a general education teaching certificate and eventually obtain a special education teaching certificate.

Since the CUA is an urban university, faculty believed that it would be best to design a program that could also be pursued part-time, but year-round, allowing candidates to retain full-time teaching positions. Furthermore, since both collaborating institutions are under Catholic auspices, and because the Archdiocese of Washington's parochial schools had recently undertaken a 5-year program to provide special education services in its schools, it was decided to recruit candidates from the parochial as well as public schools, believing that both parochial and public school teachers could learn from each others' experiences, and all would be infused with the

same sense of social justice in their learning.

In 2000, the CUA/Kennedy Institute special education program received significant financial support in the form of a 3-year personnel preparation grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This grant paid for the educational expenses of two 12-candidate cohorts and modest support for faculty to implement the program. With an educational plan and a guaranteed student body, 24 faculty and staff members from the CUA and the Kennedy Institute began meeting together monthly in a large group, and more frequently in small groups, to work out the specifics of delivering the educational package. Nearly all faculty and staff members were already employed in other duties, so their contribution to this endeavor was as much a matter of dedication as employment.

In the fall of 2000, a great deal of energy was spent recruiting the first cohort to begin in January 2001. The intention was to enroll equal numbers of candidates from the parochial and public schools and an equal number of minority and majority candidates. Faculty further hoped to recruit some male candidates. Each candidate had to meet the admission standards for graduate standing at the CUA, which included obtaining passing scores, as established by the university, on either the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) or the Miller Analogies Test (MAT).

Even though candidates accepted into the program would receive free tuition, recruiting candidates meeting the CUA criteria proved to be difficult. Commitment, not only to dedicate themselves to studying for a degree but also to serve special needs children in a U.S.-based school for 2 years after graduation caused some to think a lot before applying. The year-round schedule gave others pause although most liked the idea of being able to complete a degree in 2 years, or less, while continuing to be employed. While most public school teachers could look forward to a substantial pay raise once they earned their Master's degree, the same was not true for many parochial school teachers. Public school teachers could also look forward to a posting as a special educator or resource teacher; Catholic school teachers were not certain that they would be able to find similar positions in a parochial school.

The faculty learned a lot about recruiting and retention during the grant years. Faculty made effective use of personal contacts by approaching and informing school principals in the area. The CUA also learned that applicants needed assistance to get through the admission test hurdles, so training sessions on test-taking skills were developed. Other difficulties included finding time to study while holding down a full-time job and managing a family, and dealing with the anxiety of returning to school, often many years after obtaining a Bachelor's degree. Finally, the CUA learned that the personal

interviews conducted with each candidate constituted a good screening measure if other admission criteria were also taken into consideration. Two faculty members and a parent of a disabled child usually constituted the interview committee. During the interview, the CUA faculty sought to determine if the candidates had prior experience with persons with a disability, if they could articulate their understanding of the mission of special education, if they understood the concerns of parents, and if they had personal goals for themselves that were consistent with the program.

As a result of intense recruitment efforts, half of the cohorts were from public schools, half from parochial, half of each cohort was from a minority group, and about 15% of each cohort was male. The CUA found that educating candidates in cohorts fostered a sense of community, paid academic dividends such as ready-made study groups, and that friendships arising from each cohort continued after graduation. The CUA also learned that it takes 4 years to establish a reputation that will begin to attract applicants by word of mouth. Twenty-three candidates graduated in the first two cohorts; each of them is employed appropriately, even in parochial schools. Based on these lessons learned, faculty members continue to improve program implementation and collaboration between the CUA and a growing number of community partners.

EDUCATIONAL PLAN AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The CUA Special Education Program, committed to maintaining the Council for Exceptional Children's (CEC, 2003) performance-based standards for beginning teachers in special education, has been designed to provide candidates opportunities to gain knowledge, acquire skills, and enhance dispositions to effectively function in collaborative, consultative, and teaching roles in public, private, and parochial early childhood, elementary, middle, and high school settings. Candidates in the special education program take courses in race, class, gender, and disability in education; psychology of learning for diverse populations; language and literacy development of children with disabilities; a practicum in modification and adaptation of curriculum and instruction for exceptional children; coursework in current trends in ethical and legal issues in special education; interpersonal communication, consultation, collaboration, and the process of systems change; educating diverse learners; psychological measurement; introduction to educational research; and foundations of education. Candidates are expected to have taken coursework in classroom management and normal human growth and development prior to enrolling in the Master's program. If these are lacking, candidates can elect to take these courses at the CUA as well as other cours-

es including school and community relations, diagnosing and remediating reading problems in the classroom, and understanding learning disabilities.

Instead of incorporating a student teaching semester, candidates gain practical experiences during one summer field experience and 2 semester-long field experiences after having taken 9 initial hours of coursework. The 2 semester-long field experiences are carried out in the school in which the candidate is employed. The summer field experience, during which candidates are assigned to one of the CUA partner schools, focuses on ways to adapt the curriculum to be useful to all students. The second field experience, following academic instruction in assessment, provides practice in assessing children, scoring instruments, as well as writing up and interpreting meaningful results. The third field experience focuses on collaborating, consulting, co-planning, co-teaching, and implementing approaches to change systems when such changes seem desirable. The last field experience is preceded by a course in collaboration, consultation, and system change. The nine credits of field experience constitute one fourth of the required coursework for both a Master's degree and certification as a general special educator in the District of Columbia. The directors of teacher quality assurance in both the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland found this arrangement of field experiences to be a creative way to satisfy state requirements for a semester or more of student teaching.

The CUA faculty members have developed the following performance-based assignments to assess candidate progress and to meet the accreditation requirements of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), which are aligned with the 10 Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards: case studies of children with special needs, assessments of teaching performance, evaluation of standardized assessment (i.e., Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement), functional behavioral analysis, videotaped collaboration and consultation performance, learning and teaching observation, child portfolio assessment, comprehensive reading strategies, disability case law presentations, observation of a classroom using the *Assessment of Practices in Early Elementary Classrooms (APEEC)* by Hemmeter, Maxwell, Ault, and Schuster (2001), portfolios, and an action research project. Candidates are also periodically asked to make self-assessments on the CEC standards to track their attainment of these competencies.

All assignments are multi-faceted and related to important knowledge, skills, and dispositions that a CUA special education teacher candidate needs to demonstrate. For instance, the capstone action research project, designed to foster reflective professional development, requires candidates to draw on and apply knowledge of child development, instructional strategies, and

assessment; to incorporate, assess, and improve skills of co-planning, co-teaching and/or consultation; and to use the CUA's reflective conceptual framework to improve professional practice. More specifically, in the action research project, candidates identify a research question related to specific problems and areas for improvement based on personal experience and professional knowledge in collaboration with cooperating teachers; set goals to take action and address identified weaknesses based on theory, standards, best practices, and relevant research; gather empirical data to document changes; demonstrate reflective decision making; and draw conclusions using implications to reflect on new learning and future actions.

CONSULTATIVE RUBRIC

The CUA's performance-based assessments are designed so that together they capture all of the 10 standard areas from INTASC and CEC. Each assessment is carried out through the use of specially designed rubrics that candidates can use to develop their assignments and receive feedback to improve their future performance. Appendix A contains a sample rubric developed for use with the collaboration and consultation field placement that pertains specifically to the issues of preparing teachers to be effective collaborators and consultants. The purpose of this rubric is to provide qualitative and quantitative feedback to candidates on the work they produce and to collect data on the quality of the CUA Special Education Program. For this assignment, students carry out a mock consultation exercise, such as convening an IEP meeting that is videotaped.

PRAXIS OUTCOMES

As a check on the success of the initial CUA program, every member of Cohort 1 was asked to take the PRAXIS II test in the Core Knowledge of Special Education (Educational Testing Service, Test Code 10350) having completed the first third of the CUA program. The intention for giving this test at this time was to check for the degree of improvement in content knowledge from early in the program until candidates graduated. Every candidate who took the PRAXIS II at this early stage scored better than the norms established by the District of Columbia for special education teacher certification.

Observing the high success rate of the CUA candidates on PRAXIS II, faculty concluded that it was pedagogically sound to focus on core content knowledge at the beginning of the program to prepare candidates for theory to practice applications. The PRAXIS test results were also confirming for the CUA candidates.

INCLUSION KNOWLEDGE OUTCOMES

Further, the CUA candidates' competencies at recognizing inclusive practices were studied. To assess candidates' knowledge and dispositions about inclusion, candidates completed a case study protocol, as a pre- and post-test, entitled Natural Environment Survey, developed by Trivette and Humphries (2000) as a part of the Children's Learning Opportunities Early Research Institute. Graduates then completed a post-survey after graduation. The survey assessed three dimensions of natural environments—natural contexts, child versus adult initiation, and practitioner presence or absence—and requires a respondent to rank four sets of items. Each item in a set is an example that combines some of these three characteristics. Inclusion was not taught or presented to the CUA candidates using this particular model though context was often discussed along with other social dimensions of inclusion. The candidates were not taught to this test. The rankings were compared to the answer key for each item and the amount of difference from the keyed norm was totaled for each item and test. Overall, Cohort 1's ($n = 10$) pre-test was 9.75 points different from the normed ranking, for an average of 1.22 points per item. Cohort 1's ($n = 9$) post-test was 8.75 points different from the normed ranking, with an average of 1.09 points per item. In other words, the candidates' scores on the post-test were closer to the answer key. For Cohort 2, the pre-test (only given to 4 candidates) had a score of 13.25 points different from the normed ranking, with an average of 3.31 points per item. Thus, Cohort 2 scored more poorly than Cohort 1 on the pre-test of this survey. This may have been due to the low numbers of individuals taking the pre-test and the possibility of a skewed sample. The post-test scores for Cohort 2 ($n = 8$) were 7.5 points different from the normed ranking, with an average of .93 points per item.

Thus, it appears based on the pre- and post-tests that both cohorts showed improvement on their assessment of inclusion and natural environments. Cohort 2's post-tests were stronger than Cohort 1's post-tests, which could mean that the program showed improvement in teaching the concept of natural environments in the second year (Long & Brown, 2004).

POST-GRADUATION

Having learned how to serve children with special needs, the CUA special educators went back to their home school or to another school and had an immediate effect on improving services. Some had to struggle against the attitude of a principal who believed that the best way to cope with children with special needs was to put them all in a resource room and assign this

newly minted special educator to teach them. It has taken a great deal of skill on the part of the CUA graduates to change a system gradually so that they could apply the skills they acquired during their teacher education program. Not all have been successful, but most have found that not only did their colleagues respond to the special educator's attempts to collaborate and consult, but positions were also created that allowed them to carry out the activities for which they were educated and which better served children. Some of the CUA graduates reported becoming itinerant special educators, serving two or three schools, but others have found themselves in schools with two or three special educators. An important result, experienced by all the CUA graduates, was that their supervised field experiences gave them the confidence to be effective in their assigned jobs. Teachers who attempt to be licensed by alternative routes to certification without mentored experiences in instructional practices have been found to be at a serious disadvantage (Nougaret, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2005).

DEMOGRAPHICS AND PLACEMENT

Today, the faculty and candidates in the CUA Special Education Program have collaborated with 14 parochial and public schools in the area, and the impact of CUA candidates continues to rise. In 2005, the CUA candidates were employed in 10 DC public schools, 2 DC charter schools, and 10 Catholic schools. Applications have been received from potential students teaching in 17 different Catholic schools, 15 DC public schools, and 3 DC charter schools.

NATURE OF ROLE FROM ALUMNI SURVEY

In order to identify what roles the CUA graduates play in the field, a survey was given to the 23 individuals from Cohorts 1, 2, and some from Cohort 3 who completed their coursework in the program by the summer of 2004. Sixty-five percent of the individuals (15 respondents) sent back their surveys. Appendix B includes descriptive data from the survey.

It is noteworthy that two thirds of the graduates in this program work as collaborative and consultative special educators. Within the profiles of those reporting, however, there is a variety of ways that these roles are carried out. Only 40% of the collaborative and consultative special educators who responded function full-time in those roles. The remainder (60%) provide a mixture of indirect, consultative services and direct special education services to children. Of particular note was that 61% of the respondents expected that their role would evolve toward more collaboration during the next school year. The service delivery configurations for addressing the special

education needs of children appear to be in flux in the greater Washington, DC, school community, both private and public. Among the respondents, 33% reported providing only direct services to children with special needs in their full-time positions.

FEEDBACK FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FROM ALUMNI SURVEY

When asked about areas for improvement in the CUA Special Education Program, a few graduates recommended more hands-on experiences in practicum, more instruction on assessment, and more experience with portfolios. Feedback from Cohort 1 was used to provide more hands-on experiences with children, increase assessment instruction, and expose candidates to performance-based assessment portfolios. Graduates also stated that they wanted more pedagogical content knowledge specifically in math education and English as a second language. Graduates praised their experiences with a small cohort and the individualized support they received from their professors and the directors of the project. Faculty were seen as modeling inclusive teaching.

CONCLUSION

The education faculty at The Catholic University of America and faculty from the Kennedy Institute designed, developed, and delivered a Master's degree teacher education program in special education that can serve as a model for other programs intending to educate collaborative and consultative special education teachers who wish to work in school environments that include children with high incidence disabilities in general education classrooms. Specifically, the CUA Special Education Program has created a model personnel preparation program that has been shown to be successful at (a) facilitating rapid core knowledge acquisition about special education; (b) helping candidates acquire a better recognition of inclusion; and (c) helping graduates of the program obtain new teaching positions.

While there has been increasing pressure since 1985 to move toward greater inclusion of children with special needs into the normal life of schools, the reality in both public and parochial schools has been that children with special needs continue to be served in resource rooms or through pull-out programs (USCCB, 2002; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The CUA program has demonstrated that it is possible to educate Master's degree candidates to carry out a role as a collaborative and consultative special education teacher and to help schools adopt this role as an important part of their transition toward full inclusion. This paper contains a description of

the components of this program including issues of recruitment, the educational plan, and performance indicators.

The special education literature presumes that the consultative role is required to ensure that inclusive placements are effective for children and that collaborative and consultative special educators are needed to facilitate the requirements of both NCLB and IDEIA 2004. The National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Service Providers (http://www.personnelcenter.org) indicates that only 30% of the programs that grant Bachelor's or Master's degrees for special education teachers prepare them to be collaborative and consultative special educators. Thus, there appears to be a need for more personnel preparation in the collaborative and consultative special education model.

Personnel preparation programs and school-based programs have challenges related to special education that the use of a collaborative and consultative model might help ameliorate. Catholic schools are going to be increasingly asked to provide services for children with special needs, and there is little likelihood that new sources of government money will be given to Catholic schools to respond to this request. One way to improve the situation in Catholic schools for children with special needs is for Catholic schools to hire the kind of collaborative and consultative special educators who can work cooperatively with the general educators in the school to help them make the accommodations children need. Shifting to an inclusive environment for children with special needs is not necessarily less expensive but allows the special education teachers to serve more children as they work more closely with the general education teachers. Being allowed to develop in a more normal environment benefits all children, and teachers are benefited by receiving the support they need to respond to the unique needs of every child in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Brown, C., & Celeste, M. (2006). Answering the call to train special education teachers at institutions of Catholic higher education. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 9*(4), 473-498.

Council for Exceptional Children. (2003). *What every special educator must know: The international standards for the preparation and certification of special education teachers* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.

Dettmer, P., Thurston, L. P., & Dyck, N. (2002). *Consultation, collaboration, and teamwork for students with special needs* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Halvorsen, A. T., & Neary, T. (2001). *Building inclusive schools: Tools and strategies for success.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hemmeter, M. L., Maxwell, K. L., Ault, M. J., & Schuster, J. W. (2001). *Assessment of practices in early elementary classrooms (APEEC)*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 118 Stat. 2647 (2004).

Lawrence-Brown, D., & Muschaweck, K. S. (2004). Getting started with collaborative teamwork for inclusion. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 8*(2), 146-161.

Long, T. J., & Brown, C. W. (2004). *Project scaffold: Final report*. Unpublished manuscript, The Catholic University of America.

Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute. (1999). *Catholic schools inclusion project: Five-year strategic plan.* Unpublished manuscript, Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. §6301 (Supp. I 2001).

Nougaret, A. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. (2005). Does teacher education produce better special education teachers? *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 217-229.

Popham, W. J. (2005). *America's "failing" schools: How parents and teachers can cope with No Child Left Behind*. New York: Routledge.

Salend, S. J. (2005). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices for all students* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Trivette, C. M., & Humphries, T. L. (2000). *Natural environment survey*. Unpublished manuscript, Orelana Hawks Puckette Institute.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Department of Education. (2002). *Catholic school children with disabilities: A study commissioned by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*. Retrieved November 16, 2006, from http://www.usccb.org/education/fedasst/ideafinal.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Education department submits 23rd annual report to Congress on special education*. Retrieved November 16, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2002/05/05102002.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Spellings announces new special education guidelines, details workable, "common-sense" policy to help states implement No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved November 16, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2005/05/05102005.html

Wright, P. W. D., Wright, P. D., & Heath, S. W. (2004). *Wrightslaw: No Child Left Behind*. Hatfield, VA: Harbor House Law Press.

Thomas J. Long is an associate professor and coordinator of the Special Education Program at The Catholic University of America. Carole W. Brown is a research associate professor in the Department of Education at The Catholic University of America. Agnes Nagy-Rado is an assistant professor of education and the Director of Teacher Education at The Catholic University of America. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Dr. Thomas Long, Department of Education, The Catholic University of America, 620 Michigan Avenue, Washington, DC 20064.

Appendix A

Rubric for Consultation, Collaboration, Co-Teaching, and Systems Change

Description	This rubric is used in EDUC 534 to assess field experience related to consultation, collaboration, co-teaching, and systems change.	
Context	This rubric allows the course instructor to assess how candidates' knowledge of theory is applied in practice.	
Purpose	The purpose of using this rubric is to provide qualitative and quantitative feedback to Teacher Education candidates on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the area of consultation, collaboration, co-teaching, and systems change.	
Performance assessment Leadership behavior (25%) CEC-CC-10K2 CEC-CC-5S1	Target	Establishes manageable goals for the meeting; maintains superior control of the meeting and effectively manages time; builds strong consensus on objectives and operating procedures; clearly and specifically defines roles; creates a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment in which diversities are valued; diagnoses and responds to group difficulties regarding tasks; helps to decide several future steps for the group
	Acceptable	Establishes goals for the meeting, but they may not all be manageable; maintains sufficient control of the meeting and generally manages time; builds consensus on objectives and operating procedures; defines roles in general; generally creates a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment; diagnoses group difficulties regarding tasks; helps to decide at least one step for the group
	Unacceptable	Fails to establish or clarify goals for the meeting or establishes goals that are unmanageable; maintains inadequate control of the meeting and/or fails to manage time; fails to build consensus on objectives and operating procedures; inadequately defines roles; creates an environment that is not always perceived as safe, equitable, positive, and/or supportive; fails to diagnose group difficulties regarding tasks; fails to identify any future step for the group

Appendix A *(continued)*

Performance assessment Communication effectiveness (25%) CEC-CC-10K4 CEC-CC-10S1 CEC-CC-10S3 CEC-CC-10S6 CEC-CC-1K7 CEC-CC-2K4 CEC-CC-3K4 CEC-CC-7S3 CEC-CC-9S11 CEC-CC-9S8	Target	Builds a strong sense of trust; encourages full and active participation; provides equitable time for sharing and ensures that no one dominates the discussion; demonstrates sensitivity to the racial, cultural, gender, and religious beliefs of all participants; maintains confidential communication about individuals; uses effective communication skills throughout the meeting (e.g., uses active listening, uses no put-downs, asks for or provides clarification and rationale, solicits others' opinions, checks for understanding, summarizes outcomes before moving on); uses praise appropriate to each situation; asks for and welcomes feedback; paraphrases and affirms team members' contributions most of the time
	Acceptable	Builds trust; encourages some participation from most people; provides enough time for sharing; demonstrates sensitivity to most of the racial, cultural, gender, and religious beliefs of the participants; maintains confidential communication about individuals; uses effective communication skills most of the time (e.g., uses active listening, uses no put-downs, asks for or provides clarification and rationale, solicits others' opinions, checks for understanding, summarizes outcomes before moving on); uses praise appropriately from time to time; asks for and accepts feedback in a non-confrontational way; paraphrases and affirms team members' contributions at least half the time
	Unacceptable	Fails to adequately build trust; seldom encourages participation; fails to provide enough time for sharing; fails to demonstrate sensitivity to the racial, cultural, gender, and religious beliefs; fails to maintain confidential communication about individuals; demonstrates a lack of effective communication skills; fails to use praise when it is appropriate; reluctant to ask for and/or accept feedback; fails to appropriately paraphrase and affirm team members' contributions

Appendix A *(continued)*

Performance assessment Effective group performance (25%) CEC-CC-10K3 CEC-CC-10S1 CEC-CC-10S2 CEC-CC-10S7 CEC-CC-10S9 CEC-CC-5S10 CEC-CC-7S10 CEC-CC-7S11 CEC-CC-7S13 CEC-CC-7S2 CEC-CC-7S4 CEC-CC-7S6	Target	Clearly facilitates group problem solving and conflict resolution in most situations; completes the agenda; considers all perspectives when actively planning and implementing age- and ability-appropriate instruction for individuals with disabilities (including responsive adjustments to instruction based on continual observations as well as assessment of individualized learning objectives and evaluation of intervention plans); considers all perspectives when actively planning and implementing individualized reinforcement systems and environmental modifications at levels equal to the intensity of the behavior (using effective and varied behavior management strategies); quickly and easily establishes and consistently maintains rapport with individuals with and without exceptional learning needs; identifies and responds to group difficulties regarding interpersonal problems
	Acceptable	Demonstrates ability to facilitate group problem solving and conflict resolution at least half the time; completes the majority of the agenda; assists in the planning and implementation of age- and ability-appropriate instruction for individuals with disabilities (including responsive adjustments to instruction based on continual observations, assessment of individualized learning objectives and evaluation of intervention plans); assists in the planning and implementation of individualized reinforcement systems and environmental modifications at levels equal to the intensity of the behavior (using effective and varied behavior management strategies); adequately establishes and maintains rapport with individuals with and without exceptional learning needs; diagnoses and articulates some group difficulties regarding interpersonal problems
	Unacceptable	Fails to facilitate group problem solving and conflict resolution; fails to complete the agenda; is inadequately involved in planning and implementing age- and ability-appropriate instruction for individuals with disabilities (including responsive adjustments to instruction based on continual observations, assessment of individualized learning objectives and evaluation of intervention plans); is inadequately involved in planning and implementing individualized reinforcement systems and environmental modifications at levels equal to the intensity of the behavior (using effective and varied behavior management strategies); fails to adequately establish and maintain rapport with individuals with and without exceptional learning needs; inadequately diagnoses group difficulties regarding interpersonal problems

Appendix A *(continued)*

Performance assessment Reflection upon performance and acting upon reflection (25%)	Target	Reflects on events using all aspects of the conceptual framework; eloquently summarizes the results of the meeting, including all pertinent details; makes thorough recommendations for future strategies
	Acceptable	Reflects on events using some of the conceptual framework; adequately summarizes the results of the meeting; makes at least two recommendations for future strategies
	Unacceptable	Inadequately reflects on events; inadequately summarizes the results of the meeting; makes only one recommendation for future strategies

Appendix B

Response to Alumni Survey Regarding Role

Category	Response	Percentage/number
Type of position	Teaching in public schools	47%
	Teaching in private schools	47%
	Looking for a position	6%
Type of service provided	Consultative/indirect service	67%
	Direct service	33%
Least restrictive environment	Inclusion	73%
	Self-contained classroom	27%
Time spent with special needs issues	Average daily response	4 hours
Change in role after graduation	Maintained present role	20%
	Obtained new role	80%
Future change anticipated	Evolving role change toward collaboration in the next year	61%
	Plan to obtain new position	26%
	No change anticipated	13%