5-2021

Teach, Practice, Analyze, and Reflect: Preservice Teacher Perceptions and Experiences With Simulated Manifestation Determination Meetings

Laura Adele Trapp

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Greeley, Colorado

The Graduate School

TEACH, PRACTICE, ANALYZE, AND REFLECT: PRESERVICE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES WITH SIMULATED MANIFESTATION DETERMINATION MEETINGS

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Laura Adele Trapp

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Special Education

May 2021

This Dissertation by: Laura Adele Trapp

Entitled: *Teach, Practice, Analyze, and Reflect: Preservice Teacher Perceptions and Experiences with Simulated Manifestation Determination Meetings*

has been approved as meeting the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in School of Special Education

Accepted by the Doctoral Committee

_____
Tracy Gershwin, Ph.D., Research Advisor

_____
Jason Robinson, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Lori Peterson, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Jeraldine Kraver, Ph.D., Faculty Representative

Date of Dissertation Defense _____

Accepted by the Graduate School

_____
Jeri-Anne Lyons, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School
Associate Vice President for Research

ABSTRACT

Trapp, Laura. *Teach, Practice, Analyze, and Reflect: Preservice Teacher Perceptions and Experiences with Simulated Manifestation Determination Meetings.* Published Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 2021.

Discipline decisions regarding students with exceptionalities are complex. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) includes regulations that may safeguard educational access and opportunities through the manifestation determination (MD) process. Professionals knowledge, skill, and advocacy may also play a role in the successful implementation of the MD provision and a student's access to education. A key element included within IDEA (2004), the MD provision and much of the work of any educator is collaboration. Further, it may be assumed that an accurate MD decision is made meeting team members' effective collaboration (Lewis, 2017). Given the importance of collaboration within a MD meeting, the question of how teachers are trained to collaborate becomes paramount. Despite the importance of collaboration, there is still much to be understood about the topic and training of preservice teachers. Further, very little research has examined the role of collaboration through the MD process. The current phenomenological study explored the value of an instructional training package that included three components: (a) direct instruction, (b) simulated MD meetings, and (c) Video Analysis (VA). Semi-structured interviews as well as pre- and post-self-assessment descriptive results were analyzed to explore 14 participants' experiences. Participants overwhelmingly found the instructional package as valuable. Specific findings related to the

perceived successes and challenges of the training and future directions for practice and research are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation and the work it took to get here to my dad, David, and my mom, Jeanne. Since I was a little girl, you made me to believe anything was possible. Your unwavering love, encouragement, and support taught me to persist, find, and follow my personal journey and have fun along the way. Thank you, Mom and Dad. I love you bunches and BUNCHES!!!

I also dedicate this dissertation and work to my children, Easton and Presley. May you find joy and excitement in discovering your own personal journey, pursue what you love in life with passion and zest, and, of course, have a little fun along the way, too. I love you both bunches and BUNCHES, to the moon and back, again and again and again!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am so very thankful for my family and friends who have supported my doctoral education. I would first like to thank my husband, Jim. Thank you doesn't seem enough. Your belief, support, and encouragement means more to me than you could ever know. Thank you for the countless times you reminded me to see the bright side. I love you, your undeniable strength, and rose-colored glasses more than you know. You are my best friend and my hero. To my parents, thank you. I feel the depths of your love and support in everything I do. In addition, I would also like to thank my sister, Jana, who has been with me every step of the way. You have lifted me up, reminded me to laugh, and celebrated my journey. I am so very thankful I have you for my best friend and sister. To my in-laws, Cheryl and Mike, thank you, and I love you. You seemed to silently understand my process was undoubtedly my family's too. You have provided support and love, not only to me but to Jim, Easton, and Presley, which enabled me to pursue my dreams. Finally, to one of my dearest and closest friends, April. I have lost count of the hours of endless conversations we have had or the papers you read that helped me find my way. Thank you for being my mentor and dear friend. I love you all.

I would also like to extend my thanks to my professional community of mentors and teachers. First, to the members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Gershwin, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Peterson, and Dr. Kraver, thank you for the time, support, and dedication you have provided to support my learning process. I am extremely grateful for your feedback, encouragement, and perspective that enhanced my learning each step of the way. To my professors at the University

of Northern Colorado (UNC), so many of you lifted me up along the way, celebrated my strengths, and supported my challenges. UNC has been my home for a number of years and several degrees. It is because of the faculty that I pursued my doctoral degree at UNC, and the faculty's contribution to my learning is greatly appreciated. Last, but not least, Dr. Gershwin, my committee chair and advisor. You have supported my growth and learning from the very beginning, from my undergraduate learning until now. You have always known my direction and helped open every door along the way. I cannot imagine this process without you. Thank you! You are my chocolate chip cookie and my champion.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of implementing equitable discipline practices for students with disabilities has been an ongoing debate throughout history (Merrell & Walker, 2004). Suspension rates are consistently higher for students with disabilities, with the highest rates affecting individuals with behavioral disabilities (EBDs) (Krezmien et al., 2006). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) (IDEA) has the potential to provide students with EBDs safeguards to educational opportunities through the manifestation determination (MD) process. Consequently, professionals in the field of education should be aware of the federal law that guides disciplinary decisions for students. It is these guidelines that have the capacity to ensure student and teacher actions can lead to student learning opportunities that proactively, respectfully, and legally address behavior concerns.

A Definition of Behavior

Cooper et al. (2007) defined behavior as "that portion of an organism's interaction with its environment that is characterized by detectable displacement in space through time of some part of an organism that results in measurable change in at least one aspect of the environment" (p. 690). Simply put, behavior is an action that occurs from a person that can be observed, heard, or measured and is repeated. Challenging behaviors that occur in schools are often classified as externalizing and internalizing behaviors. Externalizing behaviors are categorized by overt, easily observed behaviors, such as physical aggression towards another person or property,

noncompliance, tantrums, yelling, eloping, etc. Meanwhile, internalizing behaviors are often associated with what appears to be an inward manifestation of the behavior. Despite being less obvious, there may be a tendency to associate these behaviors with explanatory fictions and, thus, define the behavior using a fictitious variable rooted within an unobservable process (i.e., anxiety, depression, etc.) (Bruhn et al., 2014). Examples of internalizing behaviors include somatic or physical complaints, self-harm, and acting socially withdrawn. For the purpose of clarification, this paper focuses on externalizing behaviors, as they are often the focus of most common behavioral challenges that lead to exclusionary discipline practices resulting in MD meetings. It is important to note that though the term behavioral disability is used throughout this paper, the term is intended to reflect any student who is serviced under IDEA (2004), who may have EBD needs addressed within their special education services and supports as outlined in an individualized education program (IEP).

Historical Treatment of Individuals with Behavioral Disorders

In the United States, the phrase "Do no harm" is ingrained in the melting pot of our cultural norms. Nevertheless, it wasn't too long ago when institutions, eugenics, and abuse were commonly used throughout the U.S. as an "intervention" designed to decrease problem behaviors (National Consortium on Leadership and Disability for Youth, 2007). The next section describes an examination of the past with the intent to later inform future direction discussion within the field of behavior.

Early treatment of individuals with EBDs were often rooted in fear (Shapiro, 1994). For example, historically, many cultures and organizations excluded individuals with disabilities for fear of disease, illness, or possession (Rosen, 1968). Further, historical accounts demonstrated an inherent belief that individuals with EBDs were believed to be possessed by Satan or other evil

spirits. This belief also contributed to abusive and neglectful treatments that occurred (Longmore, 1987). Though many individuals faced harsh treatments such as neglect, being left behind, whippings, being stoned, burned, and death, early evidence exists suggesting the primitive man conducted trephining or drilling a hole in one's skull to release any evil possession that was believed to be present for individuals with EBDs (Porter, 2002). Following this period of time, the American and French revolutions brought new ideas related to freedom and human dignity that opened a door for individuals to advocate for better treatment of those with EBDs (Kauffman & Landrum, 2013). Phillipe Pinel, a physician and psychiatrist, was one of the first advocates to lead a movement of change by unchaining individuals who had been hospitalized for years. His methods were coined as "moral treatment" and became a framework to be used throughout the 19th century (Kauffman & Landrum, 2013).

In the early to mid-1800s and into the 19th century, individuals with EBDs were often placed in institutions or hospitals. One of the most widely recognized institutions, Willowbrook, demonstrates a recent example of the devastating treatment that occurred for thousands of individuals with disabilities. Opening in the late 1940s, Willowbrook was intended to offer support and services to individuals with disabilities. By 1965, Willowbrook exceeded capacity by more than 2,000 residents. When residents became ill from living in cramped quarters, medical treatment was not provided. Instead, many residents became subjects of controversial medical experiments such as eating feces from infected residents and medical procedures for sterilization. Residents were also found locked in cages, covered in urine and feces, and left to starve for days at a time. Physical and sexual abuse was also common. Despite the deplorable circumstances and less than human treatment of its residents, it wasn't until 1987 when Willowbrook was finally forced to close (Reimann, 2017). Although devastating, this historical

mistreatment of individuals with disabilities helped to lay the foundation to support future political, social, and educational advances designed to improve the lives of individuals with disabilities (Shapiro, 1994).

Special Education Law

One of the first cases to pave the way for individuals with disabilities to have educational access to public schooling, Brown v. Board of Education (1954), was a landmark Supreme Court case that challenged the 14th amendment. The court unanimously ruled that separate schooling for students on the basis of race was unconstitutional and inherently unequal, violating the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. This case opened the door to legally challenge the segregation of students with disabilities. After this court case, other legislative changes began to unfold. For example, in 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was authorized declaring a federal commitment to equal access and quality education. Next, the Education of the Handicapped Act (1970) followed, providing our nation's first special education legislation allocating state funding to train special education teachers and expand programming opportunities. Meanwhile in 1972, two landmark Supreme Court cases involving students with disabilities paved the way for improved educational opportunities for students with disabilities, Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia (Mills) (1972) and Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1972). Similar to Brown v. Board of Education (1954), these two cases challenged the 14th amendment. The plaintiffs prevailed, providing a constitutional foundation for students with disabilities to push for educational opportunities. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973) then followed and provided the first federal civil rights law to protect individuals with disabilities stating,

> No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States . . . shall sole by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any activity receiving federal financial assistance. (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 1973)

Education for All Handicapped Children Act

Legal educational rights for students with disabilities were forever changed in 1975 when President Ford authorized The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) which rendered federal funding to states providing special education supports and services including: nondiscriminatory testing, evaluation and placement, education in the least restrictive environment (LRE), due process rights to include parent involvement, and a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) as outlined through a student's IEP. A hallmark of FAPE, the IEP encompasses present levels of performance, goals, services including accommodations and/or modifications, and placement. One important aspect of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) was the inclusion of procedural safeguards. Procedural safeguards provide a process for protecting the educational rights of students with disabilities and their caregivers, including ensuring parent participation, provisions of written notice for proposed changes to identification, evaluation, or programming, outlining discipline procedures, and providing a process for disagreeing with an IEP team decision (IDEA, 2004). Notably, federal special education law came into fruition because of the advocacy efforts of caregivers. Court cases such as Mills (1972) and PARC (1972) were possible because caregivers fought for their child's civil rights (Horner & Yell, 2017). Thus, procedural safeguards are essential to supporting oversight for parents to ensure educational rights are provided as well as continued advocacy for educational opportunities for their students.

Multiple reauthorizations of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) have since occurred, each bringing improved opportunities for students with disabilities and expanding procedural rights. The law's first reauthorization added provisions including: improved language that substituted disability for handicap; the eligibility categories of autism and traumatic brain injury; clarity on related services, assistive technology and rehabilitative services; as well as transition planning for students. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997) amendments included the following changes: increased parent participation, consideration to statewide testing, and more access to the general education curriculum. For students with EBDs, one essential aspect of the Individuals with Deisabilites Education Act (1997) amendments included the addition of discipline procedures. This included the MD process, a provision of services when discipline results in a change of placement, conditions for a removal to an interim alternative education setting (IAES), and the use of positive behavioral intervention strategies (PBIS) in the IEP, when appropriate and in cases when a student's behavior challenges impedes learning or the learning of peers. Finally, the most recent reauthorization came in 2004, referred to as The Individuals with Exceptionalities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) or IDEA (2004). These improvements brought increased accountability, changes to the MD provision, recommendations for the identification of students with learning disabilities, and the requirement for highly qualified teachers and research-based practices when providing educational opportunities to students with disabilities. Each of these disciplinary provisions are described in the subsequent section.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Disciplinary Procedures

Equitable discipline due process rights for students with disabilities exists within a number of federal laws, including: IDEA (2004), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990). Further, and on an even more simplified level, ethical discipline for students with disabilities is a basic human right rooted within our U.S. Constitution. Notably, two amendments in the U.S. Constitution address the protections of individual students' rights to education, Amendments V and XIV. In general, all students hold two primary rights regarding discipline; these are the right to privacy and freedom and the right to due process (Yell & Rozalski, 2008). Specifically, the fifth amendment protects individuals against deprivation "of life, liberty or property without due process of law" (U.S. Const. amend. V). Goss v. Lopez (1975*)* set legal precedent stating students have a property interest in their education. In addition, students have a liberty interest in their good reputation. Therefore, a public-school district may not take a student's property interest in her public education nor her liberty interest in her good reputation without due process of the law (Goetz & Jepsen, 2019). In essence, due process provides legal processes designed to ensure fair protection of individual rights through a fair hearing and judgment. Thus, students cannot be denied attendance from their education without legal processes being followed (Goodwin, 1987). Goss v. Lopez (1975) and Wood v. Strickland (1975) solidified students' rights specific to discipline within the U.S. Constitution (Yell & Rozalski, 2008).

Meanwhile, the eighth amendment provides protections that oversees the government's power to punish, stating "excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted (U.S. Const. amend. VIII). Ingraham v. Wright (1977) determined that despite exceptionally harsh paddling, the eighth amendment does not apply to corporal discipline in school. The Supreme Court determined in Goss v. Lopez (1975) that a 10-

day suspension is not too trivial to disregard the due process clause. Though Goss v. Lopez (1975) is often associated with due process rights, it also set a 10-day standard. A suspension for a minor offense or a disproportionate punishment or penalty can, indeed, challenge the eighth amendment (Goetz & Jepsen, 2019). These protections helped to set the foundation for the IDEA (2004) disciplinary procedures that are described in the next sections: PBIS, special circumstances, stay put, and the MD provisions.

Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Throughout the course of history, the conditions, humane treatment, and interventions for individuals with EBDs have improved. Parental advocacy and the development of federal law has helped encourage such positive change. Specifically, the 1970s and 1980s brought a new paradigm for how society viewed individuals with disabilities. This social model of disabilities provided an alternative to the medical model, which viewed the person's disability as a disabling barrier that needs intervention to improve living conditions (Srikala & Schlessinger, 2017). Further, behavioral researchers advocated that barriers were not within the individual with a disability, but rather within societal structures (Union of the Physically Impaired, 1976). Many of these improvements can be credited to the growth and continued development of PBIS. With roots in the field of applied behavior analysis (ABA), PBIS provides an empirically supported systematic approach to assessing, teaching, monitoring, and generalizing socially significant behaviors. Positive behavior intervention and supports incorporates principles of inclusion, social learning theory, organizational behavioral principles, and person-centered values (Carr et al., 2002; Lewis et al., 2017; Lewis & Sugai, 1999). Functioning as a whole-school initiative, PBIS strives to provide schools with the tools to encourage desired behaviors, prevent disruptive behavior, proactively address problem behavior, improve school climate, and increase school

safety. Positive behavior interventions and supports is a discipline that values the social model of disabilities, described as a priority to promote inclusion, an individual's equitable access to opportunities, personal dignity and personal choice (Carr et al., 2002). Therefore, PBIS strives to utilize person-centered planning as a framework for developing goals and interventions (Carr et al., 2002; Johnston et al., 2006). Additionally, a focus on environmental modifications through manipulations of antecedent conditions is a priority (Carr et al., 2002). Behavioral supports included in a PBIS framework are defined as adjustments to the environment, rather than to the individual, that provide accommodations for individuals with disabilities (Johnston et al., 2006). Positive behavior interventions and supports works to "change systems and redesign environments with a view to minimize external influences, making the person with an disability the primary causal agent in his or her own life" (Carr et al., 2002, p. 6).

Thus, perhaps one of the more proactive disciplinary protections within IDEA (2004) includes the use of PBIS. The IDEA (1997) reauthorization included PBIS as a consideration to support a student's behavior needs. The IDEA (2004) reauthorization maintained PBIS is a level of support teams "must consider in the case of a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others, consider the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior" (IDEA, 34 C.F.R. § 300.324 (a)(2)(i)(2004). Though the mention and development of PBIS is promising, the semantics included in the IDEA (2004) leave a great deal of ambiguity for professionals responsible for supporting the behavior of students with disabilities. For example, the use of the word "consider" allows an open interpretation to the IDEA (2004) provision that may lead teams to see PBIS as optional in the development of an IEP. Nevertheless, the inclusion of PBIS is viewed as a major revelation to the improvement of behavioral outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

One of the major components of PBIS that is written into the law is the mandate for the use of a functional behavioral assessment (FBA). An FBA is mandated as part of the MD provision that aids in the development of a behavior intervention plan (BIP). An FBA is utilized to identify triggers, consequences, and the overall function of a problem behavior so that a more appropriate replacement behavior (i.e., positive behavior that serves the same problem behavior function) and extinction techniques (i.e., the removal of reinforcement) can be employed with the intent to stop the inappropriate behaviors from occurring again and teach more appropriate behavior skills in place of the negative ones (Maag & Katsiyannis, 2006). The FBA process requires professionals to interview, observe, and record behavior to develop interventions rooted in antecedent, behavioral teaching, and consequence variables. Learning complex behavior requires multiple steps (Cooper et al., 2007). The FBA provides a systematic process for understanding the complexities of behaviors including an analysis of events preceding the behavior and following the behavior. The FBA allows for the development of a concrete BIP (Turnbull et al., 2000). An FBA and resulting BIP provide environmental adaptations, behaviors requiring instruction, as well as consequences to strengthen the intervention. A concrete BIP can support educators to develop lessons, utilize computer programs, build relationships, and maximize behavior change in various levels of a student's educational experience while emphasizing reinforcement contingencies (Carr et al., 2002; Cooper, 2007; Watters, 2015). Thus, the FBA is not punitive, but rather the emphasis is on the educator being available to assist the student with improving their behavior long-term. It is important to note that the FBA process is mentioned later in another disciplinary provision, the MD process.

Special Circumstances

The IDEA (2004) affords considerations for behaviors that result in significant harm to a student's self or others. In cases of significant harm, a student may be removed for up to 45 days to an IEAS, regardless of whether the behavior is a result of one's disability (IDEA, 2004). Three special circumstances are outlined in the IDEA (2004) for which a placement to an IEAS may be considered appropriate: (a) weapons, (b) drugs, or (c) serious bodily injury. Weapon violations are defined by a student who carries a weapon or possesses a weapon while on school grounds (IDEA, 2004). Drug violations are defined as knowingly possessing, using, selling, or soliciting the sale of a controlled substance while on school grounds (IDEA, 2004). The IDEA (2004) describes serious bodily injury as an injury that occurs to another person while on school grounds (IDEA, 2004).

The definitions for weapon and serious bodily injury are adopted from the U.S. Criminal Code (IDEA, 34 C.F.R. § 300.530 (i)(3)(4), (2004). A weapon is operationally defined as "a weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance, animate or inanimate, that is used for, or is readily capable of, causing death or serious bodily injury, except that such term does not include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2 1/2 inches in length" (18 USC 930 (g)(2), 1988). Serious bodily injury is operationally defined as an injury that involves: "(a) substantial risk of death, (b) extreme physical pain, (c) protracted and obvious disfigurement, or (d) protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty" (18 USC 1365 (h)(3), 1988). The IDEA (2004) attempts to further define drugs by applying definitions provided in the Controlled Substances Act. The term drugs are further operationally defined by dividing the term into controlled substances and illegal drugs. A controlled substance is defined through "schedules I-V in section 202(c) (21 U.S.C. 812 (c), 1988)." An illegal drug is defined as:

> A controlled substance; but does not include a controlled substance that is legally possessed or used under the supervision of a licensed health-care professional or that is legally possessed or used under any other authority under that Act or under any other provision of Federal law (IDEA, 34 C.F.R. § 300.530 (i)(2)) (2004).

Stay Put

Parents are always able to dispute IEP placement changes for a student with a disability. When a parent disputes any change of an IEP placement, with the exception of removals related to special circumstances (described above), the student will remain in the current placement until the dispute is resolved (IDEA, 2004). Schools are responsible for implementing the supports and services outlined within the IEP throughout the duration of the dispute. A number of considerations must be given to parental disagreements in placement. Carl and Maura B. v. Mundelein High School District Board of Education (1993) outlined that stay put takes effect when the parent files a complaint. However, there is no requirement that the complaint formally specify the stay put provision. Stay put has significance to the MD provisions because as the IDEA (2004) states that if the team determines the behavior is a MD of the student's disability, the student must return to the placement from which he was removed (Katsiyannis & Smith, 2003).

Manifestation Determination Provisions

Schools are challenged to balance the needs of educating all students in a safe and orderly environment, while meeting each student's individual needs (Yell & Rozalski, 2008). Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973) and IDEA (2004) provide more extensive discipline due process rights under federal and state laws (Yell & Rozalski, 2008). School officials electing to remove a student with a disability from the educational setting, through in-school or out-of-

school suspension, have procedures they are required to follow. The IDEA (2004) provides legal requirements for professionals responsible for providing discipline for students with disabilities that safeguard students with disabilities access to a FAPE. Notably, though discipline provisions didn't begin with the EAHCA (1975), legal rights for individuals with disabilities began prior to the IDEA 2004's reauthorization. Doe v. Maher (1986) and Honig v. Doe (1988) were landmark cases in setting precedent for providing discipline rights to individuals with disabilities (Zirkel, 2015a). Honig v. Doe (1988) set the 10-day exclusionary criteria (Zilz, 2006). Prior to a codified MD criterion, only a small number of court cases challenged the substantive requirements. These court cases were critical in developing a judicial definition for MD (Zirkel, 2015a).

Statement of the Problem

The challenge to provide equitable discipline for students with EBDs is evident (Merrell & Walker, 2004). Despite policy, educational initiatives and best practice, exclusionary discipline, such as suspension or restraint, continue to plague many students' school experience at a startling rate (Losen et al., 2015). The number of students receiving out of school suspensions could fill every "major league baseball park and every NFL stadium in the United States" (Losen & Gillespie, 2012, p. 6). Notably, students with disabilities are more than twice as likely to be suspended than their non-disabled peers (U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2014; Losen et al., 2015). Of additional concern is the degree that restraint and seclusion practices are being used on students with disabilities. Despite national coverage of restraint-related deaths, students with disabilities are again receiving well over half of the restraint and seclusions being reported. When exclusionary practices are used to discipline a student with a disability, they are deprived of the full opportunity and benefits outlined in the IEP (Pauken & Daniel, 2000). Access to interventions and services are especially important for

behavioral interventions, which rely on consistency over time (Krezmien et al., 2006). The IDEA (2004) acknowledges the need to safeguard educational opportunities for students with disabilities. The MD provision is intended to ensure that students with disabilities are not denied a FAPE for behaviors that are related to their disability. However, as with many provisions written in law, "issues of interpretation and enforcement exist" (Chopp, 2020, p. 424).

The IDEA (2004) places a great deal of emphasis that an accurate MD decision is likely when educational team members effectively collaborate throughout the MD process (Lewis, 2017). An important issue of educator skill and training arises when we make determinations about what education a student will receive based on the professional's ability to come together to effectively collaborate. Further, very little research exists to explore the decision-making process in MD meetings (Walker & Brigham, 2017). Therefore, the question of how we prepare preservice teachers to collaborate becomes an important consideration. In a survey of higher education faculty, almost all reported recognizing the priority to teach educators to partner collaboratively with families (Kyzar et al., 2019). However, many preservice teacher preparation programs do not directly teach collaboration (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). An assumption is made that our collaboration skills will naturally develop with experience (Friend, 2000). Further exposure to the skill is considered to be addressed through field placement opportunities (Fullerton et al., 2011; Ricci et al., 2017; Scruggs et al., 2007). Yet, surveys of new teachers report what we already know, exposure isn't enough (Putnam & Borko, 2000) and collaborative skills acquisition requires direct and explicit instruction (Friend, 2000; Jacobowitz & Michelli, 2008; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). If collaboration is a primary process for which FAPE is provided for students with disabilities (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2014) and preservice teachers aren't being directly taught collaborative skills, where does that leave the

current support and services students are being provided? In addition, how can we rely on a legislative discipline provision, such as the MD provision, to safeguard a student's access to education?

What we teach can often be as important as how we teach it. Teacher reports align with the common structure of higher education pedagogy requiring students to analyze problems in isolation using theory to justify analytical reasoning (Dotger et al., 2010). Given that field placements may be the first experience preservice teachers have applying content to practice, it is no surprise many new teachers experience a research-to-practice gap (Fitzpatrick & Knowlton, 2009; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Wigle & Wilcox, 2003). Because the first years as a new teacher can often be the hardest, a lack of adequate training may leave many stressed and unprepared for the experiences they will encounter (Jones, 2009; Rosenberg, 1996). Further, a lack of preparation leads to higher attrition in teacher retention (Alliance for Excellence, 2014). Nationally, approximately 50% of teachers leave the field with five years of teaching (Tyler & Brunner, 2014). Special education teachers are 2.5 times more likely to leave teaching when compared to their general education counterparts (Leko & Smith, 2010; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Preservice preparation can offer a viable solution for mitigating some of the stress that comes with being a new teacher (Billingsley et al., 2004; Washburn-Moses, 2009; White & Mason, 2006).

Significance of the Study

Limited research exists regarding how we prepare preservice teachers to collaborate. As professionals in the field of teacher education strive to challenge how collaboration can be addressed in teacher preparation, there is a shared understanding that we need more research (Bradley & Monda-Amaya, 2005; Driver et al., 2018; Gallagher et al., 2008; Hamilton-Jones &

Vail, 2014; Scruggs et al., 2007). Further exploration is necessary to determine what collaboration skills are valuable and what instructional strategies promote sustained implementation and generalization (Weiss et al., 2017). An exploratory study examining meaningful activities that can be used to prepare teachers to collaborate could add to the existing literature by identifying themes related to the social validity of specific instructional tools. Additionally, because of the relationship between collaboration and the IDEA (2004), it is important to look at a piece of the law, the MD provision, that has been rarely examined (Walker & Brigham, 2017).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived usefulness of a training package that includes direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video-analysis to support teachers' knowledge, skills, and confidence to collaborate and participate in MD meetings. Following participation in the training, a small group of teachers were individually interviewed to examine their perceptions of the training and personal confidence with implementing collaborative skills in MD meetings. Students were asked to describe their perceived strengths and weaknesses for each phase of the training, training components that helped shape their confidence to participate in MD meetings or collaborate as an educational professional, collaboration and training needs still present, and overall perceptions of the training. The goal of this study was to identify if the training package is a valuable instructional strategy to teach teachers to participate in MD meetings informing a possibility for further implementation or exploration in both teacher training and collaboration during MD meetings.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study focused on the experiences of preservice teacher educators' confidence and experience with collaboration practices. Specifically, a training was created to explore instructional practices and participants' perceptions of the training and personal confidence level in implementing skills taught.

Q1 What are the experiences of preservice teachers who participate in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video analysis as instructional tools to teach collaboration through MD meetings?

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Q4 How satisfied are the undergraduate preservice teachers who participated in the training?

Definition of Terms

Collaboration: A group of two or more people who voluntarily participate as equal parties in shared decision making, working towards a common goal (Friend, 2018).

Emotional and Behavioral Disability (EBD): Any student with a social emotional or behavioral need that is receiving special education services for a behavior that is characterized by:

> Inability to maintain or sustain satisfactory relationships, inability to learn that is not sufficiently explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors, chronic or inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances, pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression, and/or a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with school problems. (300.8 (4)(i)(A)(B)(C)(D)(E), 2004) .

It is important to acknowledge that a more formal and specific definition related to eligibility exists within federal legislation; however, for the purpose of exploring the MD provision, a

broader definition will be utilized within this manuscript to include any student, regardless of eligibility, who presents with a need related to their social, emotional, or behavior skills.

Manifestation Determination (MD): A legal provision included in the IDEA (2004), a MD is a procedural safeguard intended to ensure students with exceptionalities are not excluded from educational opportunities due to behaviors that are a result of their disability. When exclusionary discipline removals occur at a rate or frequency that a student's access to FAPE is questioned, a team meeting process is implemented to determine the unique nature of a student's behavior as it relates to their disability.

Simulation: Through the use of simulated actors, who provide a consistent model for the exposure of specific experiences and skills (Barrows, 1993), simulations provide targeted practice opportunities through an imitative representation of reality (Sauvé et al., 2007).

Video-Analysis: An instructional approach involving recording a particular personal professional experience (lesson, meeting, etc.), identifying a target skill for change to specifically observe, utilizing a tool for evaluating the target skill, creating a plan for change (Young et al., 1995).

Conclusion

Students with disabilities are experiencing disproportionate rates of exclusionary discipline putting them at risk for increased future challenges (Losen et al., 2015; Perry & Morris, 2014). The IDEA (2004) provides discipline provisions that are designed to provide assurances related to a student's access to education when behaviors exhibited relate to one's disability. However, understanding how decisions are made during the MD process is unclear. This brings great concern, given the rates of exclusionary discipline practices being used in schools. Given that the IDEA (2004) assumes a valid MD decision is made when adequate

collaboration has occurred, it is important to explore ways in which we train teachers to collaborate.

The next chapter, the literature review, focuses on providing background related to MD processes and potential preservice pedagogy related to MD processes and collaboration providing: (a) an overview of current discipline practices affecting equitable education for students receiving special education services; (b) the historical evolution of the MD provision including MD legislation, litigation, and procedures; (c) current practices to teach collaboration preservice teacher education; and (d) a review of simulations and video analysis as possible solutions to teaching and supporting the generalization of collaboration skills. The review hoped to provide a foundation for the current study, including gaps in the research and a rationale for exploring preservice pedagogy structured within the MD process.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The State of Current School Discipline Practices

Efforts to provide effective education to students with EBDs have been largely inadequate (Merrell & Walker, 2004). Students with EBD are more likely to be placed in a restrictive educational setting, hold an average GPA of 1.4, are absent an average of 18 days a year, and have a less than 50% graduation rate (Merrell & Walker, 2004; Wagner, 1995). Within three years upon leaving high school, more than 50% of students identified as having an EBD have had at least one arrest, and 68% of students are unemployed within five years of leaving school (Merrell & Walker, 2004; Wagner, 1995; Wagner et al., 2005). The field of special education is constantly evolving with the development and redevelopment of law, professional practice, and evidence-based interventions. Despite legal evolution, students who receive services for an EBD have historically and consistently been underserved (Merrell & Walker, 2004).

In 2009-2010, over three million students were excluded from school due to suspensions, causing them to miss academic opportunities (Losen & Gillespie, 2012). Students with disabilities are more than twice as likely to be suspended than their nondisabled peers (U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2014; Losen et al., 2015). Krezmien et al. (2006) found that students with EBDs were more likely to be suspended, indicating poor support for their behaviors or a lack of consideration of the student's disability, when implementing

disciplinary consequences. When a student is removed from school, they are deprived of the full opportunity and benefits outlined in the IEP. Access to interventions and services are especially important for behavioral interventions which rely on consistency over time. An issue of integrity of special education services further arises when students with disabilities are removed from the learning environment due to disciplinary consequences (Krezmien et al., 2006).

School discipline practices continue to be debated and of consistent concern for professionals who work in education (Rose & Gallup, 2004). Despite policy, educational initiatives and best practice exclusionary discipline, such as suspension, continues to increase at alarmingly consistent rates, demonstrating that exclusionary practices are one of the most overused forms of discipline in schools (Losen et al., 2015). Suspension rates continue to bring confusion to advocates for discipline reform, as research continues to demonstrate that out of school suspension is not an effective educational practice (Losen & Gillespie, 2012; Skiba, 2014). Meanwhile, zero-tolerance policies arose as a popular "solution" to discipline concerns by providing a false belief that discipline problems are being addressed when, in fact, these policies have shown little effectiveness in addressing the discipline problem (Scheuermann & Johns, 2002). Krezmien and colleagues (2006) argued disproportionate and exclusionary discipline practices for students with EBDs are only exacerbated by zero-tolerance policies. It is evidence that institutions may need to question the efficacy of these policies when students with disabilities are suspended, arrested, or expelled at alarming rates.

Suspension is only one aspect of exclusionary discipline that occurs in schools. Restraint and seclusion practices are a common occurrence for many students with disabilities, thus challenging the efficacy and implementation of an IEP (Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, 2009). A restraint is generally defined as any means (person, device, etc.) that

involuntarily limits one's freedom of movement. Seclusion is a form of restraint that involves placing a student alone in a room or area where egress is prevented (Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, 2009). No federal framework provides guidelines in the use of restraint and seclusion, and each state can create their own guidance (Butler, 2015; National Disabilities Rights Network, 2012).

In the 1990s, 142 restraint-related deaths were reported (Weiss, 1998). Today the individual cases continue to mount. In Georgia, after being left alone in a small room, a child with known suicidal tendencies committed suicide by hanging himself with his shoelaces (United States Government Accountability Office, 2009). A United States Senate report (2014) reviewed a number of cases, finding an 8-year-old girl was secluded 44 times in one school year, while another student was physically restrained 89 times in 14 months. One student received a diagnosis for post-traumatic stress disorder and required services from a psychiatric facility that resulted from the school's use of restraint and seclusion (United States Senate, 2014). All of the previous cases failed to prevail in a court of law (United States Senate, 2014). In 2011-2012, restraint and seclusion were used on at least 110,000 children in school, according to school district reports, reporting the number of restraints and seclusion increasing (U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2014). In 2015-2016, 122,000 students were restrained or secluded. Students with disabilities are receiving the bulk of the reported restraints and seclusions, with 71% of those restrained being served under the IDEA (2004) and 66% of students secluded including students serviced under the IDEA (2004). An overreliance on restraint and seclusion practices is often a result of a failure to utilize other behavioral techniques that may have prevented the escalating behaviors (Scheuermann et al., 2016).

Restraint and seclusion practices have demanded professionals' attention for some time. The Council for Children with Behavior Disorders (CCBD), a division of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) published a position paper regarding the use of physical restraint procedures used in schools. The CCBD's position paper offers to provide for some states what their state law is lacking, including the principle of conducting an FBA for those students whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others (The Council for Children with Behavior Disorders [CCBD], 2009). In 2012, the National Disabilities Rights Network (NDRN) provided guidance and a call for change. In the article *School is Not Supposed to Hurt*, the NDRN documented the efforts that have been made to make a change. The efforts include the consideration and notice that has occurred at the legislative level. The Preventing Harmful Restraint and Seclusion in Schools Act (H.R. 4247), renamed Keeping All Students Safe Act (H.R.7124), was a bill that would have set a federal standard for how restraint and seclusion would be used in schools. The CCBD (2009) strongly urged professionals to consider the "repeated use of physical restraints for any one student or across different students as the failure of educational programming and the likelihood that interventions for students are inadequate and should be modified" (pp. 14–15). Due to the aforementioned challenges, there is continued need to improve the MD disciplinary provision. Since educators are often tasked with MD decisions, educator training may be a viable solution to improving the MD process.

An Examination of Manifestation Determination Provisions

Manifestation Determination Codified Criteria

Removal from an educational setting due to disciplinary issues is classified in two categories: short- and long-term removals. A student with a disability can be removed from one's

current placement, similar to typical peers, for a violation of the code of student conduct as long as the removal does not exceed 10 cumulative days (IDEA, 2004). Mason v. Board of Education (2011) demonstrated short-term removals did not require procedural safeguards when a student with a disability was suspended for five consecutive days for a violation of the discipline code of conduct, thus demonstrating a student with a disability can be disciplined the same as one's peers when violations are less than 10 days. Though short-term removals are less than 10 days and are not consecutive in nature, education agencies are advised to consider if a disciplinary change of placement has occurred. Disciplinary change of placement for short-term removals can be done by examining: (a) if the behavior subject to the removal constitutes a pattern that totals more than 10 school days in a year; (b) if the incident is substantially similar to previous incidents that have resulted in removals; as well as (c) the length of removals through the total of time removed and the latency of the removals to one another (IDEA, 2004). Long-term discipline removals, however, are typically removals that are consecutive and are often associated with more than 10 days (IDEA, 2004). This can include removal to an IEAS, as long-term suspension or expulsion when the behavior is determined not to be a manifestation of the student's disability (IDEA, 2004). For example, C. C v. Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District (2016) was within its rights when they moved a student with a disability to an alternative education environment for a violation of the school code of conduct for which the behavior was found not to be substantially related to the student's disability. Educational agencies need to consider in-school suspension (ISS) days as suspension days unless the following three factors are documented and provided: (a) an opportunity to appropriately progress in the general curriculum, (b) services as they are outlined in the IEP, and (c) participation with typical peers occurring as it would in the student's current placement (Big Beaver Falls Area School District v. Jackson,

1993*;* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2016)

The 1997 IDEA amendments brought a codified criterion to ascertain manifestation determination and other discipline procedures. The IDEA was reauthorized again in 2004 and with it came new criteria involving two primary questions to determine disciplinary change of placement when conducting a MD meeting:

1. Was the behavior in question caused by or did it have a direct and substantial relationship to the student's disability (IDEA, 34 CFR § 300.530(e)(1)(i), 2004)?
2. Did the behavior result due to the district's failure to implement the Individualized Education Program (IEP) (IDEA, 34 CFR § 300.530(e)(1)(ii), 2004)?

Though IDEA (2004) does not specify the number of days a student can be suspended, it does state that a student suspended for more than 10 school days may have experienced a change of placement (Yell & Rozalski, 2008). School officials' legal procedures to follow when suspending a student for more than 10 days include contacting the parents in writing, conducting an IEP meeting, and holding a MD meeting. When school officials fail to meet the IDEA (2004) change of placement procedures, the suspension is a violation of the law (Yell & Rozalski, 2008).

Students who have been suspended for 10 cumulative days are entitled to the team of relevant IEP members convening to determine if the 10 cumulative days is a pattern of removals which equals a change of placement (IDEA, 2004). Yell and Rozalski (2008) stated a change of placement determination is made by reviewing the number of suspensions, "proximity of suspensions to each other, and the reason for the suspensions" (p. 12). In addition, the team must discuss the educational services that will be provided if suspended for more than 10 days. Services provided during suspensions must allow a student to continue to work towards meeting

goals and objectives as outlined in the IEP and participate in the general education curriculum (IDEA, 2004; Yell & Rozalski, 2008). The MD meeting is held to determine if the behavior resulting in the pattern of removals holds a direct or substantial relationship to the student's disability, or if the district failed to implement services as outlined in the IEP (IDEA, 2004). Schools are responsible for providing documentation that indicates if a student's conduct is not a manifestation of the disability (Katsiyannis & Maag, 2001).

The MD outcome is significant for students with disabilities (Lewis, 2017). When the MD team determines that the student's behavior is not a result of their disability or the district's failure to implement the IEP, a student can be disciplined in the same manner as a student without a disability (IDEA, 2004). When the student's pattern of removal constitutes a change of placement and the team answers *yes* to either of the two-prong questions described earlier, then specific procedures to follow are outlined in the IDEA (2004). For those situations in which the district failed to implement the IEP, the local education agency (LEA) must take immediate steps to remedy any deficiencies (IDEA, 2004). If the behavior in question resulting in the MD meeting is considered to be a manifestation of the student's disability, an FBA--unless one was already conducted prior to the behavior in question--and development of a BIP must occur (IDEA, 2004). The IDEA (2004) leaves little guidance as to what must be completed when conducting an FBA; thus, it is up to court cases and individual states or policy to define.

Case law can be persuasive and has proven to be very helpful when defining requirements set forth in the law. Broward County School Board (2010) provides a number of recommendations for completing an FBA (110 LRP 38160). The administrative law judge (ALJ) denied a parent request for an independent educational evaluation (IEE), stating that the FBA conducted by the district was appropriate and adequate to provide FAPE. This determination

provided guidance on key information school teams should incorporate in the FBA including: (a) identifying a target behavior that is interfering with the students' progress in general education or towards goals, (b) student observations with data collection on identified target behavior, and (c) formulating a hypothesis about the maintaining causes of the behavior. Both H.D. v. Central Bucks School District (2012) and C.P. v. Krum Independent School District (2014) furthered the definition of FBA for school implementation to include identifying target behaviors of concern, identifying the antecedents, and consequences are sufficient.

When a team conducting a MD meeting determines that the behavior in question was a manifestation of the student's disability, considerations must be given to a BIP. The MD team uses FBA results to develop or update a BIP. In cases when the BIP has already been created, the team must review and make modifications that address the behavior resulting in a manifestation of the student's disability (IDEA, 2004). Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District (2017) set a new standard for providing FAPE through a BIP. This standard will be applicable for those teams developing BIPs as a part of the MD process requiring IEP teams to build supports that provide access to meaningful educational benefit. Similar to an IEP, the BIP must be individualized to meet the unique needs of the child. A BIP should include a provision of instruction and strategies that will support a decrease in the target behavior (Broward County School Board, 2010; C.P. v. Krum Independent School District, 2014; H.D. v. Central Bucks School District, 2012).

Limitations of the Manifestation Determination Provisions

Several limitations exist within the MD process including the subjective nature of the law as well as the ambiguity and intent of the two-prong questions used to determine a MD of a student's disability. The question remains if our federal policy is truly providing the discipline safeguards necessary to provide FAPE when faced with current zero-tolerance discipline policies (Brown, 2012). The MD provision attempts to provide a compromise between the interests of "zero reject" for students with disabilities and "zero tolerance" for safety-threatening behavior (Zirkel, 2007, p. 445). The 2004 amendments of IDEA moved regulations toward the zero-tolerance direction, especially with specifics to the MD process (Zirkel, 2010). The MD changes with the IDEA (2004) revision have questionable consequences for students with disabilities related to the determination of student access to services vs. being excluded from school (Weber, 2006). Teams are now required to prove the behavior has a relationship to the disability, whereas past criteria assumed this relationship between behavior and disability. Consequently, a more subjective interpretation to the law is used.

It is important to note that a number of noticeable changes took place between the 1997 and 2004 changes to the MD provisions in IDEA. There is a higher degree of case law regarding MDs under the 2004 IDEA regulations than were conducted with the 1997 IDEA regulations (Zirkel, 2010). An increase in case law could be due to the ambiguous nature of the two-prong questions that guide the MD determination. Brown (2012) argued the reauthorization of the IDEA (2004) includes vague MD criteria and may make it more difficult for families to access legal representation when providing FAPE has been denied. Meanwhile, Weber (2006) stated, "The obvious goal of the statutory change is to diminish the number of cases in which the school district must find that the behavior was a manifestation of the disability" (p. 36). The 1997 IDEA

discipline regulations for MD somewhat surmise a child's discipline removal considered to be a manifestation of his or her disability and, therefore, was not a reason for a student to be removed from their placement (except for weapons and drugs) (Weber, 2006). In order for removals to be considered, the team must review relevant information. The team must determine if, with relation to the behavior, the IEP and services and supports were provided in a consistent manner to the student's needs and placement, the student's disability did not impact their ability to understand the implications or consequences of their behavior, and the student's disability did not impact their ability to control their behavior (Weber, 2006).

The 1997 MD provisions may have made it easier to determine that a student's behavior was substantially linked to their disability. Discipline removals relied on a school's ability to demonstrate the behavior and disability was *not* related. Also, the 1997 MD provision included the question of whether the student's IEP services were appropriate to the student's needs (IDEA, 1997). Questioning if the services are appropriate may be an easier question to answer than the IDEA (2004) question change of "Is the behavior a result of the district's failure to implement the IEP" (IDEA, 34 CFR § 300.530(e)(1)(ii), 2004)? Lewis (2017) analyzed one district's MD procedural process and decisions providing a case example that demonstrates the necessity of examining more than just the relationship of the disability and the behavior or the district's implementation of the IEP, but rather if the IEP was reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit. The case example showcases a student suspended for leaving the classroom without permission who eventually escalated to pushing and threatening staff. The student's IEP needs and impact of disability statement and behavioral history was limited. A current plan included a BIP to address the externalizing behavior of arguing with peers and staff. The team shared that the student often required redirection in class, but would escalate in response to redirects. Using

the BIP to make a MD determination, the team concluded that because the plan addressed verbal behaviors, not physical aggression, the student's actions resulting in the discipline removal were not a manifestation of the student's disability.

Lewis's (2017) case example demonstrates a concern implementing the intent of the law through the IDEA (2004) amended criteria. It also begs the question of whether the team's conclusion would have been different had they begun the MD process using the 1997 MD criteria. Of course, we won't know if the team's decision would be different using the 1997 criteria. We do know that the team's goal with the 2004 criteria was to evaluate, through relevant data, if there was a link between the disciplined behavior and the student's disability and if the district failed to implement the IEP (IDEA, 2004). When using the 1997 MD criteria, the teams assumed a link and, thus, were tasked with determining if the IEP was appropriate. Therefore, the BIP exclusion of physical aggression may have been viewed as an additional need of the student to be included for the IEP to be considered appropriate. Despite the incident in question involving both verbal and physical aggression, the team made a distinct point of differing the behaviors of verbal and physical aggression. The student already had a BIP and special education services for verbal aggression; therefore, an argument could be made that the student's behavior of concern should "fall under the umbrella of aggression" (Lewis, 2017, p. 9).

Regulations were changed in the IDEA (2004) to state the relevant team members must meet to determine if the behavior resulting in school removal was caused by the student's disability, or if the behavior was directly or substantially related to the student's disability. In addition, the team must determine if the school team failed to implement the IEP as it was intended. If the team determined either of the two variables were present, the team must determine the student's conduct was a manifestation of their disability. This change in the

language of the law demonstrates a separation between the court's view regarding MD (Weber, 2006). The IDEA (2004) regulations provide school personnel with more flexibility when determining disciplinary action for students with disabilities (Ryan et al., 2007). The language change in the IDEA (2004) may make it difficult to prevail that a behavior infraction is, indeed, a result of a manifestation of a student's disability (Weber, 2006). Brown (2012) suggested further analysis of the IDEA (2004) policy with current disproportionate discipline practices.

Katsiyannis and Maag (2001) argued the MD process is "conceptually and methodologically flawed and serves more of a political than educational purpose" (p. 85). When determining a MD, the team is making an assumption that the disability is an internal component to an individual defined through a social construct, yet the purpose of determining manifestation is to decide if a student can be excluded (Katsiyannis & Maag, 2001). The premise of the law utilizes a social process rooted in a medical model for an assumed internal disability, which is socially defined (Katsiyannis & Maag, 2001). Teams attempt to use a medical model to negotiate the MD process, only making the determination more convoluted when combined with the social nature of disability labels (Katsiyannis & Maag, 2001). Katsiyannis and Maag (2001) described another major flaw in the equitable determination of the MD is the lack of empirically validated methods to link disabilities and cause. Nevertheless, teams are able to use the law to deny students educational opportunities, and the link teams make between MD and disabilities are often subjective in nature (Ryan et al., 2007).

Manifestation Determination Implementation Since Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 Changes

Zirkel (2010) stated there is a higher degree of case law regarding MD under the 2004 IDEA regulations than were conducted with the 1997 IDEA regulations. Some believe the increase in cases could be due to amendments made to the two-prong questions used for making a MD (Brown, 2012; Weber, 2006). Nevertheless, analysis of these cases can provide trends in litigation as well as insight into how courts determine the link between manifestation and disability. Zirkel (2010) examined all published hearing and review officer and court decisions applied to the MD provision revised in 2004. Zirkel (2010) reviewed 14 cases published from 2006-2009. Half of the cases involved drugs or weapons. Of the 14 cases, 9 (64%) were found not to be a manifestation of the student's disability. Zirkel (2015a) conducted an analysis of 20 MD cases looking at the Individuals with Disabilities Law Reporter (IDELR) published hearing and review officer decisions addressing both the MD component of the IDEA (2004) as well as the question of IEP implementation. Of the 20 cases, 8 were for weapons, drugs, or threats to safety, and14, or 70%, were determined not to be a manifestation of the student's disability. The author also found a total of 87 published cases for MD within the course of pre-1997 authorization through 2015 cases. Throughout that time period, the percentage of "no" cases never went below 63% through any reauthorization. Katsiyannis and Smith (2003) demonstrated similar statistics. A review of 39 MD cases between January, 1999 to November, 2002 demonstrated schools prevailed in 74% of the cases. There is an emphasis in the case law demonstrating that school districts prevail in MD determination disputes. This is concerning as there is very little research present to substantiate the decision-making process involved in these meetings (Lewis, 2017). In one of the few studies conducted, Walker and Brigham (2017) found

that teachers struggled to understand the relationship between a student's disability and behavior. Thus, the limitations of this provision demonstrate a necessity to address proper teacher preparation, education, and support to appropriately educate and discipline students with disabilities (Yell & Rozalski, 2008).

Collaboration and the Manifestation Determination Meeting

Little research exists that has analyzed the decision-making process for MD meetings. Lewis (2017) analyzed 80 MD decisions by randomly selecting 40 "yes" decisions and 40 "no" decisions from one district's 721 MDs for the 2012-2013 school year. The district's procedural requirements of the MD provision appeared to be followed. However, it was difficult to analyze the decision-making process for MD meetings. Most of the formal MD paperwork submitted lacked details related to the team's decision-making process. The paperwork often shared that the discipline record, evaluation report, goals, etc. were examined, but no explanation was provided for what parts of the record led the team to a ruling for a relationship to the student's disability. Themes demonstrated teams' decisions were based on consideration of the student's disability, behavioral history, understanding of consequences, ability to control one's actions, appropriate responses in a normal circumstance, and behavior patterns outside of school. Despite common themes identified for the meeting decision-making process, the subject nature of the MD implementation was apparent. The MD team members "relied upon similar factors to reach opposite conclusions" (Lewis, 2017, p. 15). These findings indicate that lack of detail to paperwork along with the arbitrary nature of the district's MD decisions leaves questionable consequences for interpreting and implementation of the intent of the MD provision.

The MD provision exists to safeguard educational opportunities for students with disabilities, yet the decision-making process in MD meetings has rarely been examined in

research (Walker & Brigham, 2017). However, the IDEA (2004) places a great deal of emphasis that an accurate MD decision is likely when educational team members effectively collaborate to review relevant data and the student's current IEP (Lewis, 2017). A number of factors may impact collaboration during the MD process. Walker and Brigham (2017) expanded prior research completed by Jakubecy (2002), adding to the limited research conducted on MD team decision making. The intent of the study was to explore the MD decisions made by team members participating in hypothetical case studies. Team decision making was explored through the use of hidden profiles that involved the entire group all receiving some of the same information that made one MD outcome (e.g., was not a manifestation of the student's disability, or was a manifestation of the students disability) favorable, while each individual member received a bit of information that favored the alternative MD decision (e.g., student's behavior was related to their disability, or was not a manifestation of the student's disability). Thus, the information provided to any one participant was incomplete and required the other members of the team to share available information in order for each member to gain a complete understanding of the student and their behavior and, in turn, influencing the group's decision-making potential. The assumption is that when team participants share and discuss all their information, the "correct MD decision" could be made for each case study. Two research questions were explored: (a) What information do team members deem important or unimportant in making a manifestation determination decision; and (b) Are the perceptions of the discussion process in the manifestation determination procedure reported by general and special educators similar or dissimilar and in what ways? The authors' procedures involved three phases. First, case study development and hidden profiles were field tested and refined, and important information necessary for making the MD decision was finalized. Second, the MD hidden profile

meeting phase was conducted. The second phase of the study included a number of steps: (a) brief training that provided an overview of the MD process; (b) preparation for the meeting where participants were provided their assigned case study and were instructed to read the study and draw and individual conclusion regarding the IDEA (2004) MD requirements (e.g., was it a manifestation of the students disability and did the LEA fail to implement the IEP?), then rate the certainly on a scale of 1 to 10 of their decision and provide a narrative of their decision in response to open-ended question provided; and (c) the formal MD meeting procedure involving sharing of information and drawing MD conclusions, recording the outcome and providing the group's certainty in their decision on a scale of 1 to 10. Post-meeting individual certainty ratings were also provided with a written rationale for decisions. The final phase of the study included a semi-structured interview with one general and one special educator who discussed their perceptions of their meeting and the MD process. When exploring the preferred MD decision case studies for the information most frequently reported by participants to influence decision making, researchers found factual information such as student's home life, success with controlling one's emotions, and current FBA/BIP as the most commonly reported information impacting decision making. However, when looking at the non-manifestation case studies, the participants tended to rely on nonfactual information to inform their decision making such as opinions about LRE placement, opinions that the teacher was at fault, or claims that the student was showing off for peers. Though the majority of teachers reported the MD meeting process to be a fair way to make decisions about students' behavior, both general and special education teachers reported challenges with the terminology and linking behaviors to the ED disability criteria. Finally, some differences among educator roles and the decision-making process emerged as general education participants reported the need to have evidence to conclude the

behavior was, indeed, a manifestation of the student's disability, where special education participants approached the decision as though it was a MD unless the data presented indicated otherwise.

The results of the aforementioned studies provide some insight into team decision making, including considerations for teaching collaboration. As previously mentioned, the nature of hidden profiles is to provide unique information to team members by highlighting the extent to which each member discusses unique facts provided. This is especially important when holding a MD meeting that will determine a student's access to education as the validity of the decision is heavily influenced by the amount and value placed on the information provided during the meeting (Jakubecy, 2002). Walker (2013) explored the differences in information shared between general and special education teachers, finding special education teachers shared unique information provided through their hidden profile at a rate of 81.3%, while general educators shared unique information at 37.5%. In this study, general education teachers were found to be sharing unique pertinent information less than half the number of times of their counterparts. Further analysis found differences in the total number of times unique information was discussed, with special education teachers discussing the unique facts twice as often as the general education teachers. This finding aligns with research conducted on IEP meetings, demonstrating that special education teachers talk significantly more than other team members (Elbaum et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2004). When Walker (2013) explored factors that impacted decision making, half of the participants shared that hearing new information from other team members may have influenced their final decision. However, predetermined decisions in which team members maintained their original conclusions, avoided discussion of new unique information, or advocated for their position was present in two of the meetings. Finally, in both

the Jakubecy (2002) and Walker (2013) studies, none of the groups participated in a discussion that contained all of the unique information held among the team participants. Consequently, the emphasis of participant information sharing cannot be understated as it holds the key to increased accuracy of decisions and becomes even more important when participants come to the meeting with a preferred outcome (Jakubecy, 2002).

An Examination of Preservice Teacher Training in Collaboration

Collaboration is a hallmark of supporting the meaningful educational outcomes for students. Throughout the evolution of policy (e.g., IDEA and ESEA), the necessity of collaboration in education has remained a constant (Shepherd et al., 2016). Further, the CEC provides professional teaching standards which emphasize the importance of developing skills of collaboration (CEC, 2012). Despite the pivotal role collaboration often plays in successful education outcomes, many teacher preparation programs do not consistently allocate coursework to directly teach this skill (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2012; Kyzar et al., 2019; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). Many educators may assume that collaboration skills naturally develop (Friend, 2000) or that student teaching and field placements offer adequate exposure to collaboration (Fullerton et al., 2011; Ricci et al., 2017; Scruggs et al., 2007). However, this couldn't be further from the truth, as collaboration skills are best developed through direct and explicit instruction (Friend, 2000; Jacobowitz & Michelli, 2008; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009).

The success of educator collaboration is a vital factor to meeting the needs of all students (Arthaud et al., 2007; Friend & Cook, 2017; Kurtts et al., 2005). Student demographics continue to evolve and demand that educators utilize collaborative skills (Villa et al., 2004). Considering social emotional and behavioral needs alone, it is estimated that 1 in 5 students presents with a

mental health need in every classroom (Walker, 2018). Schools are often the primary location for interventions that can be utilized to support students who have mental health or behavior needs (Forness et al., 2000). Despite the necessity for schools to support social emotional and behavioral needs, teachers may not be prepared to meet the unique needs of diverse learners so that specialized instruction and appropriate education services are provided through necessary evidence based practices (EBPs) (Beam & Gershwin Mueller, 2017). Many K-12 schools have attempted to create equity and access for students to access educational opportunities by offering co-taught courses. However, this alone isn't enough as successful co-teaching requires competent and skilled collaboration that develops through specific preparation (Cramer et al., 2010; Weiss et al., 2017).

When providing FAPE for students with disabilities, collaboration is the primary process by which students receive the appropriate public education mandated by the IDEA (2004) (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2014). An important principle to the IDEA (2004) is the IEP developed from an individual student's needs and further advanced through a collaborative team. Various members of an IEP team may include the student, caregivers, related service providers, school administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, counselors, and community supports that come together to ensure the individual needs of each student with a disability are addressed and supported (Friend & Cook, 2017). All educators working on the team need the preparation to build relationships, communicate effectively, foster trust, and facilitate advocacy with various members of the team (Leko et al., 2015). Still, the student's caregiver remains frequently left out of educational decisions despite being a legally mandated member of the team. Exclusion of the caregiver voice may be attributed to the lack of preservice preparation in collaboration with graduating teachers who lack the skills, knowledge, and

confidence required for developing strong family school partnerships (Murray et al., 2008). Thus, collaboration between educators and parents is often difficult to achieve and sustain or ineffective altogether (Collier et al., 2015; Murray et al., 2013; Olivos et al., 2010). Parents have reported feeling overwhelmed and hopeless when planning for their student's education (Huang et al., 2010). Caregiver dissatisfaction isn't surprising, given the multifaceted roles and responsibilities required when planning for their child's education (Collier et al., 2015; Dunst & Dempsey, 2007) combined with educators who did not receive the training to do what is necessary to foster meaningful family, school, and professional partnerships (Dotger & Bennett, 2010; Harvey et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2013). Further, given the complex task caregivers of students with disabilities face and the complexities of collaboration, it shouldn't be surprising that educators require more support when learning how to support, encourage, and empower these families (Collier et al., 2015).

In addition to the noted needs surrounding collaboration, newly graduated special education teachers face a number of challenges during the first years of teaching. The beginning years of an educator's career are described as "survival" (Jones, 2009; Rosenberg, 1996). Preservice preparation holds the potential to mitigate stressors, but many teachers struggle with unclear roles and responsibilities (Billingsley et al., 2004; Washburn-Moses, 2009; White & Mason, 2006). When examining experiences of first-year special education teachers, a number of studies highlighted the vast responsibilities and needs experienced by beginning educators (Billingsley et al., 2004; Griffin et al., 2009; Whitaker, 2003). Whitaker (2003) surveyed 156 special education teachers and found a number of areas that require support: (a) special education policies and paperwork; (b) "unwritten" rules of the school and district expectations; (c) curriculum materials and resources; and (d) effective instructional practices to support individual

student needs. Meanwhile, Griffin et al. (2009) surveyed 596 first-year special education teachers to explore the factors that influence teachers' successes and struggles during their first year of teaching, finding teachers reported needing: (a) more time; (b) behavior management support; (c) curriculum and resources; and (d) collaboration with general education teachers. Billingsley et al. (2004) echoed themes found in both Griffin et al.'s and Whitaker's studies. A sample of 1,100 teachers were randomly selected to complete a survey investigating what aspects of a special educators' job responsibilities and experiences might influence an individual's desire to remain in the field. Additionally, a focus on induction and mentoring was explored. Similar to results of Griffin et al. (2009) and Whitaker (2003), Billingsley et al. (2004) found a broad array of experiences and responsibilities. Teachers reported: (a) teaching to a variety of needs and disabilities; (b) access to curriculum and resources; (c) excessive paperwork; (d) lack of administration involvement or expectations; and (e) research-to-practice gap. Given the varying and often unclear responsibilities, some question if teachers are adequately prepared for the jobs in which they may enter upon graduation (Leko & Smith, 2010; Menlove et al., 2004). Attrition rates only intensify the focus on preservice preparation as approximately 50% of teachers leave the field within five years (Tyler & Brunner, 2014). Providing promise, many special educators report the necessity of collaboration. Whitaker (2003) found special educators who reported informal support by other teachers was the greatest source of support. Similarly, Ricci et al. (2017) reported that a majority, 60%, of special and general education teachers felt that the university fieldwork in collaboration and co-teaching was primary to their growth as a teacher. It is clear that despite the various responsibilities special educators face, collaboration may be the tool that makes navigating these responsibilities possible (Driver et al., 2018).

Collaboration is no simple task. Despite the teacher-reported benefits, there is still much more to understand regarding how collaboration impacts preservice education or how to instruct collaborative skills (Bradley & Monda-Amaya, 2005; Driver et al., 2018; Gallagher et al., 2008; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2014; Scruggs et al., 2007). Understanding the impact of collaboration for future teachers can come with some challenges as higher education institutions often don't incorporate collaboration skill development into many programs (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). In a survey of higher education faculty from 41 preservice teacher preparation programs, 70% of the 124 respondents indicated that collaboration courses were not necessarily a part of elementary or secondary educators' course of study (Harvey et al., 2010). The collaborative coursework that was identified in the survey targeted special education majors, but was limited for general education preservice teachers. Allday et al. (2013) also examined how collaboration is addressed within 109 universities hosting teacher preparation programs. Despite the importance of collaboration for teachers educating students with disabilities (Weiss et al., 2017; Zagona et al., 2017), researchers found that only 6% of the universities required a course on collaboration. Kyzar et al. (2019) surveyed higher education faculty to examine how higher education institutions address family-professional partnerships (FPPs). It was not surprising that results from the 113 faculty members covering 52 U.S. institutions of higher education indicated agreement on the responsibility of teaching future educators to partner collaboratively with families (96.5%). Further, a large number of the surveyed faculty reported the need to dedicate at least one course to FFPs. Yet, regardless of the noted importance, only around 50% of the faculty reported satisfaction with the importance of prioritizing course content in collaboration and the amount of content currently being covered in coursework. Despite the noted priority of instructing collaboration and inconsistency in

instruction of collaborative skills, a number of studies offered guidance for understanding the role of teaching collaboration in higher education.

When teachers experience positive collaborative experiences, the experience holds potential to develop improved self-efficacy (Guo et al., 2011). Ricci et al. (2017) explored the perceptions of fieldwork opportunities that included training and placement in collaborative co-taught settings. The researchers discovered a significant difference in how preservice special education teachers rated themselves in their perceptions of collaboration from the beginning of the semester to the end. The preservice participants reported awareness and success in overcoming a number of challenges that come with collaboration. For example, these challenges included adjusting to differences in personalities, not always being on the same page, working with different goals, difficulty with compromise, and a lack of time to effectively plan. Similarly, Driver et al. (2018) saw an increase in preservice teachers' perceptions of collaborative skills developed throughout a simulated practice opportunity. When embedding a sequence of mixed reality simulations into a course on collaboration, preservice special educators' mean score gradually increased over time. Trends indicated improvements in non-confrontational language (verbal and nonverbal). Participants reported the simulations were especially helpful for practicing difficult and uncomfortable conversations. Further, the simulations increased participant understanding of the various collaborative roles present in education. Investigating ideas about professional collaboration, Pellegrino et al. (2015) interviewed preservice teachers before and after their participation in a co-taught course. Results indicated a change in ideas about collaboration and expanded knowledge of collaboration. Participants' remarks related to what makes collaboration work changed from the beginning to the end of the course. Initially, participants described communication broadly and noted the importance of their own ability to

be persistent and flexible as necessary to making collaboration work. After the coursework, participants noted ideas such as mutual respect, value what the others have to say, and empathize to indicate the role multiple parties play in collaborative success. Findings demonstrating preservice educators' expansion of collaboration understanding and skills are promising as successful educators demonstrate a number of collaborative skills. Wolf and Peele (2019) found professionalism, objectivity, advocacy, reflection, working with others, and working with students as necessary standards of practice in the field. Further, Farrand and colleagues (2019) explored collaboration in a shared-discipline training only to find the opportunity left many participants hopeful about future collaboration. One participant noted, "As a preservice teacher, I look forward to collaborating with any and all future professionals and educators because I now know just how beneficial that bond can be for children" (p. 7).

As preservice special education programs are encouraged to utilize high leverage practices (HLPs) including collaboration, some institutions of higher education have acknowledged the importance of developing the skills of collaboration in teacher preparation (McLeskey et al., 2017). Prioritizing directly and explicitly teaching collaborative skills has demonstrated a number of potentially positive outcomes. For example, when a general and special education teacher have a positive collaborative co-teaching relationship, students benefit with links to higher academic achievement for all (Mastropieri et al., 2005). Crais et al. (2004) found educators graduating from programs that provided explicit instruction targeting collaboration between family, school, and community partnerships better equipped to communicate with caregivers of students with disabilities. Researchers indicated that educators who initiate and encourage parent participation are more likely to motivate caregivers to partner in their student's education (Green et al., 2007; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). Though many

outcomes are proving positive, preservice teacher education programs continue to require consistency in prioritizing the instruction of collaboration skill to future teachers (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Brownell et al., 2005; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009; Scruggs et al., 2007).

As professionals in the field of teacher education strive to challenge how collaboration can be addressed in teacher preparation, there are several potential avenues that may hold promise. To begin, we need more research (Bradley & Monda-Amaya, 2005; Driver et al., 2018; Gallagher et al., 2008; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2014; Scruggs et al., 2007) as there is little formal understanding or consistent research to guide what collaborative or communication skills special educators need to acquire in their preparation programs. It is difficult to know how to effectively teach skills that have yet to be identified (Driver et al., 2018). Next, it is well known that educational systems often operate in a siloed fashion. We have professions for special education, general education, gifted education, at-risk education, etc. In turn, we have teacher education programs to train each specialty who rarely experience opportunities to work together, let alone participate in instructive collaboration (Friend & Cook, 2017). Researchers often agree that collaboration between general education and special education is a necessity. Further, developing and maintaining a collaborative relationship continues to prove difficult between general and special education teachers (Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Marling, 2012). Therefore, careful consideration can be given to how collaboration is structured within preservice preparation so that we build collaboration across disciplines (Spooner et al., 2010). Current status quo fails to build connections between teachers (CEC, 2012), leaving many without an inadequate understanding of collaboration at any level (Grossman et al., 1999; Santagata & Guarino, 2012). “When preparation programs seek to explicitly develop pre-professional collaboration skills across disciplines, pre-professionals learn the benefits of seeking support

from other professionals in different professions," leaving many preservice teachers excited about the possibility of collaboration (Farrand et al., 2019, p. 9). Field experiences have been a logical opportunity for collaboration across disciplines (Fullerton et al., 2011; Harvey et al., 2010; McKenzie, 2009); however, the evidence is lacking to demonstrate the collaborative skill development that will be necessary for sustained collaboration faced when working in the field (Weiss et al., 2017). Since many universities provide an introductory special education course accessible to all disciplines (Harvey et al., 2010), it seems plausible that various disciplines of preservice teachers could have a chance to build collaborative skills through experiential learning opportunities. Finally, we do know teachers need multiple scaffolded opportunities to practice new skills with explicit feedback in order to build confidence and skills (Driver et al., 2018).

Future Direction for Research: Supporting Manifestation Determination through Improved Educator Training

As described earlier, educators who lack knowledge and training in behavioral EBPs can result in an overreliance of punishment-based techniques (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Not surprisingly, research suggests preservice educators and current teachers need additional support to develop knowledge and skills necessary to implement behavioral practices in schools (Beam & Gershwin Mueller, 2017; Freeman et al., 2013; Gable et al., 2012; Reinke et al., 2011). Additionally, the challenges of navigating the MD process requires a level of knowledge, rigor, and robust analysis that many educators are simply not prepared to conduct (Lewis, 2017). Teacher preparation programs set the stage for building teacher pedagogy and, ultimately, formulate the philosophy and practices they will deliver once in the field working with students.

Freeman and colleagues (2013) found that teacher preparation programs are greatly lacking in the ability to prepare teachers to implement EBPs for students with EBDs. This lack of

preparation can leave teachers entering classrooms unprepared to support students, let alone provide an education aligned with federally mandated laws. Lack of preparation leads to higher attrition in teacher retention (Alliance for Excellence, 2014). After all, close to 10% of all teachers leave the field within the first year of teaching (Alliance for Excellence, 2014). Almost 50% of new teachers have left the field within five years of beginning their career (Alliance for Excellence, 2014). Higher rates of attrition are a costly consequence, with yearly expenses of $2.2 billion (Alliance for Excellence, 2014). Thus, overall attrition also perpetuates the problem of students' access to highly skilled educators. Darling-Hammond (2000) and Johnson et al. (2005) found teachers who have had at least three years of teaching experience encourage greater academic achievement and facilitate stronger positive outcomes for students. Thus, the need to prepare teachers for the realities of the field are paramount to meet all student needs.

Simulations

Field placements provide one of the few practice opportunities in preservice teacher preparation programs (Arnett & Freeburg, 2008; McKenzie, 2009; Phillion et al., 2005). Though, field experiences provide an intended scaffolded setting to experiment with teaching strategies and skills learned during coursework (Girod & Girod, 2008), they do not always provide multiple opportunities to practice a targeted content skill (Darling-Hammond, 2010), feedback (Zeichner, 2010), and safe learning experiences to a degree that promotes knowledge acquisition, self-confidence, and generalization of skills that will be used when working in the field (Badiee & Kaufman, 2015; Weiss et al., 2017).

Preservice teachers reported being worried about their ability to succeed when in the classroom (Boz & Boz, 2010; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014), reporting a gap between coursework requirements (i.e., readings, lecture, written projects, etc.) and direct classroom challenges

(Putnam & Borko, 2000). Teacher reports align with the common structure of higher education pedagogy requiring students to analyze problems in isolation using theory to justify analytical reasoning (Dotger et al., 2010). Given that field placements may be the first experience preservice teachers have applying content to practice, it is no surprise many teachers experience a gap between what they have learned in their coursework and what is expected in practice (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999).

At the core of teacher training is an opportunity to practice the skills being taught (Loewenberg Ball & Forzani, 2009; Zeichner, 2012). Many educators recognize the pitfalls of providing content in isolation without opportunities to practice (Knight, 2019; Yoon et al., 2007). Authentic learning opportunities are created for future teachers when preservice preparation programs consider ways to align coursework delivery and classroom application (Dotger et al., 2008; Knight, 2019; Yoon et al., 2007). If preservice teacher preparation programs wish to adequately address the research-to-practice gap experienced by early educators, practice opportunities must be embedded into course instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Pomerance et al., 2016; Sykes et al., 2010). As many teacher preparation programs are emphasizing a need to align course content directly with field experiences (Leko et al., 2012), simulations used to train professionals in the medical field hold promise as a promising pedagogy addressing concerns related to both maximizing field placements (Badiee & Kaufman, 2015; Hixon & So, 2009) and reducing the research-to-practice gap (Carrington et al., 2011; Hixon & So, 2009).

Simulation learning has a broad research base for their use in the medical field (Barrows, 1993; Dotger et al., 2008; Drews & Backdash, 2013). Though simulations have been noted as useful to a variety of occupations and utilized with different modalities (i.e., mixed simulations), the focus of this review is on the work developed by Howard Barrows as his medical framework

has recently been analyzed as a viable option to train preservice teachers. A prominent name in developing simulations in the medical field, Barrows began building his pedagogy in 1963 by incorporating a standardized actor to play a patient with specific needs, providing a consistency in training and practice for multiple physicians who worked to solve the medical case and provide treatment for the patient (Dotger et al., 2019). Simply defined, a simulation is an imitative representation of reality applied as a system (Sauvé et al., 2007).

The essence of the learning experience is created through practice opportunities that can be optimized as students play roles, experiment with content, analyze results, and reflect on the process (Lyons, 2012). Researchers in the medical field have found students who learn through simulated pedagogy have an opportunity to review their simulations to encourage a deeper analysis of practice that is often lacking when experimenting in the field (McMahon et al., 2005). A number of other noted benefits have been discovered. First, simulations provide a student in training the opportunity to experiment with new skills and take risks without harming the patient (Kneebone, 2003; Murray et al., 2002). Without a fear of failure or harm to the client, students are able to practice communication and collaboration skills required by the field (Holcomb et al., 2002). Having control over the context through a simulation can allow instruction to focus on the needs of the student in training, rather than that of the patient, thus intensifying learning opportunities (Kneebone, 2003). Further, simulations provide an opportunity to emulate specific challenges found in the field (Dotger et al., 2015) or focus on a broader range of experiences than what may be available in practice (Lighthall & Barr, 2007). Finally, addressing the importance of supervision to maximize learning simulations include immediacy of feedback (Kneebone, 2003).

Given the success of simulations in the medical field, it may be plausible that the advantages may transfer to the field of preservice teacher education. A number of important characteristics have been found that may be applicable to the education field (Barrows, 2000; Issenberg et al., 2005). First and foremost, simulations provide a missing link in education (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Zeichner, 2010*)* by providing an integration of course content (Barrows, 2000) with repeated practice opportunities that include instructor feedback (Issenberg et al., 2005). Additionally, simulation gives structured challenge, contextual impact, and social impact (Barrows, 2000) that provide a sense of purpose to the experience (Badiee & Kaufman, 2015).

Simulations may also help reduce the research-to-practice gap for newly graduated teachers. By offering repeated trials, in a safe space where students can practice newly learned content followed by reflection and feedback, simulations can provide more intentional practice time than many field experience opportunities (Carrington et al., 2011; Hixon & So, 2009). Through structured role play, simulations can be catered to include content relevant to newly taught content as well as to capture various scenarios present in the profession. For example, the legal components of an IEP meeting combined with the constraints of field placements make it difficult for preservice teachers to fully engage with content learned. Gershwin Mueller and colleagues (2018) completed interviews with 60 participants who engaged with a semester-long course project that required preservice educators to conduct the IEP meeting planning and conduct the IEP meeting. Applied content from three courses was included, requiring participants to work for the duration of a semester to create the IEP based on the students' academic, behavioral, and social needs. A number of themes were present in the participant interviews indicating the project was a positive learning experience. One participant shared, "I

just couldn't imagine going into teaching and not having had that experience before" (p. 217). Other themes that emerged were: (a) simulated IEP meetings provided a valuable and helpful way to learn; (b) helped with future work as a special educator; (c) putting content to practice; (d) safe space to make mistakes and gather meaningful feedback; and (e) collaboration. Further, using the simulated interaction model (SIM), a number of researchers have been able to provide preservice candidates practice opportunities to collaborate with parents. Using standardized parents (SPs) who are trained to emulate a variety of parental characteristics, preservice educators have benefited from the interactions demonstrating growth in multicultural awareness (Dotger et al., 2008). Simulations may allow a layer of depth to instruction by producing diverse scenarios that would be difficult to create, thus allowing future educators an opportunity for exposure and practice prior to the field (Dieker et al., 2014). Producing an added bonus, simulations provide a suspended risk to both live students and the preservice educator. Through the scenario, preservice educators have the freedom to make mistakes as they experiment with content without the worry of causing "harm" to students (Carrington et al., 2011; Dieker et al., 2014). When preservice educators are provided with opportunities to participate in simulations with embedded course content, in the safe space of a classroom, additional time is available to experiment with the content, therefore building their self-efficacy (Gibson et al., 2011; McPherson et al., 2011). This may hold great potential for maximizing field placements as they no longer are the first experience teachers have applying content (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999). Field placements become an additional opportunity to refine the skills they have already built (Badiee & Kaufman, 2015).

Video Analysis

As discussed earlier, lecture-based models or activities that occur isolated from course content often do not generalize (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Joyce & Showers, 2002). Effective implementation requires instruction that incorporates in-context support of target skills (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Pomerance et al., 2016). One teaching approach that has gained momentum in the field of teacher education is recording teaching experiences and then completing observations based on video-taped classroom experiences (Weber et al., 2018). Video analysis, video monitoring, or guided video analysis (this approach hereafter abbreviated to VA) provides an opportunity to incorporate in-context support to evaluate target skills. Directly addressing the instructional desire to combine context and skill, observing oneself teaching, can encourage further reflection and enable varying perspectives for implementing a target skill expanding the opportunities preservice teachers have in the field (Tripp & Rich, 2012). Even without knowledge of the many benefits to be discussed in subsequent sections, it can be easily understood as to how VA has a long history being used as a tool to improve instruction (Alexander et al., 2012).

The use of video to aid learning developed shortly after the invention of the video recorder in 1951 (Fukkink et al., 2011). One of the first recorded educational applications of video feedback occurred in 1963 (Allen, 1966). Replicating the Stanford study, Ivey and colleagues at Colorado State University provided another early example of microteaching as a form of professional skill development (Ivey & Authier, 1978). Microteaching included recording the student during instruction of a brief lesson (usually provided to peers), followed by a review of the strengths and areas to improve, and then concluding with reteaching the lesson (Tripp & Rich, 2012). Early studies of VA were used to improve competencies in a number of professions including teachers, psychologists, and doctors (Huhra et al., 2008). The inclusion of

self-monitoring as a component of VA has demonstrated positive effects to addressing behaviors such as over-eating and smoking (Kingery, 1990; Myers et al., 2011). With over 50 years of innovation and empirical research (Fukkink et al., 2011), the practice of VA has evolved from isolated focus on specific behaviors to a critical analysis of actions occurring in a specific context (Tripp & Rich, 2012).

Today, throughout the world, the use of videos as a part of teacher education has become recognized as a valuable instructional tool (Greeno et al., 1996; Weber et al., 2018). Many have recognized the versatile nature of VA in pairing it with other forms of instruction such as role plays and feedback from supervisors (Fukkink et al., 2011), many of whom embrace the use of VA as an instructional tool and advocate the constructivist nature of the practice (Greeno et al., 1996) as students are provided opportunities to view themselves practice content-driven goals and develop a new image of themself as a practitioner (Hosford, 1981). Putting the student at the forefront of instruction encourages instructional experiences that are responsive to the learner (Santagata & Taylor, 2018). The tool of VA has been described as a tool to delivery content (Brophy, 2004). It is through a combination of instructional activities (Fukkink et al., 2011; Krammer et al., 2006) and interactions defined by the participant (Hosford, 1981).

There are two essential components included in the VA framework: self-monitoring and video-recorded content session. In addition to its use in education (e.g., change student behavior and improve the performance of teachers), self-monitoring has been acknowledged as a tool across various professions such as healthcare, marketing, and customer service (Scott et al., 2012; Storni, 2010). Recognizing self-monitoring and its role in continued improvement to teacher skills, professional standards are included in both the CEC and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) professional practices (CCSSO, 2011; CEC, 2012). Self-monitoring

includes an autonomous cycle of identifying a behavior to change, building awareness of the incidents of the behavior, recording the incidents using a standard to evaluate the efficacy of the instances, and developing a plan for change and continued monitoring and evaluation of the target skill (Young et al., 1995). Due to the immediacy and continuous nature of self-monitoring, it can be a popular instructional practice (Edelson, 2001; Korotitsch & Nelson-Gray, 1999). Self-monitoring practices hold potential to support new teachers' abilities to monitor their own instructional and professional behaviors (Briere et al., 2015), shifting the responsibility from the instructor or coach to the new teacher (Fedders, 2011). To address the goal of teaching an individual to become more aware of one's own behavior, Lan and Morgan (2003) provided two suggestions for ensuring self-monitoring is an easy and helpful tool: (a) build automaticity through practice, and (b) participate in retroactive self-monitoring through the use of video recorded sessions. One priority of this study includes exploring video recorded session structured with VA as a possible pedogeological approach to teaching teachers; thus, the focus of the subsequent sections will include addressing the suggestion of retroactive self-monitoring provided by Lan and Morgan (2003).

A number of options are available for using videos to improve teacher knowledge and skill by monitoring a behavior. For example, teacher candidates may observe video recorded sessions of other teachers or peers and monitor for demonstration of target skill(s).Video analysis is unique as teacher candidates observe video recorded sessions of their own teaching (Nagro et al., 2017) and monitor for demonstration of target skill(s) (Nagro & Cornelius, 2013). Reflection of one's lesson through video recording has historically included identifying instruction and identifying instructional strengths and weaknesses (Alexander et al., 2012); however, VA often includes a self-evaluation rubric and written feedback (Nagro et al., 2017). Use of a rubric alone

or in combination with a written reflection is helpful as many new teachers may need more direction in learning to self-reflect initially, focusing more on the description or feeling and thus, reducing the possibility of behavior change that can come with analysis, judgment, and planning (Brophy, 2004; Kalk et al., 2014). Further, for self-monitoring with reflection to be most effective, it should occur as soon as possible after the video recorded session (Alexander et al., 2012).

Many researchers agree that VA holds potential to support learning (Brophy, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2006). A number of possibilities have been noted when using VA as an instructional practice. First, when compared with traditional forms of reflection, VA is exceedingly more effective for developing reflection skills (Seidel et al., 2011; Tripp & Rich, 2012). This is surprising, given that the video can be paused and viewed as many times as necessary. This provided additional time to examine the content provided in the video (Brophy, 2004). The video allows teachers to notice behaviors, skills, and experiences they did not remember (McDuffie et al., 2014; Rich & Hannafin, 2008; Sherin & van Es, 2005). Next, as discussed earlier, effective field placement experiences can be a challenge (Allen & Wright, 2013; Bradley & Kendall, 2014). Of increasing concern, preservice teachers reported not feeling prepared for the classroom despite field experience (Nagro et al., 2017). Many universities are faced with budgetary constraints (Joseph & Brennan, 2013) and limited time and resources that may impact a struggle to locate placements, integrate course content into practice, and offer diverse learning experiences (Allen & Wright, 2013; Bradley & Kendall, 2014). For teachers in the field of special education, the partnership between the university and school placement is further complicated by teacher attrition and retention impacting the ability to partner preservice educators with experienced mentor teachers (Fedders, 2011). For decades, there has been a

shortage of teachers in the field of special education. In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education reported that nearly every school district in the country experienced a shortage of qualified special education teachers (Smith et al., 2010). Nationally, approximately 50% of teachers leave the field with five years of teaching (Tyler & Brunner, 2014). Special education teachers are 2.5 times more likely to leave teaching when compared to their general education counterparts (Leko & Smith, 2010; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). In order to maximize field placement addressing some of the university and logistic constraints, VA can be utilized as a means of layering feedback for preservice teachers (Fedders, 2011; Lee & Cheng-Chih, 2006). Assigning responsibility to the preservice teacher through self-monitoring may increase the self-management and depth of understanding of their own professional behaviors. Using a quasi-experimental study, Nagro et al. (2017) examined if VA could support preservice teachers, specifically as it relates to actual abilities of reflection and identified instructional skills. The results of the study indicated that both participant groups improved their perceived abilities as a teacher. However, those who received VA with feedback were better able to go from basic reflection to meaningful reflective abilities and to not just notice items applied, but truly analyze the application being implemented. The findings (increased perception of ability and actual reflective ability and instructional skills) suggested VA may have a positive impact on preparing preservice teachers. Preservice teachers begin to notice their own strengths and limits and plan for improvement, ultimately building skills in professional decision making (Crawford et al., 2012; Oosterheert & Vermunt, 2003). Halter (2006) and Sherin and van Es (2005) found teacher reflections changed when using VA from a focus on the pedagogy to a broader analysis including pedagogy and environmental factors. Further maximizing the field placement experience, VA can provide a link between the course content (theory) and practice opportunities (Bayram, 2012; Rich & Hannafin, 2008) by

providing targeted instruction rooted in over rehearsal, ultimately increasing retention and generalization of targeted skills (Corbin, 1967; Wang & Hartley, 2003). Santagata and Taylor (2018) examined the long-term effects of VA on professional practices. A total of 24 participants who had prior experience with VA through a video-enhanced mathematics course were compared to a control group at the end of their first year of teaching. Both groups were required to evaluate two lessons through a description of the learning goals, effectiveness rating, and reason for their conclusion. Those who had prior experience with VA in their preservice coursework outperformed the control group in both the quality of evidence they drew upon and their attention to their learners. The use of VA holds great potential in influencing teacher growth through expanded professional beliefs and vison (Oosterheert & Vermunt, 2003) and addressing the gap between theory and practice (Stürmer et al., 2016).

Conclusion

As schools become more diverse, it is predicted that the discipline process will become increasingly difficult (Arnberger & Shoop, 2006). Decisions regarding discipline are rarely easy. When students struggle with behavior, many of the adults who support the students struggle as well. Having an understanding of the legal provisions that protect students is a safeguard for educators. Professionals' knowledge in discipline provisions for students with disabilities will continue to directly impact students' with disabilities access to services and achievement. Yell and Rozalski (2008) appropriately stated, "When teachers have to use disciplinary procedures, it is important that they understand their duties and responsibilities, as well as the rights of their students" (p. 14). The MD process is one way in which professionals can provide consideration for disciplinary decisions that are made for students with disabilities. Despite the subjective nature of the process, professionals hold some power in developing structures, professional

development, and ongoing accountability for how a MD is implemented. A solid overview of the MD process is part of the necessary structures; however, teams also may benefit from understanding the foundation of the provision. Administrators, teachers, and families could benefit from education on their rights and responsibilities. Additionally, school professionals may benefit from learning additional collaborative and communication strategies necessary to determine a MD outcome that is substantively sound. The progress of future teachers' professional competence should be one of the most important considerations in higher education (Depaepe & König, 2018). Instructional methods that include repeated practice opportunities (i.e., overt rehearsal) with targeted course content that allow for the inclusion of teacher self-management encourages future teacher learning that may not only be generalized and sustained, but also expansive of one's individual professional vision (Bryan & Recesso, 2006; Fukkink et al., 2011). Developing professional beliefs and vision, or the ability to examine professional events and make meaning to direct actions, are important aspects to any teacher training (Blomberg et al., 2011). By examining perceptions through a phenomenological study in which preservice teachers are required to video record their simulations and self-monitor their progress of specific collaborative skills, I hoped to discover if the method is found valuable for these specific teachers. Upholding the IDEA's (2004) disciplinary provisions is a responsibility held by all educators who support a student with disabilities. Consequently, now more than ever, proper education is essential to successfully educate and disciple students with disabilities (Yell & Rozalski, 2008). The following chapter will provide the methodological overview of the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the value of an instructional training package that included three components: (a) direct instruction, (b) simulated MD meetings, and (c) VA. Preservice teachers need more than the knowledge of strategies with respect to collaboration and conducting a manifestation meeting with key educational stakeholders; they need the ability to apply the strategies as soon as they begin teaching. Specifically, this study explored preservice teachers' perceptions and confidence related to both the training and their perceived ability to implement collaborative meeting behaviors. Based on the previous literature provided, there was an identified need to address: (a) using pedagogy to train preservice teachers that will address the research-to-practice gap between what teachers learn through coursework and what they are expected to implement in the field; (b) training preservice teachers to collaborate as a tool that may support the various roles and responsibilities faced in practice; and (c) adding to the limited research highlighting the decision-making process of MD meetings. By examining perceptions through a phenomenological study in which a specific group of preservice teachers participated in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and observation of their progress of specific collaborative behaviors through VA, I hoped to discover if they perceived the instructional method as a valuable tool for learning collaborative behaviors to support their participation in MD meetings and beyond.

It takes knowledge, skills, and training to successfully facilitate a meeting that includes all participants' voices, working together to draw a fair and equitable conclusion for how to support a student's educational opportunities (Blackwell & Rossetti, 2014). Walker (2013) explored MD simulations and hidden profiles to investigate team participation, discovering that general education teachers contributed to half of the unique information shared compared to special education teachers. Further, parent participation has been researched through the IEP process indicating a less than satisfactory rate of participation (Valle, 2011). It is assumed that parent dissatisfaction with shared educational planning would extend to MD meetings where difficult discussions related to a student's behavior and, thus, access to education is determined. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) has noted the need to include parent voices throughout the reauthorizations of the law and yet, schools still struggle to meet the mandate (Wagner et al., 2012). Further, there is little research conducted on the topic of MD meetings despite their importance in potentially safeguarding educational opportunities for students with disabilities who struggle emotionally and behaviorally.

Exploratory Research Questions

The research questions for this study focused on exploring specific instructional practices to train preservice teachers to collaborate. Specifically, the intent of this study was to investigate how a group of preservice teachers viewed their learning and confidence with utilizing collaborative behaviors during MD meetings after participating in a training including direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA as instructional tools. Thus, the research questions centered around the perceived value of the training. In addition to exploring the perceived value of direct instruction, simulations, and VA, the questions explored the perceived confidence

teachers gain to collaborate and participate meaningfully in MD meetings. Four research questions were explored in this study:

Q1 What are the experiences of preservice teachers who participate in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video analysis as instructional tools to teach collaboration through MD meetings?

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Q4 How satisfied are the undergraduate preservice teachers who participated in the training?

Research Question 1

This question addresses the perceived value of direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA as instructional practices for a targeted group of preservice teachers. With this question, I hoped to gain a better understanding of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the training package and its components. I crafted interview questions that allowed me to explore the possible strengths and weaknesses of direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA as tools to learn collaboration during a MD meeting as perceived by a small target group of preservice teachers. I hoped answers gained from this exploratory question will address the need to explore additional tools that can be used to address the research-to-practice gap many new teachers face after graduating from their preservice preparation program.

Research Question 2

With this question, I hoped to explore participants' personal perceptions of their confidence to utilize collaborative strategies to participate in MD meetings. Specifically, I planned to explore questions that ask participants to share their confidence before and after participating in the training. Further, since the overarching goal of the study was to explore

viable and helpful instructional tools, as perceived by a specific set of teachers, I asked participants what specific instruction, information, or support teachers may need to feel comfortable participating in collaborative MD meetings. As highlighted in the limited research, there is a gap in the research related to the collaborative processes utilized in MD meetings.

Research Question 3

With this question, I explored the perceived impact of direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA on a target group of preservice teachers' perceived ability and confidence to collaborate in general. Specifically, I asked questions about each component of the training and the participants' views on their ability and confidence to implement the collaborative and conflict resolution strategies across the various experiences encountered in the field. It is a priority to prepare future teachers who are confident in their abilities to address the various challenges faced in the field. Collaboration is required of any professional working in education, yet we often don't directly teach the skill.

Research Questions 4

With the final research question, I explored the overall perceived satisfaction with the training experience altogether. I used the answers gleaned from the prior questions to further explore this question, along with concluding interviews by asking for any final thoughts on their participation and personal outcomes from the training including direct instruction, simulated meetings, and VA?

Research Design

A qualitative methodology was used to explore all research questions posed for this study. Specifically, I used semi-structured individual interviews to explore participants' experiences with the training. This study also utilized quantitative methodology to measure pre-

post confidence ratings as a secondary source (described later). However, the focus of this study lies in the qualitative methodology and will be detailed in the following sections.

The study sought to uncover the meaning of a phenomenon experienced by preservice teachers taking part in MD simulations with VA. Qualitative research is focused on understanding participants' experiences, how they construct their knowledge, and the meaning attributed to these experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). With an interpretive orientation, a qualitative model assumes “there is no single reality, but rather multiple realties and interpretations to a single event” (Merriam, 2009, p. 8). Interpretive inquiry can bring “visibility and unpack the mechanisms which link particular variables, through an explanation of the participants accounts of their experience” (Barbour, 2014, p. 4), bringing forth valuable information related to educating preservice teachers to collaborate within MD meetings.

There are multiple types of qualitative research methods. However, despite the variation in methods, a number of defining characteristics are present in qualitative research. First, the focus is on meaning and understanding of the participants' perspectives (Merriam, 2009). Process over product is of primary importance as the researcher looks to understand the participants' “lived experiences” (Creswell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Second, the researcher is considered to be the primary tool to data collection and analysis. For example, researchers are encouraged to utilize participants' verbal and nonverbal communication, clarify, and explore through the data collection process. Additionally, the researcher must constantly monitor their own subjective biases that can impact data interpretation. Third, qualitative research is inductive in nature. The researcher is working to build understanding of concepts, rather than test ideas. Fourth, rich descriptions of participant experiences and interpretation are used to convey the meaning of the phenomenon. A combination of quotes, field notes, interviews, or excerpts of

electronic communication enhances the descriptive nature of qualitative research (Merriam, 2009).

Qualitative Interviews

Conducting interviews is one form of data collection used to explore the participants' experiences. A qualitative interview is an interaction between the researcher and study participants in which discussion is driven by questions related to the research being conducted with the primary purpose of gathering specific information (deMarrais, 2004; Merriam, 2009). Interviews are essential when "we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them" (Merriam, 2009, p. 88). Further, interviews can allow additional flexibility for the researcher to explore a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Peters & Halcomb, 2015).

Qualitative interviews can be classified into different categories ranging from highly structured to a very unstructured, almost conversation-like format (Merriam, 2009). Due to the study being driven by a constructivist belief that each participant's experience was unique and, thus so, would be their experience with making meaning of the training, a semi-structured interview format was selected. Semi-structured interviews "assume participants define the world in unique ways" (Merriam, 2009, p. 90), allowing for the interviewee freedom of expression without interference while honoring the purpose of the study (Edwards & Holland, 2013). Semi-structured interviews contain a mixture of structure and less structured questions (Merriam, 2009). Through the use of semi-structured interviews, I strived to obtain in-depth information about the preservice teachers' perceptions with simulated MD meetings, VA, and goal setting. Interviews were approximately 30 minutes, conducted over the phone and recorded for verbatim transcription.

Phenomenology

A phenomenology approach (Creswell, 2013) to qualitative research was selected for this study because the research objectives aim to capture the "essence of the experience" (p. 104). The research questions that guided the study are intended to examine preservice teachers' take-aways from simulated MD meetings and VA. True to a phenomenological approach, the questions included inquiry into each participant's value of the instructional practices and if they provide benefit for implementation of collaborative practices during simulated MD meetings. As already indicated, collaboration, conflict resolution, and team participation poses a problem for the IEP process (Elbaum et al., 2015; Esquivel et al., 2008). Further, preservice educators report being less than prepared for conflict resolution and collaboration (Farrand et al., 2019; Santagata & Guarino, 2012; Zagona et al., 2017). Using a qualitative approach that is supported by an inductive process may foster the development of concepts, hypotheses, or theories (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) and, in turn, provide powerful information for exploring ways to enhance the pedagogy of preservice teacher preparation.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) stated, "Phenomenology is the study of people's conscious experience" (p. 26). The focus of the study was on the here and now, with an emphasis on exploring the nature of the experience and what it meant for the participants experiencing the phenomenon. The research strives to understand participant experiences as a part of their unique context while exploring any interactions (Patton, 2002). It is through the participants' truths that knowledge is developed (Bryman, 2017; Ospina et al., 2018). Utilizing a phenomenology approach, the study explores the shared experience of the research participants. Participant experiences are analyzed to develop commonalities, thus developing an understanding of the phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Though qualitative research is inductive in nature, a theoretical framework provides the basis of the researcher's orientation to the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The study utilized a constructivism framework for analysis and interpretive understanding. Constructivism is rooted in a number of beliefs: (a) knowledge is built as individuals interact with the world; (b) participant interpretations are unique and built from their social and historical perspectives; and (c) meaning making is a social endeavor (Crotty, 1998). The constructionist view, for this study, focused on understanding how the preservice teacher makes meaning through the use of simulated MD meetings with VA as it relates to learning. Preservice teachers are in the midst of constructing their understanding and knowledge of what it means to be an educator, and simulations and VA may be one tool to support this process. Academia is by nature a social context. The preservice teachers in the study constructed meaning from the content they learned in class with their peers and teachers, the meeting simulations, and combining that with their experiences with video recorded self-reflection. Further, a phenomenological approach is paired nicely with a constructivist approach to further help participants construct meaning through broad open-ended questions (Creswell, 2013).

Quantitative Pre-Test and Post-Test Assessments

The study utilized pre- and post-assessment questionnaires provided throughout each phase of the training, specifically (a) pre-assessment prior to any instruction, (b) post-assessment after direction instruction, (c) post-assessment after simulations, and (d) post-assessments after VA. A total of five questions were included in the pre-assessment survey. Because the survey was embedded within course content, student names were included, along with four questions related to the training content. Background information related to the participants' experiences with individuals with exceptionalities and their experiences with challenging behavior was

collected through multiple checkbox selections with an option of “other”. A forced-choice rating of participants’ confidence performing specific collaboration and conflict resolution skills and their knowledge related to the MD provision was included. Finally, the pre-assessment concluded with an open-ended question to include any additional information participants wished to add prior to participating in the "Collaboration through the Manifestation Determination Process" unit. The following three post-assessments contained the same three questions; however, the participants were asked to assess their confidence after participating in a specific phase of the training (i.e., direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA). Each of the three assessments contained a question for the students’ name and an open-ended question allowing participants to share any “ah-ah” moments they experienced as a part of that specific phase of the training.

Background Experiences

The pre-assessment included two multiple selection questions that focused on gathering the participants' background experiences with individuals who have exceptionalities and personal experiences with challenging behavior. Regarding the participants’ experiences with individuals who have exceptionalities, multiple boxes could be selected, which contained selections related to the following: (a) having an exceptionality; (b) working at school, volunteering at a school, working at a school to specifically support students with exceptionalities, volunteering at a school specifically to support students with exceptionalities, having a family member who received/receives special education services/504 supports, having a family member who has an exceptionality but did not qualify for special education services/504 supports, having a friend who received/received special education/504 supports, having a friend who has an exceptionality but doesn’t received special education/504 supports, having friends with siblings or family

members with exceptionalities, viewed tv shows, movies or read books about individuals with exceptionalities, took a course in college about individuals with exceptionalities; and (c) another box which participants could complete with additional experiences not included. Regarding the participants' experiences with challenging behavior, multiple boxes could be selected, which contained selections related to: personally struggling with one's own challenging behavior, worked in a school in a school and observed challenging behavior, supported a student's challenging behavior in a school or residential setting, witnessed a student's challenging behavior in a school or residential setting, supported a student with challenging behavior in the community setting, has a family member who struggles with challenging behavior, took a college course about supporting individuals with challenging behavior, describing self as having little to no experiences with challenging behavior, and additional experiences not included.

Preparation and Confidence of Skills

Each pre- and post-assessment asked participants to complete seven questions rating their perceived level of confidence to perform a specific set of skills related to collaboration and conflict resolution skills with families and other educational professionals, to participate in a MD meeting, to support disagreements with families, and in their individual knowledge of the MD provision. The questions used a side-by-side column format requiring participants to select one of the following: not confident, somewhat confident, confident, and very confident. Collaborative skills were defined as a paraphrase, reflection, consideration of body language, asking of open-ended questions, and provision of verbal specific acknowledgments.

Open-Ended Questions

The last part of each assessment included one open-ended question that allowed participants the freedom to expand on any major learnings gained from that specific phase of the

training. A copy of the pre-assessment and each post-assessment that was administered is provided in Appendices H and I.

Researcher Stance

A notable characteristic of all forms of qualitative research is that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Qualitative researchers have a responsibility to acknowledge the potential biases one may bring to the study (Merriam, 2009). Accepting that subjectivity can never be completely neutralized, qualitative researchers are encouraged to enhance the integrity of research by engaging in "reflexivity" to critically focus on oneself as a researcher (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). Explicit consideration is given to inform the reader of potential "biases, values, personal background, gender, history, culture and socioeconomic status that may shape the interpretation of data collected in the study" (Creswell, 2009, p. 177). As a teacher and student, I worked to recognize my own experiences and perceptions that may influence how I interpret the participants' experiences. I, too, have constructed my own meaning within the educational and teaching experiences I have lived. I worked to recognize my own biases and bracket those experiences, allowing focus to remain on the participant (Creswell, 2013).

I am a licensed special education teacher certified to work with a variety of exceptionalities in grades kindergarten through 12. My desire to pursue a career in special education did not come by chance. I had a loved one who qualified for special education services receiving support related to emotional and behavioral needs. The struggles faced by the student and their caregiver was frustrating at best and helped shape the course of my professional career. Though my license allows me the flexibility of working with a variety of exceptionalities, I set out with only one goal--to be the best special education teacher for students with emotional and

behavioral needs. I worked for several years in a number of center-based programs in elementary and middle schools that offered behavioral support for students across the district who required more intensive services than were provided at the students' neighborhood schools. While working within these programs, my interest in emotional and behavioral supports only increased. I pursued a master's degree program in clinical counseling. A year and a half into my clinical counseling program, I came to the realization that schools were where my passion resided, and I transferred to my intervention specialist master's program. Completing my master's, I worked as a whole school behavior interventionist and a school special education facilitator. My current interests include legal issues in special education, ABA, classroom management, trauma-informed school practices, inclusion for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities, building collaborative partnerships, and effective teacher preparation.

The topic of training educators to collaborate and manage conflict is of interest to me because of my professional experience. As a special educator supporting students with emotional and behavioral needs, I experienced a number of challenges facing educators, families, and students with these needs. In my experience, the students I supported were misunderstood and often excluded. I found myself frustrated at the circumstances and worked to advocate for more equitable opportunities for the students I case managed. My advocacy efforts could best be described as adversarial. Though my knowledge and expertise was valued, my fear and frustration was layered into my efforts, making my advocacy efforts less effective. Thankfully, as a part of my doctoral education, I was able to participate in research related to the facilitated IEP process. This brought a new perspective to my understanding of collaboration, consultation, and advocacy.

Despite my newfound understanding and tools, I still witnessed student circumstances that were, in my opinion, unacceptable and at times abusive (i.e., restraint, seclusion, suspension, etc.). It was during my last year working as a center-based special education teacher that the MD process became a strong interest area of mine. In the program in which I worked, there was a student being repeatedly suspended. The student, who was already on shortened days, had been suspended almost 30 of their half-school days within the first four months of the school year. I watched from the outside as the team struggled to provide FAPE, listened to colleagues remark in our team meetings that the behavior "wasn't a manifestation of his disability," and saw first-year educators entrusted with facilitating the MD meetings. In my opinion, these meetings were doomed to fail the student as a basic understanding of the MD provision, and the skills necessary to collaborate or facilitate collaboration appeared lacking. After all, the same meeting for the same behavior occurred over and over again with the team drawing conclusions about the nature of the student's disability prior to ever setting foot into a meeting. I sought to better understand the MD process in hopes of helping this student or others. In my exploration of the MD topic, I began to reflect on prior MD meetings I had attended. I found these meetings, too, failed the student and at times seemed to function as a loophole to exclude the student. I realized in my early years as an educator, that I lacked the basic understanding of the MD provision and collaborative skills necessary to adequately advocate. I wondered if there was a way to teach future teachers about the MD provision while also targeting the skills necessary to collaborate and support conflict with the hopes of striving to create better advocacy efforts for students and see more educators equipped with the skills of collaboration.

Building on my academic knowledge and professional experience, I believe students' needs are best met when there is a team of individuals working together for the good of the

student. This seems to become even more important when addressing behavior support. I believe preservice teacher preparation programs have a responsibility to provide future educators with the skills necessary to navigate the challenges and reap the benefits that come with collaboration.

Participants

All participants included in the study attended a western university in the United States. As a part of their preservice teacher preparation program, teacher candidates enrolled in a basic behavior management course addressing the following course objectives: (1) provide knowledge of the principles of behavior and how the historical foundations and the educational system relate to students who have behavioral needs; (2) foster an understanding of how to create an effective learning environment that is safe, productive, and conducive to the students' cognitive, social, and behavioral needs; and (3) foster collaboration among special educators, parents, general educators, related service professionals, and paraprofessionals when addressing problem behaviors, classroom management programs, and the creation of behavior intervention plans. Through their enrollment, candidates were required to participate in a coursework training package that included direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA designed to provide background knowledge of the MD provision and target collaboration skills--specifically, the ability to share their input in the meeting and encourage other participants' voices while discussing a student's behavioral needs. The course included 22 preservice candidates and related service providers, 14 of whom agreed to participate in the study. A summary of demographic information is included in the table below.

Table 1

Participant Demographic Information

Age	Education Emphasis	Teaching Experiences Prior to Preservice Program	Formal Instruction-Collaboration and Conflict Resolution	Year of Program
21	Special Education	Volunteer in school	None	Junior
21	Theatre Education	Volunteer in school	University coursework	Senior
20	Elementary Education with CLD and K-12 Endorsement for ESL	Volunteer in community	None	Junior
21	Elementary Education with an emphasis in Special Education	Volunteer in school	None	Junior
19	Special Education	Volunteer in community	Volunteer/work experience training	Sophomore
19	Elementary Education with ESL but switching to SPED	Volunteer in community	None	Sophomore
19	Elementary Education with ESL but switching to SPED	Volunteer in high school	None	Sophomore
22	Elementary Education with cultural and linguistic bilingual education	None	None	Senior
21	Special Education	Education based employment	University Coursework	Junior
20	Elementary Education with emphasis in literacy	Volunteer in community	Volunteer/work experience training	Junior
21	History with minors in anthropology and special education	None	University Coursework	Senior
20	Elementary Education with emphasis in performing visual arts	Volunteer in school	None	Junior
20	Elementary Education with special education emphasis	Volunteer in community and school	University Coursework	Sophomore
20	Special Education	Volunteer in community	None	Junior

Inclusionary and Exclusionary Criteria

To be included in the study, participating preservice teachers met the following criteria: (a) were undergraduate preservice educators in special education or general education or undergraduate related service providers; (b) were enrolled in the introductory or secondary behavior management courses offered through the university; and (c) had provided consent to participate in the study. Participation in the study was voluntary. Participants were notified that they could withdraw at any point. Participants were assigned numbers and included their general demographic information such as age, year in the program, major, and background information related to collaboration and the MD provision. Participants who did not meet the above criteria were excluded. Specifically, exclusionary criteria included undergraduates enrolled in the introductory or secondary behavior management course who were not planning to pursue an education related field.

Participant Recruitment

Participants in this study were purposely sampled to better analyze possible ways to improve preservice teacher preparation. Qualitative research studies can have vastly different sample size requirements than a quantitative study (Malterud et al., 2016). Evaluating research questions using a qualitative phenomenological study can be achieved with a small sample size (Kornhaber et al., 2015). Consideration was given to the number of participants that might be necessary to reach a data saturation point where new information gathered from the participants is limited or repetitive in nature (Tran et al., 2017). The goal was to gather a minimum of 20 undergraduate preservice teachers who were enrolled in a basic or advanced behavior management class offered through the special education department. All participants were over 18 years of age. The process for gathering volunteers included:

1. Discussing overview of study with students enrolled in the Behavioral Dimensions of Students with Exceptionalities I (EDSE 325) course that they were already participating in, with MD meetings and collaboration as a part of their course content.
2. Providing a letter and verbal explanation explaining the current research and risks, ensuring possible participants that there would be no impact on their grade should they choose to opt out of the study.
3. Collecting participant signatures.
4. Reminding participants their involvement in the study would be voluntary and they could withdraw at any point without explanation. This is especially important to emphasize as the students were already completing the instruction as a part of their course content; therefore, they needed to understand the study was separate from their coursework and there would be no risk of penalty for lack of participation in the study.

Ethical Assurances for Participants

Thorough consideration was given to ensure strict adherence to the ethical responsibility to respect the human participants involved in the study. Any possibility related to recruitment, data collection, and handling of data was first examined by considering the impact on the research participants. Before the recruitment of participants, the researcher received clearance from the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). During the recruitment process, informed consent, or the participants' rights, was provided in written and spoken form (Alase, 2017). Details included within the informed consent included: identification of the researcher, affiliate institution, purpose of the research, roles of the participants, data collection process, confidentiality agreements, and any possible risks or benefits. Participants were reminded before

signing consent and after signing of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. Once participants signed their consent, the confidentiality of each individual was of primary concern. Ensuring confidentiality includes protecting the identity of the participant through data collection and analysis. The use of numbers to conceal the identity of the participants was utilized. Ensuring confidentiality during data collection was protected by storing materials in a locked password-protected computer on a password-protected flash drive that was only accessible by the researcher. All documents and raw data will be destroyed by shredding and burning or by permanent deletion three years after the completion of the research. It is important to note that the study did not adhere to the anonymity requirement since the researcher knew the participants through face-to-face interaction.

There were no foreseeable risks for participants in this study. It was possible the students would be concerned that their responses could affect their grades. To safeguard this risk, the students were assured that the confidentiality of each individual was of primary concern and that participating, not participating, or withdrawing from the study would not impact their course grade. Ensuring confidentiality included protecting the identity of the participant through data collection and analysis. The use of numbers to conceal the identity of the participants' data was utilized.

There was no direct benefit to the participants regarding this study; however, the findings may benefit future preservice students and educational research with regard to the knowledge and preparedness of teachers with regard to MD practices. Further, this study will contribute to the enhancement of the special educator licensure programs at the university at which the study was conducted

Procedure

Participants were provided with four 1 hour 15 minute training sessions provided by the lead researcher. Instructional content was delivered within the three stages of the gradual release model of "I do," "we do," "you do" framework (Levy, 2007). The training sessions were divided into three phases: (a) direct instruction, (b) MD meeting simulation, and (c) VA.

I Do

During the first phase, "direct instruction," defined as any activity that provides course content guided or led by the instructor (i.e., lecture, supplemental active learning activies, demonstration, etc.), the instructor provided general information of the topic through assigned reading and a lecture presenting relevant background information such as what is an MD meeting, sharing necessary behavioral data, and tips for collaboration and how to support meeting conflict. The instructional phase of the training included Sessions 1-3. Though the instructor presented information related to target skills (i.e., MD, collaboration, and conflict), active learning instructional strategies were incorporated throughout lectures. Active learning is considered to be "instructional activities involving students in doing things and thinking about what they are doing" (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Using a constructivist framework, activities were provided that encourage students to assimilate the new information into their existing framework as they build their own understanding. With the belief that learning is social in nature, many of the activities included peer interaction. For example, throughout the MD lecture, breaks were given to encourage students to interact with the content by participating in the following activities:

1. Stump your partner. Using lecture content, come up with one or two questions based on what has been presented so far. Then share out.

2. Use your own words. Participants will be asked throughout the training to turn to their neighbor and explain the content being presented (i.e., what happens if the team determines it was a failure to implement the IEP) in their own words.
3. Case study examples. Use case law to "Be the Judge" scaffolded as Think-Share and then Think-Pair-Share, also scaffolded within an "I do," "we do," "you do" framework (Levy, 2007).
4. Building background. Provide students the course definition for collaboration with specific words highlighted (i.e., equal parties, common goal, etc.) and have students brainstorm examples of what these words mean or can look like in practice.

We Do

Next, the participants engaged in the "we do" of their instruction by participating in small-group breakout rooms containing 4-5 students. Participants were provided with a discussion prompt and instructed to engage in a small-group discussion with the intent of practicing the collaborative behaviors that were introduced in the lecture. The instructor modeled the breakout expectations by role playing the discussion as though they were a student practicing in the breakout room and demonstrated the expectation through a whole-group discussion. During the modeling, consideration was given to verbally identify, in the moment, any specific collaborative behaviors used, as they were utilized by the instructor's role play to demonstrate a model of how to practice. Participants evaluated the collaborative practice by utilizing a rubric they would employ during their own simulation, as observations without purpose have proven to be a less effective tool for novice teachers (Walker & Dotger, 2012). Participants were provided time at the conclusion of the breakout discussion to update their rubric and note any examples of collaborative behaviors they observed. Finally, a whole-group discussion occurred, and

participants discussed any “ah-has” from their practice implementing collaborative behaviors. As students are provided with an opportunity to work with peers to explore content, the instructional activities incorporate the use of sociocultural theory while still remaining rooted in a constructivist approach. For example, working with peers to analyze examples observed, students will be evaluating their practice requiring a higher degree of analysis and cognition in order to extend their mental models (Vygotsky, 1978). Additionally, student motivation is addressed within this phase of instruction by considering the use of exemplar models to build the students’ new skills (Rosenthal & Bandura, 1978).

You Do

Simulations

Participants concluded the unit with the “you do” phase of the study with simulated practice of a MD meeting. Social cognitive theory highlights the role mastery experiences play as primary means of development. Simulated practice contains a level of guided practice that is important when building competency. A strong sense of efficacy holds the power to motivate, highlight positive attributes of an experience, and provide a sense of control. Teachers encounter a great amount of uncertainty from supporting a worried parent to listening to an angry colleague. There is no way to possibly instruct to all the various experiences that come with being a teacher. However, through simulations, we can provide the practice opportunities that may allow future educators to seek novelty as a challenge and bounce back from the struggles they will inevitably face (Bandura, 1977). All meetings are recorded and posted to the course shell should any student wish to observe more than one meeting.

Simulations included time to participate in one simulation. The instructor was present to observe, but did not participate in the meeting facilitation. A short 10-minute debrief with parent

actors, facilitators, instructor, and students occurred at the conclusion of the simulation. This allowed an opportunity to share any celebrations or ask any questions. The simulations were approximately 20-25 minutes in length with groups of five to six students assigned to a case study. The MD team role assignment included general education teachers, special education teachers, school principals, and the special education administrator. To align with simulated pedagogy developed by Barrows (1993) and continued in the educational field by Dotger and colleagues (2019), a standardized actor played the role of the parent. This allowed the presentation of specific parental needs providing consistency in the training (Dotger et al., 2019). Two case studies were provided, including information such as student demographic information, background information related to the student, description of the incident resulting in the MD meeting, and IEP snapshot with eligibility criteria, present levels of functioning, annual goals, accommodations and modifications, and a service statement. Case studies were available to participants the entire duration of the unit; however, participants did not receive their case study assignment until the class prior to the scheduled simulation. The MD team roles were provided to the class prior to the simulation. On the day of the simulations, students were provided a small amount of time to collaborate within their assigned case study group or ask questions related to the MD process, collaboration, and their case study.

Simulation Materials

Materials provided to the participants during the simulations included a participant role (i.e., special education teacher, building administrator, counselor, etc.), previous history with the student as well as any goals the MD meeting participant might have going into the meeting. In addition, a meeting agenda and MD document outlining the procedures of the process was provided with the expectation it is followed.

Video Analysis

The third phase of the intervention also included in the "you do" involved the student participating in VA to individually evaluate their performance of their collaborative behaviors exhibited during the simulated MD meeting. Building from the desire to support preservice teachers' self-efficacy, the inclusion of VA as an instructional tool came from a desire to help students become autonomous and self-directed learners. By watching oneself and evaluating the success and areas of struggle, students have an opportunity to attribute their actions to observable outcomes. Partnered with the repeated practice of structured simulations that may build self-efficacy, VA may provide students with an opportunity to attribute their outcomes or behaviors to causes such as effort or skill, providing a sense of controllability and, thus, increasing motivation (Weiner, 2010).

Due to the pandemic COVID19 contingency plans, all simulations were conducted and recorded using Zoom; thereby, allowing students to participate in VA of their own behavior including a self-reflection that is scaffolded with a rubric, open-ended questions, and goal setting. The recordings were uploaded to the university course shell for all participants to access their team simulation. Participants were instructed to watch their simulated MD meeting, self-reflect on their implementation of collaborative techniques from a rubric provided, answer open-ended reflection questions (included in Appendices K and L), and create an informal goal for the next collaborative opportunity. The study was designed to provide an opportunity to build skills and awareness of the legal processes involved in a MD meeting, learn techniques for collaboration and conflict during a MD meeting, practice taught collaborative techniques in a simulated environment, and through video recordings evaluate performance, self-reflection, and goal set.

- Session 1: Overview of MD process.
- Session 2: Collaborative skills and strategies for conflict.
- Session 3: Collaborative skills and strategies for conflict.
- Session 4: Simulation and VA.

Setting and Materials

All simulated MD meetings occurred via Zoom. The sessions were recorded by using Zoom. All meeting participants were recorded. Two publications were assigned for required readings to occur outside of the training. The objective for the required reading assignment was to provide another modality for access or reinforcement of course content. For example, participants were asked to read a practitioner's manuscript detailing a teacher's perspective of the MD process. All material presented and used throughout the training were provided to students via electronic format using the online course shell in the training module.

Scenario Development

A total of two case studies were used for the four groups of simulated MD meetings. The purpose behind repeated use of the case study was to highlight the subjective nature of the MD process. Through recordings posted, participants had an opportunity to observe how one MD team utilizes the data and collaborative behaviors to draw separate conclusions. Case study scenarios included a variety of age, gender, and student needs (i.e., emotional or behavioral, cognition, and academic needs). Informal interviews with current and past special education teachers as well as case law details led to the scenario development, creating entirely new situations. Given the participants are participating in only one simulation, all case studies were based on real-life discipline situations that resulted in MD meetings with an effort to remain consistent in providing a medium level of challenge in each scenario. Challenges of the scenario

were assessed by considering the factors that escalate conflict because of discrepant views of a child or child's needs (Lake & Billingsley, 2000). Scenarios included student demographic information, background information related to the student, description of the incident resulting in the MD meeting, and IEP snapshot with eligibility criteria (present levels of functioning, annual goals, accommodations and modifications, and a service statement). Family diversity considerations were included in each case study (e.g., single parent, grandparent as caregiver, and same-sex couple). Considerations were given to ensure that case studies represented prevalence, instructional importance, and clinical and social impact (Barrows, 2000).

Participants received the case study information in several phases. First, participants were provided access to every case study at the start of the training by posting it on the online university course shell within the training module. They had the freedom to read each case study to familiarize themselves with the vignettes. Assignment of the case study and participant roles occurred during the session prior to their simulation, giving students the weekend to prepare. Participants were instructed to read over their case study to identify known and unknown information so they came to the next training session with questions related to the case study or their role. The students were provided 5 minutes at the beginning of the simulation session to meet their team, answer and ask any questions, and prepare for the MD simulation. The objective for this process of case study distribution was to recreate the immediacy that often occurs with MD meetings, yet allow the participants time to reflect on the authentic nature of analyzing information provided to identify necessary information or questions that will support the purpose of the meeting.

Data Analysis

Interview Analysis

According to Creswell (2009), there were a number of steps to conduct in order to adequately analyze the interview data. First, prior to any formal analysis, each audio-taped interview was transcribed verbatim. The second step included reading through all the data with a purpose of gaining a feeling of what has been said about the topic. At this point, I was concerned with the general ideas participants are presenting, tone, credibility, and depth of the participant responses. As I read each interview for a general overview, the margins were used to record any general thoughts about the data at this stage. Merriam (2009) described this initial category construction with the data like "having a conversation with the data, asking questions of it, and making comments to it" (p. 178). The open coding procedure utilized Microsoft Word with the purpose of identifying labels or categories for ideas or themes emerging from the data. Merriam (2009) suggested using three sources for naming one's categories: the researcher, the participants, or information gathered from reviewing the literature. Thus, prior to proceeding to axial coding, categories were examined for the assurance of the following criteria: (a) responsive to the purpose of the research; (b) exhaustive in that important data fit into one category; and (c) mutually exclusive in that important data fit only into one category (Merriam, 2009). Notes of specific participant quotes that emphasized the labels were recorded. Finally, axial coding procedures were used to attempt to identify any relationships among the codes. Coding was used for the identification of any themes or patterns in the data. The code list was written much like a dictionary that included the code, its definition, and an example of each code from the transcripts. Inter-rater reliability (described later in the trustworthiness section) was conducted

between the lead researcher and another member of the research team. Once overall themes were identified, a summary of the conclusions involving common or divergent themes were reported.

Confidentiality and anonymity was honored using numbers. Any demographic information that could be used to identify a participant was altered in written reports. Any raw data were saved using a password-protected computer. Information will be erased or destroyed three years after the study is complete. Participants were informed in both writing and verbally that the best efforts would be taken to secure their confidentiality. Participants had the right to discontinue participation in the research study without any consequences.

Pre- and Post-Test Analysis

All participants completed the pre- and post-assessment questionnaire that was given throughout the training phases. Participant pre-assessment was completed prior to any content being taught, after direct instruction, after simulated MD meetings, and after VA. Descriptive statistics of means, standard deviations, and at times percentages were utilized to describe the results. Part 3 of each assessment contained one open-ended question which was independently read, analyzed, and coded for themes. Each question was independently coded using Microsoft Word. Analysis began by reading through each question with a purpose of gaining a feeling of what has been said about the topic. Next, open coding was utilized with the purpose of identifying labels for ideas emerging from the data. Notes of specific participant quotes that emphasized the labels were recorded. Next, axial coding procedures were used to attempt to identify any relationships among the codes (Merriam, 2009; Richards & Hemphill, 2018). Finally, selective coding was used to identify the main variable present in the data creating the major themes (Johnson, 2015). The code list was written much like a dictionary that included the code, its definition, and an example of each code from the transcripts. Inter-rater reliability was

conducted between the lead researcher and another member of the research team. Once overall themes were identified, a summary of the conclusions involving common or divergent themes was reported.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Participation in the pre- and post-assessments was inconsistent among a number of the participants. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 are included in the appendices to provide details of participants' responses for each pre- and post-assessment. Descriptive statistics of means, percentage of confidence, and standard deviations were utilized to describe the current results. Any open-ended statements were independently read, analyzed, and coded for themes. Once overall themes were identified, a summary of the conclusions involving common or divergent themes related to the qualitative interviews was reported.

Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research

All research is concerned with reliable, valid, and ethical studies. Further, professionals involved in applied fields have an added ethical responsibility to ensure that the research study conducted contains a level of rigor making it trustworthy to intervene in people's lives (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative validity is concerned with the accuracy of findings based on a specific set of procedures. Qualitative reliability demonstrates consistency in the research procedures. There are a number of measures that can be taken to ensure the trustworthiness of a study. To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of this study, the following sections describe processes that were utilized to enhance reliability, validity, and reduce bias.

Peer Debriefing

Qualitative research seeks to understand the world as the participants experience it. Therefore, reliability in a qualitative study is less concerned with replication and similar results if

the study were to occur again and more with "whether the results are consistent with the data collected" (Merriam, 2009, p. 221). To aid in determining if the results were consistent and reliable, peer debriefing with a second independent coder was included in the data analysis procedures (Patton, 2002). Intercoder agreement was accomplished by having an independent reviewer read more than half of the interviews (N = 8), using the dictionary code list provided. Through the review of the transcripts, open and axial coding was used by providing codes and passages of text to determine if agreement on the selection of codes could be made. Disagreements among codes were discussed between the two raters with the goal of building consensus regarding the dictionary code list and thematic analysis. One major change to the thematic analysis was the original three themes consisted of authenticity of the experience, a meaningful way to learn, and widely applicable. After discussing the codes with the independent reviewer, it was determined that the widely applicable theme and its subthemes actually fit within authenticity of the experience theme. Further, both coders agreed that a number of challenges shared by the participants were pervasive and large enough to become a theme. Thus, the additional theme of challenges was added and supported by subthemes. A total of 50% of the interview data was coded by the second coder with complete agreement among the codes.

Member Check of Synthesized Data

One of the most important tools to determine accuracy of findings is to conduct a member check (Merriam, 2009). Member checks include sharing the pre-published findings with participants to determine if the researcher's analysis of participants' experiences hits the mark (Brantlinger et al., 2005; Creswell, 2009). The process of allowing participants to review the data after analysis can clarify any misunderstandings and strengthen the results by "fine-tuning to better capture experiences" (Merriam, 2009, p. 217). In order to ensure my results captured the

essence of the participants' experiences and perceived confidence, I provided a follow-up member check. Specifically, I provided a summary of main themes found after all analysis had been conducted. All participants were sent the survey via email and asked to agree, disagree, or add additional feedback to the results being provided. Five of the participants responded to the member check reporting they agreed with the results and would not wish to add or change the findings. All participants agreed the findings summarized their experience well.

Peer Feedback: The Researchers
Doctoral Committee

External evaluation of the research was conducted to enhance the reliability of the study. Patton (2002) stated the credibility of the researcher "is dependent on training, experience, track record, status and presentation of self" (p. 552). As a professional new to research, the integrity of the study was enhanced by peer feedback. Four faculty members serve don my doctoral committee and provided expertise in a variety of research and interest areas adding a layer of robust analysis and critique to the study. The committee chair was an expert in qualitative research as well as family-school partnerships, teacher education, and supporting student behavior, thus aiding in supporting a strong methodological development. Another member of the committee had extensive knowledge in training preservice and beginning teachers, ABA, and inclusion. A third committee member brought knowledge and expertise in self-determination and self-advocacy. A fourth committee member brought knowledge and expertise related to teacher education. All committee members undoubtedly contributed to the study by incorporating their individual strengths towards a collective goal of increasing the trustworthiness and credibility of the methodology and execution of the study.

COVID-19 Contingency Plan

Due to the timeline of this study, it was imperative that consideration be provided to an alternative delivery of the training format. During the time of the study the World Health Organization (2020) was recommending a distance of 6 feet between oneself and others. Further, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention was recommending that individuals maintain a distance of 6 feet from others, refrain from gathering in crowds, and wear a face covering when gathering in public. The following components of the training were adjusted due to face-to-face sessions being canceled.

Direct Instruction

Rather than in-person meetings, the study utilized an online platform, suggested by the university, where each training was held via a synchronous session. Breakout rooms were organized to allow students to participate in the active learning instructional activities planned for each lecture. Each session was recorded, allowing students to go back and review the content covered.

Manifestation Determination
Meeting Simulation

Using the same online platform to organize the MD simulations, each MD meeting team was provided their own meeting link. All meetings were recorded to allow participants access to the VA portion of the training as well as the opportunity to view all simulations.

Video-Analysis

Access to recorded simulations was available on the online course shell the same day of the simulation. All presented and required materials were posted to the online course shell, including the self-monitoring tool used to observe one's simulation.

Conclusion

Discipline decisions are rarely easy. Further, when a school team begins to examine a student's access to education through the lens of MD, it is important for educators to be knowledgeable and confident when collaborating to make team decisions. Exploring meaningful possibilities for expanding preservice teacher training opportunities related to collaboration and conflict resolution was at the heart of this qualitative inquiry. In the behavior course, I use a popular saying, "If you expect it, you must teach it." "Teachers are not machines that can be used with flawless precision whatever techniques research has certified" (Zahorik, 1984, p. 34). In order to adequately address collaboration skills for future teachers, preservice preparation programs must foster opportunities for instruction within the teacher development coursework and clinical experiences (Friend & Cook, 2017; Levine, 2006). It was my hope to explore the social validity of the training including simulations and VA as they related to directly and explicitly teaching collaboration skills to preservice teachers.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study provided preservice teachers a training package that included direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA feedback and rehearsal as a part of their undergraduate education. The intent of the training was to prepare this group of future educators to understand and participate in an important mandated behavioral support process, while simultaneously practicing collaborative practices with a team of educators and families. The purpose of the study was to explore the value of an instructional training package that included three components: (a) direct instruction, (b) simulated MD meetings, and (c) VA. Four research questions were explored in this study:

Q1 What are the experiences of preservice teachers who participate in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video analysis as instructional tools to teach collaboration through MD meetings?

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Q4 How satisfied are the undergraduate preservice teachers who participated in the training?

Qualitative Findings

Data analysis indicated that all participants noted satisfaction with and value of the training, with one participant sharing,

> I had never participated in a simulation like this. And I thought it [simulation] was really helpful. I like to see what happened. I don't know, I just thought that was cool. I wonder why this [simulation] has never happened to me before to do something like this. This is so sick! People need to do this more often.

Another shared, “Thank you for giving me the opportunity to practice for those kinds of scenarios [simulated MD meetings].” The training targeted a basic overview of the MD process along with collaborative and conflict resolution skills to use within a MD meeting. Notably, only a small number of the participants noted formal training in collaboration and conflict resolution prior to participating in the training. Any prior collaboration and conflict resolution training opportunities were most commonly provided through special education classes that participants had taken. A few participants shared informal experiences, such as participating in student government in high school, as ways they had learned collaboration skills. All participants detailed little to no knowledge of the MD provision. As one participant shared,

> I had no experience prior to this class. I didn't even know that they [MD meetings] were a thing. I think, in general, I do pretty well with things like collaborating and conflict resolution stuff because I've had to do a lot of that throughout my life. But, within an MD meeting I never knew that it was a thing. And so, I think I definitely would have been like, whoa, just kind of turn into fish out of water.

Another participant shared, “I would have been completely useless in the MD meeting. I wouldn't know anything about it.” Findings from this study provided meaningful insight into strategies and tools that may be considered when educating preservice teachers in collaboration and conflict resolution strategies in consideration of the MD provision. Data analysis revealed three major themes: (a) authenticity of the experience, (b) a meaningful way to learn, and (c)

challenges along the way. Authenticity of experience refers to experiences within the training and simulation that the participants described as bringing a sense of realism and application to the future. The theme of a meaningful way to learn describes participants' experiences with each phase of the training. Finally, the challenges theme provides an overview of participants' experiences that made their learning experience more difficult. Each of the three themes and corresponding subtheme is detailed below.

Authenticity of the Experience

Participants identified several factors that contributed to the authenticity of their learning experience. Participants commonly described the learning they experienced through the simulation as preparation for “future real-life opportunities.” It was often noted that the knowledge presented, practice provided, and the opportunity to reflect was realistic to what they would either experience or need to know when in the field. Furthering the authenticity of the training, all participants shared the value of having “real” parents participate in their simulation. As one participant expressed, “Working with the parents and the real people was huge. And I felt like I was actually making a difference for this parent, even though, you know, it wasn't a real situation.” Also, adding to the authenticity for participants was the ability to learn skills that can be used in “everyday life” and widely applicable to their future careers. The skills of collaboration and conflict resolution and the practice within a MD meeting presented skills and opportunities that were considered transferable to other areas of life. As one participant shared,

> I think after all this [training and simulation], I'm equipped with the collaboration and conflict resolution skills that will not only be used in everyday life but, as well as in the MD meetings, and the ability to self-reflect on my own strengths and weaknesses when it

> comes to reflecting on anything I'm doing, whether it's participation in the meeting or just kind of anything that I'm doing in my own classroom."

Similarly, one participant stated,

> I think it's like you learn these strategies and you can use them anywhere you go. And in all kinds of situations, working with other teachers and other parents. You could even use them working with students to help come up with solutions. So, I think you can use them pretty much everywhere. So, they're good for anybody to have.

The application of the learning experience to future endeavors, such as their classroom, meetings, working with parents, colleagues, and students, was expressed by many. Though most noted the ability to apply the skills they learned to a variety of contexts, some also highlighted a lack of formal instruction related to collaboration within their personal preparation. For example, "I mean, I think you definitely hear a lot about conflict resolution skills, but you're never taught them." One participant shared their experience with an emphasis on teaching hard skills, "When we think about teacher training, you're thinking about curriculum, you know, not necessarily people-to-people skills." Notably, most of the participants who had experienced formal instruction in collaboration had received this instruction through courses specializing in special education content. Yet, participants expressed that without the training they "would have no idea what to do," and lacked necessary skills:

> If they [educators] don't know these collaboration and conflict resolution strategies, they don't, they can't ease the anxiety of another teacher or their admin or whatever. The whole point with special education is to help students with their skills, so we should be doing the same thing for educators, right.

Four subthemes emerged within the theme of authenticity of experience including: (a) real-life practice, (b) parents as actors, (c) collaboration and conflict resolution skills, and (d) supporting students.

Real-Life Practice

Participants described their learning throughout this study as a practice that will prepare them for real-life experiences. As one participant described, "Actually being able to in that meeting and see it happen firsthand . . . now when my first real meeting happens, it won't be so scary and so intimidating." Another stated, "I do think that it [simulations] gave us the chance to practice. Like I said, I mean practice for real-life situations." Others described the training as authentic by providing a glimpse into the future. One participant shared that "this experience [simulation], particularly really helped me think about what I'm going to do in the future better and what to kind of expect if this happens in my future career." Similarly, another participant expressed,

> When I actually start teaching and take from this meeting with the way this simulation went and then go forth into a school and then maybe the exact same thing happens. Who knows, and I will at least be prepared enough in a similar situation to move forward.

Notably, all participants expressed and showed improved confidence through participation in the training. One participant shared about their experience with improved confidence and the benefit to future real-life opportunities: "After actually doing those meetings and practicing and doing it [simulations], I feel much more confident actually going out and doing it in real life." Similarly, another shared about the benefit of the practice and their confidence: "It [simulations] definitely builds you up for success in that area . . . some teachers going completely blind never have done

anything even close to this." Another participant reported feeling as though the training format supported confidence and generalization of their skills for future experiences:

> I feel like there's been a lot of things on conflict resolution and collaboration that I've learned in other classes that just didn't stick, and so I feel like now with the way that you explained it, and taught it to us that it will stick and I understand it. I feel confident that I can go out now and use those skills in actual meetings and in, you know, the field.

Parents as Actors

This subtheme highlighted the importance of including real parents, as the simulated actors, who have experience within the field of special education. Parents as actors provided the authenticity of the training by facilitating "real" parent experiences, accountability, and opportunities for feedback from someone who "has been through it." One participant discussed the added realism through having parents as actors by sharing that "having the actual people there to sort of get it going and stuff was super helpful and made it more real." Participants commonly noted the parents' personal experiences added to the authenticity by bringing real responses from how they would respond in an actual meeting. For instance, one participant said,

> They [parent actors] could actually get their experiences, and they reply, just like they would in an actual meeting. And so, and they gave the pushback that they actually would. And I think if it wasn't an actual parent and they wouldn't know how to play the role as well. And they wouldn't have the background knowledge to actually play it.

Other participants expressed the added benefit of real parent actors through their insight and feedback. A number of participants mentioned the ability of the parent actors to share real experiences from the field, thus adding to the participant's background knowledge. As one participant shared, "I see the benefits from being that those are real individuals [parents] that

have been through those situations, and they have plenty of years of experience personal and professional and that provides great insight for us who haven't had that."

Participants shared that parents also brought an added layer of accountability to their learning. For example, "I thought that was a really, really cool experience, especially getting to work with actual parents. I think that's the biggest part because it almost forces you to collaborate." Meanwhile, another participant shared how the parent accountability challenged their experience and added to their personal confidence:

> This is the first simulation I've ever done in my education, in my program. And so I found it really, really helpful especially having a real parent there to kind of challenge me a little bit. Her challenging me like that I think it makes me more confident if I do have parents that are going to challenge me, then I know how to kind of go about that more. And the more you practice with it [interacting with parents], I think the more comfortable, you'll probably get.

A number of participants shared feelings of worry about collaborating with a real parent. Notably, all participants who expressed worry also expressed feeling more prepared when practicing with a real parent. As one participant shared,

> I know that I do worry about that communication between parents. I was really scared to be in that kind of situation [simulation] and even during it, just being in front of a parent and seeing that obviously, they're not happy because of the situation [MD meeting], just that feeling inside that I'm kind of scared, even though I shouldn't, there's no real reason to be because it's not about me. But afterward, I feel I can go back in there. And even though I am, you know, I am going to still feel, you know, a little sense of worry, I feel I'm better prepared and more capable to talk and think through those situations.

Likewise, another participant expressed personal fears when working with parents:

> Having actual parents that are older than us because I know, one of the things that I struggle with the most is being able to stand up for myself, especially when speaking to older adults just because that's not the way that I was raised. I was raised to respect your elders kind of thing. And so, I think it was a very interesting thing to be actually able to have parents come in and play those roles for us.

Participants discussed the value of parent feedback as a tool enhancing their learning experience. In addition to practicing a simulated meeting, the participants were able to engage in a brief debrief at the conclusion of their simulation. Commonly noted among the participants was the added background gained by talking to parents about their experiences and receiving their feedback. One participant shared that "this [debrief] was nice because we actually got to talk with the people and the parents who were in there, which was really cool. And so, it felt more real." Similarly, another participant talked about "getting to talk to a parent who has experienced those [MD] meetings and had, you know, more insight and was able to share it with us, which I thought was really, really awesome." Relatedly, one participant shared the added value of praise coming from someone who had the experience:

> It was great to get their [parents] feedback, especially since they have been through it. It actually felt really great to hear you guys did amazing, all these things. So that really when it comes to if I had to do it again, I definitely feel more confident because I got that praise from an actual educator, or someone who's been involved with it [MD meetings] that usually is very open about their voicing their opinions.

Collaboration and Conflict Resolution Skills

This subtheme highlighted the value of learning collaboration and conflict resolution skills "you can take anywhere" and use, "even if it's not the exact same situation." For example, one participant shared the role the training package provided in learning collaboration and conflict resolution skills to enhance their personal growth:

> I think after all this [training], I'm equipped with the collaboration and conflict resolution skills that will not only be used in everyday life, but as well as in the MD meetings, and the ability to really kind of self-reflect on my own strengths and weaknesses when that comes to reflecting on anything I'm doing, whether it's participation in the meeting or just kind of anything that I'm doing in my own classroom."

Again, another participant echoed the value of the training within their personal life when sharing, stating that "it [training] helps us see how we can use it in our personal lives, not just in the classroom."

Notably many participants discussed the role the training played in the work as a future professional. Work with colleagues was commonly noted among the participants. As one participant shared, "Even if they [other participants] don't use it for a meeting like this or any kind of meeting like that, they'll use it with their colleagues, all the time." Another professional context the participants identified for the application of the skills learned in this study was in the area of parent collaboration. This was an especially important area for many participants, as many participants shared their apprehension of working with parents. One participant shared that "having no prior knowledge of this kind of big thing collaboration, I think I came in a little more hesitant just dealing with parents in general. I think it is a really scary thing on the forefront of every future teacher's mind, I don't know how to deal with parents." Despite the fears, the

practice and experience of the training were described as “helpful” when it came to collaborating and seeing the “parents’ perspective,” as demonstrated by one participant’s comment: “It definitely helped me to hear parents’ perspective and be able to practice things that we had talked about in the class.” With an increased awareness of the “parents’ perspective,” participants discussed the role parents may play in advocating for their child, one highlighting an increased understanding and confidence when dealing with conflict with a parent, saying that “I know what to do next time it comes up, next time a parent just comes swinging, I know that's something I should expect. And that's something that I can deal with now.” Many participants expressed the application to supporting collaboration with parents in several areas from dealing with conflict to disciplining, celebrating a student, and making decisions together. As expanded on by one participant:

> I think that it's important for situations where you're creating a line of communication with the home of the student so that could be when there's disciplinary action and you're calling home to inform about that, then you need to be aware of how you're speaking and how you're delivering information. And also, about what the parent is telling you as well . . . definitely useful in the setting of conferences because you're explaining the different areas of excellence, but their student’s different talents, and then I saw those possible areas for improvement. And you want to make sure that they're [parents] included in that process because that is their child, and they want to know what the school is doing what they could be doing and just the different changes they can do together.

Many participants detailed the specific skills of collaboration and conflict resolution skills they found most helpful to their personal experience. The most commonly noted skills included listening to others, encouraging another participant's voice, and sharing one's own

voice. Several participants highlighted how to use listening skills and their own voice to build a shared dialogue among the team. For example, as one participant expressed,

> I definitely think that I took away just listening skills and how to bring other people into your conversation. Which is something that I think I always kind of hesitated on how to do properly. But through the MD meeting, I definitely really learned how to get people to talk with me, rather than just us each talking.

For one participant, the training provided a new understanding of collaboration. Similar to what others shared regarding building a shared team process, one participant expressed,

> I learned a little bit more about what collaboration meant by collaboration doesn't necessarily fall directly on me. I thought I would be the only person doing all the steps, when in reality, it's all people doing all the steps together.

Supporting Students

Supporting students was another subtheme that contributed to the theme that the training provided real-world practice. The main areas discussed among the participants centered around their ability and experience with building a background in foundational behavioral knowledge and increased awareness of the MD provision and how to support it. Several participants expressed an increase in behavioral knowledge and its application to their future experiences. Participants commonly shared the ability to take what was learned from their case study and use the background to support future students in similar circumstances. Further, several participants discussed an increased awareness of understanding and supporting unexpected behaviors in the classroom and the impact of understanding "behavior that's due to a disability." As one shared, "I feel that [understanding a students' behavior disability] alone has given me more perspective on how to handle different kinds of situations, when it comes to students who have certain behaviors

and how to look at it differently." The value of learning more about student behavior was emphasized as well, "I really think that all education majors should have to take this class because learning about behavior overall is a really good thing for teachers to do."

When it came to supporting students, participants also discussed the MD provision specifically. As mentioned previously, the participants commonly shared they learned the importance of sharing their voice in the MD process. A shared voice was also expressed as a part of understanding the importance of advocating for students. As one participant stated, "I can't imagine now becoming a teacher, knowing what I know now, and going in and not doing what I can to help that student," and another noted, "It's [the study] given me a lot of insight into what I need to do in order to be a role model for my students." Meeting decisions were also commonly expressed as student support among participants. Most noted they would have little to no confidence in an MD meeting prior to the training. The lack of confidence was most commonly linked to no background knowledge in the meeting process or expectations. One participant shared that "some of those more decision-making things that come with the [MD] meeting and kind of that more behavior focus I don't think I would have been quite as well prepared for prior to having all of the instruction." While another shared increased comfort and ability to make decisions due to having the training, stating "I think after all the instruction, I feel pretty comfortable and kind of being able to generally assess IEPs and making some decisions based on an event to determine the results of the meeting."

A Meaningful Way to Learn

All of the participants stressed the value of the training as a meaningful way to learn collaboration and conflict resolution skills through the phases of direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA. Specifically, this theme details specific components of the study that

were commonly described by participants. Notably, though participants found value in each phase of the study, expressing each phase was helpful and added to the next; interestingly, they all overwhelmingly expressed that simulations were their most helpful and liked phase of the study. As one participant stated, “It was like building blocks, each of them [direct instruction, simulations, and VA].” The formatting of the phases, direct instruction, simulations, and video analysis was noted as a preferred structure that added to the overall learning process. One participant shared, “I really liked the format, the first getting instruction, then practice it, and then evaluate.” Similarly, another stated, “I believe the whole experience with the direct instruction, simulated meetings, and the video analysis really helped me to be better prepared for my future and education.” Many participants also highlighted the unique opportunity of simulations as a part of their preparation, with one participant sharing that “the meetings that we had, that's just something that I've personally never experienced, but it's also one of those things that, now I've had it, I couldn't imagine not having that in one of my classes.”

During interviews, all participants expressed little to no confidence in their ability to participate in a MD meeting or utilize collaboration skills within the MD meeting context prior to the training. One participant detailed,

> I would say just having never had any experience and not having the knowledge of even what it [MD] was, and then I'm not great with conflict to begin with, so just not knowing anything and then not being good with conflict in myself, my confidence was pretty low.

Another shared, “ I was more afraid of being in that kind of situation and feeling like I couldn't have a voice and I wouldn't know how to operate.” Notably, all participants interviewed expressed an overall improvement in personal confidence level. One participant shared, “I definitely feel more confident. . . . I feel I have the tools and the knowledge now to use to be able

to put my best foot forward and be able to help at least a little bit more." Many participants shared similar ideas regarding the importance of having an "opportunity to practice" as a means for enhancing their personal confidence. For instance, "It's less scary after having done, you know, the first time you do something, it's always really scary and really intimidating and then after that, it just gets easier and easier and that definitely was the situation here." Similarly, another participant stated, " I think it [study] definitely helped to be able to have a meeting before actually having a meeting when I, you know, start working because then I'll have that background." Others noted the practice provided "an example" to build on,

> I feel pretty confident. I feel now I have a baseline and a guide to kind of remember what are the things that I need to be focusing on and how I can help a situation just by listening and reflecting, paraphrasing, and all those different skills.

Four subthemes within the theme of a meaningful way to learn included: (a) first stepping stone for teachers, (b) the role of practice, (c) an outsider's perspective, and (d) learning with peers.

First Stepping Stone for Teachers

This subtheme highlighted the role direct instruction may play in building background knowledge and providing new information from "a point of zero." All participants noted the value in having direct instruction as a "first step." As one participant shared, " I think direct instruction is definitely good just for, you know, the textbook definitions, but the direct instruction gave us just the background knowledge of what it is, why we do it. I definitely think it's very helpful." Similarly, another participant stated,

> I think that's a good kind of first stepping stone for teachers, and I would say it shouldn't stop there. It shouldn't just stop at instruction because it's a little difficult to put

> something into practice, I guess, if you just know the knowledge of it. You have to, you know, use it or lose it.

In addition, participants also noted the value of providing direct instruction as a means of shaping and supporting their future actions. For example, “I think that leading up to it [simulated meeting], what we learned in the classroom definitely was a big part of how we went about our meetings.” Another participant shared how using direct instruction as a way of providing new knowledge can shape their thinking,

> It's just that basically your way of thinking definitely changes when it comes, when you get direct instruction like this, you know, you look at things differently. And, you know, you're like, okay, before I would have seen it like this. And now, I see it, this whole brand-new light.

The Role of Practice

All participants noted the benefit of having the opportunity to practice as a part of their simulated meeting experience. In fact, most participants emphasized the importance of the practice and expressed a need to include more practice opportunities within the training. For instance, one participant said, “I wanted to practice it before the practice,” where another similarly shared, “More practice before the MD meeting would have been nice.” Another shared their personal value of the practice by stating, “I would love even to see more simulations and stuff like that because, like I said, I think the more I would practice it, the more I would get confident using those skills that you taught us with conflict resolution and stuff like that.” Other participants discussed the value of adding more practice by including additional layers of challenge, “It would be nice if we could practice an easy, a medium, and a really hard.” With the acknowledgment of practice, many participants discussed the “hands-on nature” of learning “by

doing.” For instance, one participant stated, “I think, like most things in life, it's a very hands-on experience, and you need to learn by doing.” Similarly, another shared,

> I feel you learn more from actually doing it. When you're put in the driver's seat and told this is your case, how are you going to handle it? And that's, you know, that’s real life, at least for me, that's how I like to do things is real-life experience and hands-on work.

Regarding the aspects of this study providing hands-on learning, participants also noted the role simulations played in their ability to “experiment” and “practice” the course content. Several participants shared the role practice plays in building “habits" that further the likelihood they may apply the skills in practice. One participant stated, “Practice build habits. So, if you are working on it and actually get to try out these different strategies, then you're more likely to then use them when you come across the need to use them.” Further, a participant expressed that “it's a great way for us to be able to test what we've been learning and see how much we've absorbed and see how we as future educators would use that in an actual situation or meeting.” Yet another shared their process of practice and the confidence gained by practice stating,

> I really loved doing it [simulation]. It was really cool, and I was definitely nervous and walked away a lot more confident in myself and in the materials that we've discussed in class and learned, which was really cool because I actually felt like I was getting something out of it.

Simulations also allowed participants a “safe space” to experiment, as one participant shared, “a safe space because we are allowed to try and experiment with how we're going to react to these situations,” while another similarly noted “The simulations, you know, kind of gives people practice of working on those strategies and kind of figuring out what works with people and what doesn't work with people.” Another participant echoed the idea of experimentation by sharing

the following about simulations as a part of their learning, “It's [simulations] their toolkit to kind of reflect on how different reactions are gonna come about, and that goes for between colleagues and the parents because you're not the only one in that meeting.”

As mentioned earlier in the results, all participants expressed that they felt improved confidence by having participated in the training package. A number of participants described the simulated practice as improving their confidence of skills. For example, one participant shared, “I've always been, practice makes perfect. So, I just think the more that you actually do something, the more comfortable you become, the more confident you become, the easier it comes and more naturally for you.” Another stated, “I think the more practice, I would do the more confident I would get with it.” Similarly, another participant said, “I am a pretty strong believer in the idea that practice makes perfect or as close to perfect as you can get. So, I think the simulations provided a really good opportunity to kind of practice and enhance all of those skills.” Simulated practice meetings seemed to add an additional layer of “experience” with the practice. Participants shared they now “know what to expect" because they “experienced it firsthand.” One participant expressed, “I think it's super helpful to do those meetings because you gain insight, which helps your confidence because I've already been in the situation.” On the same note, “I was able to build more confidence and understand more what it's like in person to have one of those [MD] meetings and to actually be able to go through one of those scenarios.” Finally, many participants shared their personal success and value of the simulated practice experience. For example, “I ran out to my mom after my meeting and I was like, I just had the coolest experience. It was so awesome. I felt like I totally kicked butt.” Another shared,

> I thought this [simulation] was very, very helpful, at least for me, someone that really struggles with conflict and by far the most nervous thing, the thing I'm most nervous

> about going into teaching is the parents and my administrators and collaborating and conflict which I know is inevitable. So, having it [collaboration] be inevitable and getting the chance to practice it before the stakes are really high, and there's a kid involved, and emotions are involved, and all the environment things I think is really, really helpful for teachers, and I think overall, I think that it really made me more confident just going in as a first-year teacher.

Outsider's Perspective

This subtheme highlighted the opportunity with which VA could provide for a student's growth and awareness of one's skills. One participant shared that "watching yourself is one of the best ways to learn because you're learning, you know, you're adapting from what you've already done." Many participants emphasized how watching oneself can play an important role in preparing for future experiences. One participant stated, "I really like that [the VA] it made us reflect on what we do currently versus what we need to work on ourselves to better prepare for those kinds of situations," while another noted, "I think watching yourself back you can, it's a good tool to see what you did really well and what you can improve upon for next time." Participants described the role of watching oneself apply course content as an "outside perspective." One participant stated, "It's just one of those things that it's very helpful to look back on it from an outsider's perspective, I think it's kind of like the same thing as when you play a sport and you have a film day, you get to go back and watch the game from outside of the game, kind of thing." Similarly, another expressed, " I think video-analysis can help you formulate as an outsider look." With an "outsider's perspective," many participants noted the ability to see behaviors they wouldn't otherwise notice as well as remember context forgotten in the moment. As one participant shared,

> Video analysis is key for seeing what actually happened because many times people may imagine that they did a skill or they achieve something a certain way, but they didn't really see it in the video-analysis, meaning that that's something that they still need to work on.

Another noted, “It [VA] gives us a chance to really look at ourselves, what are we going to say, you know, in the moment, because we can think about it and think about it, but when it comes down to it, you know, it doesn't always come out the same way you thought about it.” Likewise, another shared, “I like that you get to see yourself in a different light. When you're in the meeting, you're at the time of it, you don't get to observe yourself as much because that's not the focus, the focus is everything else going on.”

With an “outsider’s perspective,” many participants noted that VA can highlight “strengths” and “what you can improve.” One participant described VA as “a great tool to have because you're able to see your strengths and your weaknesses and see things that you may have forgotten about in the moment.” Similarly, another stated, “You could just watch yourself and see what you do and what you want to keep doing, what you want to work on, because there are things that you do just subconsciously that you have no idea that you're doing.” Many participants echoed similar sentiments regarding the specific behaviors that were noticed in their VA individual reflections. The most commonly noted behaviors observed among the participants were “body language” or watching oneself talk. For example,

> I think video analysis is awesome. I think being able to watch myself back was so cool. It's just you notice so many things. I don't watch myself talk ever, and being able to watch that and see what I look like listening to somebody was super helpful.

Another participant stated,

> One of the biggest things that I saw was, I have a tendency to space out when I start talking, and if I am put in a stressful situation, I just automatically space out and words will just start coming out, and I'm not quite sure what I'm saying, and I won't remember it afterward. So I think being able to watch back and actually see what I said.

Learning with Peers

Many participants expressed the value of having peers to watch as an important aspect of their learning. As one participant noted, "Working with other students who are also doing the same thing is absolutely great because you know we're learning off of each other as well." Others specifically asked for more time to reflect on the process with their colleagues. It was evident from the interviews that being able to observe peers provided an example from which many participants gained additional ideas by seeing how their peers collaborated "differently." As one participant shared, " It's helpful to see how everyone did things differently." Another stated,

> I watched the video multiple times. Each time I watched a different person to see how they collaborated and how they, you know, de-escalated the parent or, you know, kind of pushed back with another faculty member. I think it was really helpful to people to see how we all interact together and how each person handled a situation very differently.

Similarly, another participant stated, "I feel you definitely can pick up on some of the things that other people said and what you said and be able to be like, oh, I should remember that for when I'm actually in a classroom and I'm putting the situation."

Challenges Along the Way

Participants commonly identified three factors that brought challenges to their learning experience. Due to the pandemic, our course content was presented online via Zoom. Most of the participants mentioned the online learning platform was difficult and not as conducive to

learning and engaging with the content of collaboration. In addition to challenges with collaborating online, many of the participants wanted more "practice before the practice." As discussed in a prior theme, the role of practice was of great value to most of the participants interviewed. However, this was also presented as an area of challenge as they expressed wanting more practice before the simulations. Some participants noted the practice included within the direct instruction activities as difficult and described struggling to engage with those opportunities because we were online. Additionally, others wondered if more opportunities were presented within the direct instruction phase, would they have gained even more from the simulations? Finally, though many participants expressed the value of VA, many also highlighted the role VA played in identifying their areas of improvement. Along this same idea, a number of participants specifically emphasized the tendency to be "overly critical" when watching yourself on video. Three subthemes within the theme of challenges included: (a) Zoom was difficult, (b) not enough practice before the simulation, and (c) being overly critical with VA.

Zoom was Difficult

This subtheme highlighted participants' challenges with participating in the training package online. Though data weren't formally collected regarding participants experience with online coursework, it is important to note that because of the timing between the pandemic and the study, many of the students may have had very little experience with online learning. For some, it may have been their first or second course ever taken online. Despite the noted difficulty of learning online, several participants acknowledged the need to be online due to the pandemic and circumstances as one participant stated, "I think it definitely was weird doing it [training] online. But given the circumstances, this whole thing is kinda, it's a weird year." Others

expressed learning collaboration online wasn't ideal and possibly hindered their ability to practice the skill. A few participants specifically discussed the collaboration practice provided during the direct instruction phase and the added layer of difficulty because of being online, sharing that "I think the practice was kind of hard. Just because people don't really know what to say. And I think the online component probably made that even more difficult." On a similar note, another participant acknowledged the practice as meaningful, but shared that the online experience felt "awkward," adding, "I know we had one point where we're able to get the small groups and try it out, but it was still, you know, I mean, it was Zoom, it was awkward." Additionally, participants shared the challenge of learning online as it related to learning collaboration. As one participant shared, "I think that it is more the formatting of it is just what made it a weaker use of collaboration. I don't think you'll have as much of a problem in in-person settings." A few participants discussed specific skills of collaboration they found challenging due to being online. Participants shared the role of reading body language and the challenge of being online. One participant stated, "We can't see our entire body language, and so I think that was a little difficult." Further, another discussed that the full benefit of VA may have been hindered due to the online format,

> I don't think there was any way it would have been better other than if we weren't on Zoom and we could record ourselves in, you know, sitting around a table talking, but we can't really do that right now. So Zoom was, I mean, it was great for the circumstances that we have, you know.

Finally, several participants linked not knowing when to speak up to being online. For instance, one participant shared,

> I think it was hard to know when to jump in. I know when we were doing the class discussion, I kept reaching for the unmute button. But every single time I go for it, someone else talks. So I definitely think that that was hard. Knowing when was the right time to speak.

Another compared the online experience to an in-person fish bowl when deciding when to speak up,

> I think it was definitely harder because you're having to go through the motion of actually unmuting and then waiting for you to connect and stuff, but in person, when you do fishbowl talks in classrooms, it's definitely hard to know when is the right time to jump in but also when you're in a classroom, it's quiet and you can just kind of jump in and if someone else starts to talk, it's pretty easy to go, oh sorry, because you can read their body language and see them.

Not Enough Practice Before the Simulation

This subtheme highlighted participants' desire to have more practice before the simulation. As described earlier, all participants discussed value with the simulated MD meeting practice. Yet, many participants were left wanting more. Notably, most participants discussed a desire to have "practice before the practice." As one participant said, "More practice before the MD meeting would have been nice." Another shared, "I wanted to practice it before the practice which was the meeting." One participant discussed adding additional practice into the direct instruction as a way to support the simulation, "including more activities before the actual process [simulation], just so that way we can kind of practice a few times to see what it's going to really be about, I think that could possibly be helpful." Another specifically noted needing practice related to the collaboration skills, sharing "I think a bit more practice with the

collaboration skills." Finally, several participants expressed the desire to have additional simulated practice. Suggestions included participating in multiple meetings, trying both case studies for comparison, and adding layers of difficulty to the case studies to provide an opportunity to challenge the learner's practice of collaboration skills. As one participant said, "I just wish we could have done one more."

Being Overly Critical with Video-Analysis

Many of the participants discussed the role VA played in highlighting their strengths and needs. Of note was participants emphasis on noticing their areas of improvement. Though participants discussed the process of VA as valuable to their learning, many also reported it was a challenge to watch themselves and/or focused their discussion of VA's value on emphasizing "areas for improvement." For some, the strengths in their performance of collaboration and conflict skills was not discussed as they highlighted what they "needed to do differently." As one participant stated, "Sometimes you get lost, picking up the flaws, rather than picking up the strengths that you see." Participants noted it was at times hard to watch themselves. One participant described the challenge of watching oneself, "It's really weird. It's really weird. And it's really hard. I kept having to start it, and I hear my voice and be like, stop. I have to stop. This is weird and it makes you really hard on yourself." Notably, a large number of participants expressed the potential of being "overly critical" of oneself when participating in VA. One person shared their own personal experience with VA and the process and the potential to be overly critical, saying "It's a little nitpicky because you're watching yourself, so when you're very critical of yourself, and it kind of depends on the person, too, I happen to be a little more self-critical." A few participants discussed the implication on future skills when being overly critical with VA: "A possible weakness is when you are self-evaluating, that could lead to perhaps over

critical analyzing or over critiquing what's going on, and it becomes more of a negative than intended for us to improve." Another shared, "I think it's possible to be overly critical of yourself and then that could get you in your head and then in the future. Want to take less risks."

Descriptive Survey Results

Means, percentages, and standard deviations were calculated for all pre-post assessment questions related to participants' confidence with performing a specific set of skills before the training and after each phase of the training. Pre-assessment background characteristics are presented using percentages and include the number of participants who answered that individual selection. The following sections will provide information gained from the pre-and-post assessment results including the following: (a) demographic information, (b) pre-assessment results, (c) direct instruction, (d) simulated meeting post-assessment, and (e) VA post-assessment. All post-assessment results will provide a comparison with prior assessment results. Open-ended pre-and-post assessment results for the open-ended questions will be discussed within each assessment section.

Pre-Assessment Results

Demographics

The pre-assessment contained five questions. The first question required participants to provide their name. The following questions, (2 and 3) asked participants to check any listed experiences they have with individuals with exceptionalities and challenging behavior. Next, participants rated their confidence for the outcomes of the training. Finally, the last question was open-ended to provide any additional information. Related to background experiences with individuals with exceptionalities or individuals with challenging behavior, very few participants reported working in a school directly supporting students with exceptionalities. Pre-assessment

results reflect the interview demographic information shared that most of the participants enrolled in the course were on the general education track. When detailing participants' experiences with challenging behavior, the most noted experience reported by participants and their experiences with challenging behavior was through witnessing it in a school or community setting. Meanwhile, the least noted were both personal struggles with challenging behavior, personally supporting challenging behavior in the community, and having a friend who exhibits challenging behavior.

Confidence

Following demographic information, the participants assessed their confidence of the learning outcomes for the training. Participant mean scores ranged from 1.62 related to knowledge of the MD provision to 3.08 for collaboration with other educational professionals, with the lowest mean score being 1.62 and the highest being 3.08 with a range of 1.00-4.00. Participant scores were highest in the areas of collaborating with other educational professionals, with 92% of the participants reporting they were confident or very confident in their ability to perform the targeted collaboration skills with other educational professionals. Additionally, participants scored fairly high in their confidence of collaboration with families at 69%. The lowest preparation scores were associated with knowledge of the MD provision, with 15% of the participants reporting they were confident and very confident. Table 2 details participants' pre-assessment descriptive results.

Table 2

Pre-Assessment Descriptive Statistics

Collaboration Skills	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families	2.00	4.00	2.92	0.73	0.53
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.	1.00	4.00	3.08	0.73	0.53
Utilize collaborative skills (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.	1.00	4.00	2.46	0.84	0.71
Use conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.	1.00	4.00	2.46	0.75	0.56
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.	1.00	4.00	2.54	0.75	0.56
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) during a MD meeting.	1.00	4.00	2.38	0.84	0.70
Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.	1.00	3.00	1.62	0.74	0.54

**N = 13*

Post-Assessment Direct Instruction

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Post-assessments results provided details for two major questions: (a) confidence rating after each specific phase of the training, and (b) any open-ended question results that detailed any additional information related to that phase of the training. The post-assessment for direct instruction included 13 participants' ratings related to their confidence to perform collaboration

and conflict resolution skills with families and colleagues, to support conflict, and within the MD meeting as well as the participants' confidence in the knowledge of the MD provision after participating in the direct instruction portion of the training.

Participant mean scores ranged from 2.77, related to knowledge of the MD provision, to 3.31, regarding confidence to utilize conflict resolution strategies to support disagreements with families, with the lowest mean score being 1.62 and the highest being 3.08 with a range of 1.00-4.00. Participant scores were highest in the area of utilizing conflict resolution skills to support disagreements with families at 92% of the participants reporting they were confident or very confident in their ability to perform support disagreements with families. This was an increase in confidence from participants' pre-assessment results in the area of supporting conflict with families, with only 46% of participants reporting they were confident or very confident in their ability to utilize conflict resolution skills to support disagreements with families. Additionally, participants continued to rate their confidence fairly high in their confidence of collaboration with families at 69%. The lowest preparation scores were associated with knowledge of the MD provision, with 69% of the participants reporting they were confident or very confident. A total of five open ended comments were provided, detailing additional information related to the direct instruction phase of the study. Participants' responses were categorized into "specific skills" and the "importance of collaboration." Related to specific skills, participants discussed the value of learning about body language, paraphrasing, and validating. The importance of collaboration was noted as skills to use for everyday life, when communicating with other families and other educators, as important to involve the family in order to create the best plan for a student. Table 3 details participants' direct instruction post-assessment descriptive results.

Table 3

Post-Assessment: Direct Instruction Descriptive Statistics

Collaboration Skills	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families	2.00	4.00	3.23	0.70	0.49
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.83	0.69
Utilize collaborative skills (e.g. paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.	2.00	4.00	3.15	0.66	0.44
Use conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.	2.00	4.00	3.31	0.61	0.37
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.73	0.53
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable)during a MD meeting.	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.73	0.53
Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.	1.00	4.00	2.77	0.80	0.64

**N = 13*

Post-Assessment Simulations

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

The simulation post-assessment results included five participants' post-assessment scores and demonstrated mean scores ranging from 3.40, related to confidence in their ability to utilize collaboration and conflict resolution skills with families and other educational professionals and

utilize conflict resolution strategies to support disagreements with families and other educational professionals, as well as within the context of a MD meeting, to 3.80, regarding their knowledge in the MD process. Given the range of possible scores is from 1.00-4.00, post-assessment scores were on the higher end of the possible range of 4.00. Participant scores were highest in their knowledge of the MD process, with 100% of the participants reporting they were confident or very confident in their knowledge of the MD process. Additionally, participants rated their confidence fairly high regarding the ability to utilize collaboration skills to participate in a MD meeting, with 100% of participants rating themselves as confident or very confident. A total of five open-ended comments were provided detailing additional information related to the simulation phase of the study. Participants' responses fit two categories of bigger ideas: collaboration practice and confidence. Specific responses relate to having never been taught the skills of collaboration and appreciating the instruction, learning skills of collaboration they were good at, and discovering how nervous they were within the experience but also the importance of finding their voice. Table 4 details participants' simulation post-assessment descriptive results.

Table 4

Post-Assessment: Simulated MD Meetings Descriptive Statistics

Collaboration Skills	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families	3.00	4.00	3.40	0.49	0.24
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.	3.00	4.00	3.40	0.49	0.24
Utilize collaborative skills (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.	3.00	4.00	3.60	0.49	0.24
Use conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.	3.00	4.00	3.40	0.49	0.24
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.	3.00	4.00	3.40	0.49	0.24
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) during a MD meeting.	3.00	4.00	3.40	0.49	0.24
Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.	3.00	4.00	3.80	0.40	0.16

**N = 5*

Post-Assessment Video-Analysis

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

The VA post-assessment results included 12 participants' post-assessment scores. Notably, all mean scores demonstrated a drop in confidence from their post-assessment simulation scores among all confidence areas assessed after participating in VA. Mean scores range from the lowest 3.00, related to confidence in their ability to utilize conflict resolution skills to support disagreements with families, to the highest mean score of 3.67, regarding their

knowledge in the MD process. Though there was a drop in confidence, the range of possible mean scores is from 1.00-4.00; therefore, the post-assessment scores remained on the higher end of the possible range scores. Participants' percentage of confidence rating themselves as confident or very confident also dipped in all areas except their knowledge of the MD process, which remained at 100%, with changes from the post-simulation results for the specific number of participants rating themself as confident or very confident. Though the participants' confidence ratings dropped, most participants still rated themself within the confident or very confident category, with the lowest percentage of confidence being reported with 74% of participants in confident or very confident with regards to using collaborative skills to participate in a MD meeting. A total of five open ended comments were provided detailing additional information related to the VA phase of the study. Notably, three out of five of the statements were directly related to the qualitative themes identified. Relating to both the subtheme of an outsider's perspective and the challenges theme, one participant's open ended response shared they did not like watching themselves, but found it helpful to what they thought they did versus what they actually did. Another participant's response also related to the theme of an outsider's perspective, noticing specific successes and areas to improve. Notably, similar to the qualitative finding, this participant mentioned body language as something they noticed. Lastly, similar to the qualitative finding that participants may apply their skills learned to support students, one participant's open-ended response specifically discussed the importance of clarity to share all necessary information,

> The "ah-ha" moment I had during this experience was realizing the specificity required to properly navigate and discuss during these MD meetings. If there is a lack of clarity in an answer that can lead to an escalation of the process. It is key to be clear, concise, and

accurate in how we speak to have an accurate analysis, but also have a calm and comprehensive dialogue.

Table 5 details participants' VA post-assessment descriptive results.

Table 5

Post-Assessment: Video-Analysis Descriptive Statistics

Collaboration Skills	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.64	0.41
Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.	2.00	4.00	3.17	0.69	0.47
Utilize collaborative skills (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.76	0.58
Use conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.	2.00	4.00	3.00	0.71	0.50
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.	2.00	4.00	3.08	0.64	0.41
Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) during a MD meeting.	2.00	4.00	3.17	0.55	0.31
Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.	3.00	4.00	3.67	0.47	0.22

**N = 12*

Conclusion

Chapter IV included an in-depth description of the results and evaluation of findings for the study that investigated the perceived usefulness of a study that included direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA for a targeted group of preservice teachers. The emergent themes of (a) authenticity of experience, (b) a meaningful way to learn, and (c) challenges along the way were discussed. Subthemes and participant quotes were included within each major theme. Pre-and-post assessment results indicated that despite a dip in confidence after VA, participants' overall confidence increased throughout the study. Further discussion, implications for practice and research, as well as the study limitations will be described in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Throughout much of history, it has been a challenge to provide equitable discipline practices for students with disabilities (Merrell & Walker, 2004). Despite the IDEA (2004) providing a promise of equal access, disproportionate discipline continues to occur at alarming rates (Whitford et al., 2016). Though IDEA (2004) provides the MD provision, which includes a meeting process intended to support a safeguard of educational opportunities for students with disabilities, there remains remarkable concerns with the actual understanding and implementation. The IDEA (2004) simultaneously stresses the important role collaboration plays in supporting an appropriate team decision within the MD process (Lewis, 2017; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2014). Further, the role of comprehensively including the parent throughout the special education process is emphasized even further throughout IDEA (2004) regulations. Therefore, it is imperative to consider the implications and consequences of educator skill and training related to collaboration. However, studies examining the decision-making process for MD meetings are scarce. Collaboration skills alone are a monumental task without the additional responsibilities associated with the MD provision. Despite the challenges of the MD provision and knowing how to effectively collaborate, all educators have a legal and ethical responsibility to ratify the IDEA's discipline provisions. Therefore, exploring what teachers value and perceive as effective for their learning and future with respect to acquiring this skill set is an important first step. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the potential value of instructional training

which included direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA to support teachers' knowledge, skills, and confidence to collaborate and participate in MD meetings.

Restatement of the Research Problem

This study used a qualitative phenomenological study and descriptive statistics in an effort to explore the usefulness of the MD instructional training package. Specifically, four research questions were developed that focused on the participants' satisfaction, experiences, and confidence:

Q1 What are the experiences of preservice teachers who participate in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video analysis as instructional tools to teach collaboration through MD meetings?

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Q4 How satisfied are the undergraduate preservice teachers who participated in the training?

This study was conducted with 14 participants who were enrolled at a western university in a preservice special education teacher preparation program. Qualitative analysis revealed three themes: (a) authenticity of the experience, (b) a meaningful way to learn, and (c) challenges along the way. Using the information gathered from this study, the research questions are answered, along with detailed implications based on the findings below.

Research Questions 1 and 2

Q1 What are the experiences of preservice teachers who participate in direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and video analysis as instructional tools to teach collaboration through MD meetings?

Q4 How satisfied are the undergraduate preservice teachers who participated in the training?

When describing the experiences encountered within the training, participants expressed the value of each phase of the training: direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA. The development of collaboration skills requires direct and explicit instruction (Friend, 2000; Jacobowitz & Michelli, 2008; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). As one student shared, "Skills for students, shouldn't we be doing that for teachers?" Participants described the value of having direct instruction as a necessary first step to acquiring a basis of knowledge. The simulation phase was favored by the overwhelming majority of the participants by providing real-life experiences and a space to apply and experiment with class content. Meanwhile, the VA provided an opportunity to reflect on strengths and needs and to increase one's overall awareness of self. The following discussion explores Research Question 1, participants' experiences of the training, and Research Question 4, their satisfaction with the training. First, participants commonly discussed the nature of the simulated learning opportunity as "real-life practice." The experience felt real and enhanced the authenticity of the experience for participants. Notably, though the MD provision was a completely new concept, participants were able to see the value of learning the provision and practicing collaboration and conflict resolution skills through its context. Professionalism, objectivity, advocacy, reflection, and working with others are essential aspects of a teacher's job (Wolf & Peele, 2019), and the participants in this study expressed being able to connect with those skills within the context of a simulated MD meeting.

All of the participants appreciated having actual parents participate as actors in the simulated MD meeting, describing it as having value by bringing with it a sense of realism to the practice. Participants noted that the parent actors had prior experiences and knowledge they could bring into the meetings. The parent actors responded to conversations and interactions with authenticity because they had been through it themselves. Many participants expressed

apprehension regarding collaborating with parents, but felt more prepared at the conclusion of the simulation. Real parent actors brought accountability and challenge. This wasn't another role-play or hypothetical case study. Participants expressed having apprehensive nerves, feeling the pushback from parents, seeing their anger, and feeling like their collaboration efforts made a difference. Further, the training included a short debrief at the conclusion of the simulations as an opportunity to talk directly with parents to share feedback on the process or ask questions. Preservice teachers are rarely provided an opportunity to talk directly with parents as a part of classroom instruction (Stoddard et al., 2011). Notably, although only a small amount of time was allotted to the less formal interaction with the parent actors, participants still highlighted the value of the debrief, noting parents' feedback meant more coming from an experienced person who has lived through similar real-life experiences. Prior research that has incorporated families into preservice teacher preparation has demonstrated the ability to influence beliefs and strengthen family-school partnerships (Gershwin Mueller et al., 2019; Patterson et al., 2009). Further discussion related to involving parents as faculty will be discussed in recommendations for practice and future research.

Research Questions 2 and 3

Q2 Does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings?

Q3 Does the experiences of participants in the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to collaborate as an educational professional?

Developing a collaborative skillset is necessary for any educator (Leko et al., 2015). Participants in the study repeatedly expressed the value of learning collaboration skills through the training. Within their discussion of the utility of this practice was the application of the collaborative skills to transfer and support a variety of collaborative opportunities the

participants may encounter when working as a teacher. Participant responses echoed the findings in other studies that have investigated simulations, indicating simulations may increase participant awareness of collaboration in their future as an educator (Driver et al., 2018; Gershwin Mueller et al., 2019; Patterson et al., 2009). Participants in the current study stressed the relevance of the skills learned. Participants shared a variety of contexts with which they may use the collaborative skills in the future. Most commonly discussed was collaboration skills with parents and colleagues; however, a number of participants discussed the ability to use collaboration skills with students. Having a skill set to encourage the participants to share their voice and champion another's when sharing successes, supporting conflict, participating in an MD meeting, supporting behavior, understanding a student's disability, and advocating was especially important for future educators. This may be especially helpful given the struggle experienced by many first-year teachers (Billingsley et al., 2004; Washburn-Moses, 2009, White & Mason, 2006) or those working in special education who may experience unclear roles and responsibilities (many teachers struggle with unclear roles and responsibilities). The importance of having a collaborative skill set may serve as a pivotal factor in directing the course of success for a future teacher (Driver et al., 2018). Finally, collaboration may not be fully developed without the ability to put yourself in someone else's shoes through empathy and perspective. As discussed prior, the parent was a pivotal focus for expanding the participants' understanding of collaboration and the importance of shared voices for all participants.

Participants adamantly shared that the instructional package provided a meaningful way to learn. Each phase of the training had value for the next. Although participants spoke mostly about the positive aspects learned from the simulations, direct instruction, and VA that also contributed to their experience. Direct instruction was described as essential by the participants

as providing foundational knowledge necessary to meaningfully participate in the simulations. Participants shared that had they not received the direct instruction, they may not have gained as much from the simulated MD meetings. Supported by the direct instruction, all participants expressed excitement, relevance, and value with their simulated MD meeting. At the heart of learning is practice, experimentation, analysis, and reflection (Lyons, 2012). Similar to research that highlights the benefits of simulations, the participants stated that there was an opportunity to experiment with the content through a safe space (Gershwin Mueller et al., 2019; Kneebone, 2003; Murray et al., 2002) and that the presence of such valuable scenarios takes place in the profession (Dotger et al., 2015). Participants expressed a priority to learn the skills now in order to prevent harm to the student later (Carrington et al., 2011; Dieker et al., 2014). Most notably, all participants in the interview and pre-and-post assessments reported an improved level of confidence after the experience. Further, the participants commonly attributed this improvement to their simulated practice (Gibson et al., 2011; McPherson et al., 2011).

Meanwhile, participants shared that VA provided an opportunity to combine the simulated role-play with the reflection with the intent to further analyze their collaboration and conflict resolution skills. Despite the challenge of watching themselves and being overly critical, the participants expressed the value of VA. First, as suggested by Lan and Morgan (2003), VA should be supported with a rubric. This is helpful as it can provide direction to the process or reduce the focus on one's feelings or judgment (Brophy, 2004; Kalk et al., 2014). This is an important aspect to consider as the participants who noted the rubric as helpful support also shared fewer concerns about feeling "awkward" and focused more on what skills they will utilize in the future. With the challenges also came successes that are important. Video analysis is structured through the use of video recording which provides multiple opportunities to view the

recording and go at an individual's own pace (Brophy, 2004). Participants acknowledge this as a helpful aspect of their process. In fact, some shared they watched the video multiple times to see both themself and other participants' reactions and collaboration skills utilized. Similar to research, participants reported that VA allowed them to see behaviors they wouldn't otherwise see or remember (McDuffie et al., 2014; Rich & Hannafin, 2008; Sherin & van Es, 2005). From an outsider's perspective, the participants were able to develop a new perspective regarding their collaborative and conflict resolution skills (Hosford, 1981). Most participants commonly discussed the ability to notice their own strengths and improvements and plan for future opportunities (Brouwer et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2012; Oosterheert & Vermunt, 2003). Further, the use of VA to enhance the consideration of future opportunities to apply a given skill is especially exciting. When participants can anticipate opportunities, they can intentionally plan to use skills and further expand the variety of opportunities they may experience in the field (Brouwer et al., 2017).

Another interesting finding of this study was the challenges online learning and delivery added to the participants' experiences with collaboration. Without question, the pandemic forced a virtual format. Participants in the study had signed up for an in-person course and were forced to adjust their expectations after the semester had begun. Although a COVID-19 contingency plan was included within the study methodology, specific research regarding preservice teacher preparation during a pandemic simply did not exist. Notably, even though participants acknowledged the necessity of the online platform, they continued to report that Zoom wasn't ideal. Students were simultaneously asked to learn new content, apply what they were learning, and then analyze and reflect on their performance, all while coping with a global pandemic reporting it was difficult to apply the skills they were learning and felt awkward. It is hard to

separate which participant perceptions were directly influenced by participants actively experiencing a global pandemic. In reality, it may be safe to say all of their experiences and perceptions were likely affected. The results in this study warrant further examination about how preservice teachers experienced and overcame challenges and maximized their online learning during the pandemic because, despite their comfort and preference for in-person instruction, it may not be an option. The pandemic's existence gave no choice as to how the instructional package was provided; to ensure safety, participants were forced to engage with the content virtually. Further, due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations, schools, families, students, and teachers were currently and actively making the shift to learn and build collaboration through virtual platforms. We may never return to learning as we knew it prior to the pandemic. It is inevitable that significant changes will continue regarding how instruction, learning, and family-school partnerships occur, and we are only beginning to understand how to support those changes.

An analysis of participants' pre-and-post assessment scores provides an exploration of Research Questions 2 and 3, does the experience of the training inform or shape the participants' perceived confidence to utilize collaborative skills to participate in MD meetings and as an educational professional? Notably, participants' confidence grew throughout the training. The sentiments shared within the interviews aligned with the results of their pre-and-post assessment. Also, of importance, was a dip in confidence in all areas assessed. Although confidence isn't a formal evaluation of knowledge, it does provide a platform for the development of self-efficacy skills that support the advancement of further learning. Bandura (1997) explained self-efficacy or confidence as the belief in one's competence or ability to favorably accomplish a task. Self-efficacy stems from a process of mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion,

and physiological and affective states. Mastery experiences can be described as successes or failures. Participants shared the role of VA in providing the outsider's perspective to evaluate their performance showcasing areas of success and needs. Vicarious experiences are opportunities to observe individuals, especially those who are role models. Participants highlighted the value of VA to learn from their peers. For many, their peers served as that model needed to gain different ideas and examples of how to collaborate. Verbal persuasion includes support from influential people in our lives. Parent actors played a vital and influential role for all the participants. Finally, physiological and affective states are those emotions experienced while learning that influence one's confidence. Participants shared a variety of emotions involved within their process, including fear, nerves, excitement, purpose, and confidence. Both preservice and beginning teachers experience learning opportunities and experiences which can be interpreted through the four sources of self-efficacy as can the participants' experiences with the instructional training package provided in this study. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory proposes that mastery experiences are necessary components of building confidence (1977b). Although the MD provision was not the primary focus of the training, participants responded positively to its application for their learning. Notably, it was the area of greatest growth in pre-and-post assessment results. Though more research is needed to explore confidence and actual skill performance, participants reported that having the background and experience of the MD simulation provides a foundation for the future. This is essential, given the level of knowledge and analysis required to participate meaningfully in a MD meeting (Lewis, 2017).

Implications for Practice

Several recommendations for the future of preservice teacher education are worth noting. First, there is evidence we need to target collaboration and conflict resolution skills for both

general and special education preservice teachers. For instance, preservice teacher education programs do not prioritize or consistently provide coursework in collaboration and conflict resolution skills (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2012; Kyzar et al., 2019; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). Findings in this study demonstrate a similar trend with very few participants having coursework that had addressed collaboration and conflict resolution. Yet the opportunity to experience positive collaboration may improve self-efficacy (Guo et al., 2011). Of importance, participants in this study reported valuing the instructional process and targeted content as well as feeling more confident and ready to apply the skills when they are in the field. Notably, many participants discussed how they plan to engage with parents in the future. Specifically, they shared listening to others, encouraging another participant's voice, and sharing one's own voice as important skills to have for shared decision making. This is an exciting finding, given the role family-school-partnerships play in supporting successful student outcomes (Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2012; Kyzar et al., 2019; Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). Thus, as faculty and staff tasked with the honor of providing instruction to our future teachers, they can consider examining their course goals and objectives to prioritize targeting these skills.

Notably, this study utilized the “I do, we do, you do” pedagogy to simultaneously address targeting a complex layer of skills (Levy, 2007). Participants were provided with instruction addressing legal provisions as well as collaboration and conflict resolution skills. Participants reported having very little background or formal experience with either skill, yet they all reported feeling more confident at the conclusion of the training. Further, it was expected that participants would apply the behavioral concepts learned in class into their instruction and practice. Therefore, within a behavioral undergraduate course, preservice teachers were

concurrently taught with legal, collaboration, and behavioral instruction, unique and authentic application activities, and reflection, all within one pedagogical approach.

The next recommendation to consider for preservice teacher preparation is the priority of providing authentic experiment-based application well before preservice teachers' field placements, thus providing future teachers with access to instruction supported by application opportunities (Dotger et al., 2008; Knight, 2019; Yoon et al., 2007). Preservice teachers commonly experience pedagogy that requires the analysis of course concepts in isolation (Dotger et al., 2010). For instance, teacher preparation commonly utilizes field placements as the primary opportunity for practice, application, and experimentation (Arnett & Freeburg, 2008; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; McKenzie, 2009; Phillion et al., 2005). For some preservice educators, field placements serve as the first opportunity to authentically apply multiple semesters of coursework and new learning, potentially increasing the likelihood they will experience research-to-practice gap (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999). Not only is the preservice teacher trying to remember multiple semesters of the content presented, but the actual skill of applying the content is new as well and vastly different from anything they have experienced in their preservice preparation (Knight, 2019; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Yoon et al., 2007). Many participants in this study had not yet experienced field placements, yet they were provided with a learning opportunity that provided scaffolded practice, application, and experimentation that they all expressed as valuable and worth continuing to offer as an instructional pedagogy within the current course. Importantly, the "I do, we do, you do" pedagogy incorporated simulated practice. Similar to instruction in the medical field, simulations may provide an option for maximizing field placements (Badiee & Kaufman, 2015; Hixon & So, 2009) and addressing the research-to-practice gap (Carrington et al., 2011; Hixon & So, 2009). Of note, many participants described the need to include more

simulated practice within their teacher preparation program. One participant questioned why they had never experienced something like this in their other courses. Given the findings from this study, professors and staff interested in including simulation as a part of their coursework may want to consider the following three factors: repeated opportunities to practice the target skill, role plays that include actors who have an authentic experience with the role they are playing, as well as reflection and feedback opportunities (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Issenberg, et al., 2005; Lyons, 2012). First, the simulations proved to be a valuable experience for all participants; however, the desire for more practice was commonly stated by most participants. Participants also considered having only one simulation a challenge. They were left wanting more practice and opportunity. Repeated opportunities may provide access to the full benefit of the simulated learning opportunity (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Next, all participants described the authenticity of the simulation because of real parent participants as the actors. Though the simulation included a case study and "acting," the participants acknowledged that the parents inevitably brought their first-hand experiences to the practice. When the parent responded or challenged the preservice teachers, they likened it to how they would actually respond in a meeting because they had already been through it. This level of authenticity may be difficult to recreate with an actor who has no prior experience when compared to a parent actor who has lived what it is like trying to be an equal partner in their child's education. Finally, planning for reflection and feedback opportunities is a valuable consideration. The primary tool for reflection and feedback within the study was provided by a short debrief immediately after the simulations concluded and VA. Instructor feedback is an important aspect used to scaffold simulated practice (Issenberg et al., 2005). Participants found the debrief with parents after the simulation very helpful. It was through the VA where consideration to feedback may have been insufficient. Nagro et al. (2017)

found VA was better able to support preservice teachers when paired with feedback by supporting meaningful reflection vs. just the application of targeted items. Notably, though all participants' confidence levels improved throughout the training, there was a clear decrease in confidence after the VA. Although the VA was structured with a rubric that required the participants to acknowledge successes, preservice teachers may need additional preparation before watching themself for VA. Further, formally building in a class, individual or small-group debrief may also better support the process.

Finally, instructors and institutions may want to prioritize and examine how to directly involve families in preservice teacher preparation. As discussed with the benefits of simulations, an important theme discovered was the value of actual parents playing the roles in the simulations. Participants who had access to real parents noted a number of benefits provided by the parents that went beyond the simulated practice opportunity. Of importance was the authenticity, insight, and feedback provided by the parents which participants noted helped them to build background, experience, and perspective for future collaborative opportunities. The benefits and opportunities of parent-family involvement for preservice teachers may extend beyond simulated practice opportunities. For example, through the “Family as Faculty” model researchers have explored the effects and possibilities of including families in teacher preparation coursework by including practices such as simulations, guest instructors, and research conducted alongside families (Graff, 2021; Graff et.al., 2020; Patterson et al., 2009; Webb & Krudwig, 2005) into their teacher preparation. The “Family as Faculty” model has explored possibilities for preservice education that may address concerns with successful family-school partnerships by exploring the effects of including families as experts, examining teacher biases, and exploring power imbalances present in education (Graff et al., 2020). It is without

question that many schools and families struggle to meaningfully engage in a successful partnership (Collier et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2013; Olivos et al., 2010). Families can become contributors to changing the current narrative that may only serve to disengage family-school partnerships (Baquedano-Lopez et al., 2013). Therefore, including families as vital contributors to preservice teacher preparation is a necessary consideration, especially given that some of the barriers to parent-family involvement with schools may be linked to a lack of adequate preservice preparation (Dotger & Bennett, 2010; Harvey et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2008; Murray et al., 2013). Moreover, considerations for improving family-school-partnerships are especially important for families who have children supported with special education services, given the creation of appropriate services relies on the IEP team's ability to successfully collaborate (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2014). Further, as it relates to the MD provision, a student's access to education is contingent on the team's ability to share necessary information and collaborate successfully (Jakubecy, 2002; Lewis, 2017; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2014). Indeed, including families as experts and leaders in instruction and research may hold powerful influence to interrupt the disproportionate power imbalance and deficit-based approaches necessary to move beyond the current surface level structures of family-involvement and promote real and meaningful family engagement (Ishimaru, 2020).

Implications for Research

Findings from this study as well as a close examination of current research point to three recommendations for future research that will be discussed. The previous recommendations for practice included a discussion of the possibility of structuring a more meaningful VA with instructor or class feedback. In addition to the continued exploration of using feedback to enhance VA for preservice educators, an important consideration for research may include an

examination of self-compassion and VA reflection. Notably, many of the participants in the study shared the experience of VA being "difficult," "awkward," and emphasized their areas of improvement. Overall confidence levels dropped in all areas assessed on the post-assessment for VA. Although the rubric and VA feedback forms required participants to acknowledge areas of strength, this didn't seem to be the takeaway for many. Participants may have even been harder on themselves than they realized by being overly critical. Arguably, it may be impossible to completely eliminate the awkward nature of watching oneself on video, especially when tasked with the expectation of reflection. Thus, important consideration may be given to understanding how self-compassion or the act of providing kindness, empathy, and nonjudgmental understanding to one's experience (Neff & Germer, 2017) may relate to the reflective process of VA. Exploring self-compassion of preservice teachers may provide possibilities that could inform instruction or enhance teacher satisfaction and well-being. Arguably, understanding self-compassion for preservice teacher educators may be important well beyond the exploration of VA. For example, the attrition of teachers leaving the field has been a persistent concern for the education field (Tyler & Brunner, 2014). Though there is still much to be explored related to teacher attrition, researchers have found factors such as lack of preparation and job-related stressors as contributing factors (Tyler & Brunner, 2014; Kena et al., 2014). This begs the question: Can contributing factors related to attrition be neutralized by supporting preservice educators' self-compassion? Notably, researchers exploring self-compassion using the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) discovered that levels of self-compassion were associated with a number of factors that may support the VA reflection process, learning, and preservice teacher well-being. For instance, higher scores are linked with an increase in optimism, perceived competence, and motivation (Hollis-Walker & Colosimo, 2011; Neff et al., 2007). As it relates,

many participants involved in the training using VA demonstrated a dip in competence. Some even discussed how the process of VA could hinder the application of targeted content as some individuals may only see their faults and become overly critical. Without question, there is still much to know about the role of self-compassion and preservice teacher education; however, the possibility it may hold for supporting learning and well-being for future teachers is exciting and well worth a deeper examination.

The intersection between preservice teacher preparation and collaboration requires additional exploration and research. Interestingly, higher education faculty are unwavering in their value of the necessity of collaboration for preservice teachers (Kyzar et al., 2019), yet collaboration is commonly left out of preservice teacher preparation (Harvey et al., 2010). A potentially contributing factor may be a lack of understanding that exists regarding what collaboration skills are necessary for preservice educators. Perhaps if the field was more aware of what specific skills to teach the priority to include collaboration into higher education coursework may improve. As practitioners consider further exploration of collaboration, there are a number of possibilities worth noting. An examination of the shared decision-making process and the factors that contribute to what each team member shares needs to be further explored. For instance, Walker (2013) found a discrepancy in the shared information between general and special educators participating in hypothetical MD meeting case studies. Aligning with previous research (Elbaum et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2004), special education teachers shared unique information more often than their general education colleagues. Given that appropriate IEP decisions are based on shared decision making, the field may benefit from a better understanding of the shared decision-making process. Also, it is possible that exploration in shared decision-making may further understand specific skills of collaboration for additional

research. Notably, most participants from the current study reported feeling more prepared and willing to share their voice. This is an important finding to highlight and explore further as most of the participants were preservice general education teachers, who have historically spoken less in meetings (Elbaum et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2004; Walker, 2013) and report they believe they helped less in making meeting decisions or knew less what to do than other team members (Martin et al., 2004). It is without question that preparation doesn't guarantee implementation or generalization; thus, a look at participants' implementation of skills during the simulations or after would add to the bigger picture for preservice preparation. Further, the IEP and MD meeting teams often include a diverse group of participants from families, administrators, special educators, general educators, related service providers, and counselors, to name a few. Each participant in any given meeting will likely come with their own position, interest, and bias. Specific attention and research should be given to better understand the decision-making process that occurs within a MD meeting specifically, given the provision is intended to safeguard a student's access to FAPE. The lack of collaboration or shared information could consequently lead to a student receiving further suspensions and exclusion from learning opportunities. Notably, suspension rates are more than twice as likely to occur for students with disabilities (Losen et al., 2015; U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2014). Relatedly, trends in MD litigation demonstrate more times than not the behavior is determined not to be a manifestation of the student's disability (Katsiyannis & Smith, 2003; Zirkel, 2015b). This is concerning given students' with disabilities suspension rates. When suspension rates are combined with MD decisions that are disproportionately weighted in one direction and little is understood to substantiate the MD decision-making process (Lewis, 2017), the need for more research becomes apparent.

Although field experiences continue to provide many of the collaboration opportunities in preservice preparation (Fullerton et al., 2011; Harvey et al., 2010; McKenzie, 2009), simulated learning may serve as a viable solution for authentic learning opportunities prior to actual classroom experiences (Dotger et al., 2008). Continued exploration into simulations as an authentic learning opportunity for preservice teachers may include several considerations. First, an emphasis within future research regarding simulations can include families within the process. For example, this study examined the perceptions of preservice teachers who participated in simulated meetings finding the process was meaningful and valuable. An overwhelming factor noted by participants that enhanced their learning process was the inclusion of real parents. Thus, as a field, it is important to continue to bring real families into the process and explore the experiences and outcomes. Further, future research may explore the families' perspective of the simulated meeting process. It may be helpful to know what are the parent actors' experiences of simulated meetings: do they see it as valuable, what strengths or challenges do they experience? An exploration of family perspectives from those who have participated in MD meetings is valuable as well. Knowledge of parent experiences in actual MD meetings may inform case development, instruction, and future research opportunities. Further expanding the simulation research, specific to the simulated MD meeting process, should continue. Researchers may want to continue to replicate the research to test the social validity across a variety of participants and situations. Further, an interesting area of exploration might include following up with participants who had participated in simulated MD meetings once they have taught for a year or two to explore their perceptions of the training benefits and current needs at that time. Although participants all noted and demonstrated on post-assessments a growth in their confidence with the MD provision, it may be interesting to see what they remember from the training or see

themselves applying in practice and what are their perceptions of the training, once they are in the field. Further, an added layer of exploration to the simulated MD meetings process could include an examination of the training package for educators already in the field or for those who have experience with MD meetings. Finally, related to teaching the skills of collaboration and simulated MD meetings, participants in the study expressed a challenge with collaborating through an online platform. Despite the fact that the circumstances were not negotiable and online learning was necessary in order to continue coursework during the pandemic, an area of future research could explore the experiences with online learning during the pandemic as well as specifics related to collaboration. The information gained by exploring experiences and effects of learning during the pandemic could inform future preservice teaching pedagogy. Without question, living through the pandemic brought many changes to the access and delivery to learning and life. As a result of the pandemic, countless families and schools have been forced to conduct IEP meetings, P/T conferences, and other collaborative opportunities online. If this was a challenge for the participants in this study, during a simulated MD meeting, it is likely others in the field struggled with online MD or IEP meetings. Information gained from exploring the successes, struggles, and experiences of future teachers, current teachers, and families may be necessary as learning platforms continue to evolve.

Limitations

The current study sought to explore the experiences, satisfaction, and confidence of preservice teachers when provided with training including direction instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA. The goal of the study was to explore the social validity of the training and, therefore, findings cannot be generalized to all preservice teachers. As with all research, the limitations of the current study are worth discussing. First, the lead researcher and interviewer

for the study was also the instructor of record for the course implementing the training. Therefore, participants in the study were all current students of the lead researcher/instructor. Thus, it is possible that the answers provided in the interviews were tempered because the interviewer was also their teacher. Assurances were provided to ensure participants were aware there would be no impact on their grades and the purpose was exploratory. However, given the relationship between the participants and the researcher, some caution should be considered when analyzing the findings. Second, the study contained a smaller than anticipated sample size. Class sizes were smaller than expected due to the COVID-19 pandemic and, thus, the opportunity to recruit participants was impacted. Finally, not all participants completed the post assessments along the way, thereby limiting the number of responses throughout the post assessment collection. Nevertheless, this was the first study to explore simulated learning through a MD meeting, thereby adding to a very small body of research related to the MD provision. Further, the participants expressed that the benefit of a real parent actor relates to the research being done with the "Family as Faculty" model and can be used to improve the current study for future replication.

Conclusion

Despite the pivotal role collaboration plays in so many aspects of a teachers' daily responsibilities, there is still so much to know about how preservice teachers are prepared to collaborate. Further, the MD collaborative decision-making process has rarely been explored (Walker & Brigham, 2017). The current study explored the usefulness of a training package that included direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA to support preservice teachers' knowledge, skills, and confidence to collaborate and participate in MD meetings. In addition to finding the training was an authentic and meaningful learning opportunity for the participants in

the study, considerations for improvements to the training were identified through strengths and challenges that were experienced. Particiants in the study overwhelmingly acknowledged the value of each phase of the training as direct instruction was expressed as a good first stepping stone, simulations provided valuable practice opportunties and VA promoted self-awareness of one's strengths and areas for growth. Although participants noted the importance of all three phases, the simulated practice opportunity was most commonly acknowledged as pivitol to learning and increased confidence. Further adding to the simulated experience, partcipants overwhelmingly shared that the parent actor played a very important part in the authenticity of the simulation. Participants expressed an improved confidence in all target areas of collaboration, conflict resolution, and the MD process, thus demonstrating a need for further exploration of simulations as a possibility for simutaneously teaching complex course content. These findings are promising, especially when considering the need to embed more practice opportunities into course content (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and exploring ways to address the research-to-practice gap (Carrington et al., 2011; Hixon & So, 2009). Future research utilizing direct instruction, simulated MD meetings, and VA as a meaningful pedagogy for preservice teacher preparation is necessary to better understand the value and effectiveness of the training. Although the study did not directly address the decision-making process of a MD meeting, it did add to a small number of studies that explored the provision. Additionally, the subtheme of real parents as actors with the simulated MD meeting opens new doors to explore means for understanding and developing more meaningful family-school partnerships, collaborative practices, teacher preparation, and MD meeting decision making.

REFERENCES

Alase, A. (2017). The interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): A guide to a good qualitative research approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(2), 9-19.

Alexander, M., Williams, N., & Nelson, K. (2012). When you can't get there: Using video self-monitoring as a tool for changing the behaviors of pre-service teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, *31*(4), *18-24.* https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1283786934?accountid=12832

Allday, A. R., Neilsen-Gatti, S., & Hudson, T. M. (2013). Preparation for inclusion of teacher education pre-service curricula. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *36*(4), 298–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413497485

Allen, D. W. (1966). A new design for teacher education: The Teacher Intern Program at Stanford University. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *17*(3), 296–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/002248716601700304

Allen, J. M., & Wright S. E. (2013). Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching, 20*(2), 136-151. https://doi:10.1080/13540602.2013.848568

Alliance for Excellence. (2014). Teacher attrition cost united states up to $2.2 billion annually, says new alliance report. https://all4ed.org/press/teacher-attrition-costs-united-states-up-to-2-2-billion-annually-says-new-alliance-report/

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq*. (1990)

Arnberger, K., & Shoop, R. (2006). A principle's guide to a manifestation determination. *Principal Leadership*, *6*(9), 16-21. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/233341106?accountid=12832

Arnett, S. E., & Freeburg, B. W. (2008). Family and consumer sciences pre-service teachers: Impact of an early field experience. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, *26*(1), 48-56. https://natefacs.org/Pages/v26no1/v26n1Arnett.pdf

Arthaud, T. J., Aram, R. J., Breck, S. E., Doelling, J. E., & Bushrow, K. M. (2007) Developing collaboration skills in pre-service teachers: A partnership between general and special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *30*(1), 1–12.

Badiee, F., & Kaufman, D. (2015, April-June). *Design evaluation of a simulation for teacher education*. SAGE Open. https://doi:10.1177/2158244015592454

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. http://dx.doi.org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Baquedano-Lopez, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernandez, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community improvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of Research in Education, 37*, 149-182. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.3102/0091732X12459718

Barbour, R. (2014). *Introducing qualitative research.* https://doi:10.4135/9781526485045

Barrows, H. S. (1993). An overview of the uses of standardized patients for teaching and evaluating clinical skills. *Academic Medicine*, *68*(6), 443–453.

Barrows, H. S. (2000). *Problem-based learning: An approach to medical education.* Springer.

Bayram, L. (2012). Use of online video cases in teacher training. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*, 1007-1011.

Beam, H., & Gershwin Mueller, T. (2017). What do educators know, do and think about behavior? An analysis of special and general educators' knowledge of evidence-based behavioral interventions. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *61* (1), 1-13.

Billingsley, B. S., Carlson, E., & Klein, S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. *Exceptional Children*, *70*, 333-347.

Big Beaver Falls Area School District v. Jackson, 624 A.2d 806 (1993).

Blackwell, W. H., & Rossetti, Z. S. (2014). *The development of individualized education programs: Where have we been and where should we go now*? SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014530411

Blomberg, G., Sturmer, K., & Seidel, T. (2011). How pre-service teachers observe teaching on video: Effects of viewers' teaching subjects and the subject of the video. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(7), 1131-1140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.008

Bonwell, C., & Eison, J. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. U. S. Department of Education. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED336049.pdf

Boz, Y., & Boz, N. (2010). The nature of the relationship between teaching concerns and sense of efficacy. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*, 279-291. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/02619768.2010.490910

Bradley, E. G., & Kendall, B. (2014). A Review of computer simulations in teacher education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *43*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.2190/ET.43.1.b

Bradley, J. F., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (2005). Conflict resolution: Preparing preservice special educators to work in collaborative settings. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *28*, 171–184. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/088840640502800404

Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klinger, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children*, *71*, 195–207.

Briere, D., & Simonsen, B., & Sugai, G., & Myers, D. (2015). Increasing new teachers' specific praise using within-school consultation intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *17*(1), 50-60.

Brophy, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Using video in teacher education.* Elsevier.

Brouwer, N., Besselink, E., & Oosterheert, I. (2017). The power of video feedback with structured viewing guides. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 66*, 60-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.013

Broward County School Board, 110 LRP 38160 (2010).

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Brown, T. (2012). The effects of educational policy and local context on special education students' experiences of school removal and transition. *Educational Policy*, *26* (8), 813-844.

Brownell, M. T., Ross, D. D., Colón, E. P., & McCallum, C. L. (2005). Critical features of special education teacher preparation: A comparison with general teacher education. *The Journal of Special Education*, *38*(4), 242–252. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669050380040601

Brownell, M. T., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). An interview with Dr. Marilyn Friend. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *37*(4), 223-228. http://doi.org/10.1177/105345120203700405

Bruhn, A. L., Woods-Grove, S., & Huddle, S. (2014). A preliminary investigation of emotional and behavioral screening practices in K-12 schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 37*(4), 611-634.

Bryan, L. A., & Recesso, A. (2006) Promoting reflection among science student teachers using a web-based video analysis tool, *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, *23*(1), 31-39. https://doi:10.1080/10402454.2006.10784557

Bryman, A. (2017). Quantitative and qualitative research: Further reflections on their integration. In J. Brannen (Ed.), *Mixing methods: Qualitative and quantitative research* (pp. 57-78). Routledge.

Butler, J. (2015). How safe is the schoolhouse: An analysis of state seclusion and restraint laws and policies. http://www.autcom.org/pdf/HowSafeSchoolhouse.pdf

Carl and Maura B. v. Mundelein High School District, 20 IDELR 263 (1993).

Carr, E., Dunlap, G., Koegel, R., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Albin, R., Kern Koegel, L., & Fox, L. (2002). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *4* (1), 4-16.

Carrington, L., Kervin, L., & Ferry, B. (2011). Enhancing the development of pre-service teacher professional identity via an online classroom simulation. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *19*, 351-368.

C. C. v. Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District, 116 LRP 43118 (2016).

Chesnut, S. R., & Cullen, T. A. (2014). Effects of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and perceptions of future work environment on pre-service teacher commitment. *Teacher Educator*, *49*(2), 116–132. https://doi:10.1080/08878730.2014.887168

Chopp, D. (2020). School districts and families under the IDEA: Collaborative in the theory, adversarial in fact. *Journal of the National Association of Administrative Law Judiciary*, *32*(2), 423-60.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Dudley-Marling, C. (2012). Diversity in teacher education and special education: The issues that divide. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(4), 237–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112446512

Collier, M., Keefe, E. B., & Hirrel, L. A. (2015). Preparing special education teachers to collaborate with families. *School and Community Journal*, *25*(1), 117-135. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1695740222?accountid=12832

Cooper, J., Heron, T., & Heward, W. (2007). *Applied behavior analysis* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Corbin, C. B. (1967) The effects of covert rehearsal on the development of a complex motor skill. *Journal of General Psychology*, *76*, 143-150. https://doi:10.1080/00221309.1967.9710383

The Council for Children with Behavior Disorders (2009). CCBD's position summary on restraint and seclusion in school settings. https://higherlogicdownload.s3.amazonaws.com/SPED/bc40048c-cf24-4380-a493-273ff305ca3c/UploadedImages/CCBD%20Position%20on%20Use%20of%20Seclusion%207-8-09.pdf

Council for Exceptional Children. (2012). *Initial preparation standards with elaborations.* https://www.cec.sped.org/~/media/Files/Standards/Professional%20Preparation%20Standards/Initial%20Preparation%20Standards%20with%20Elaborations.pdf

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (inTASC) model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Author. https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf

C.P. v. Krum Independent School District, 114 LRP 41006 (2014).

Crais, E. R., Boone, H. A., Harrison, M., Freund, P., Downing, K., & West, T. (2004). Interdisciplinary personnel preparation: Graduates' use of target practices. *Infants and Young Children*, *17*, 82–92. https://doi:10.1097/00001163-200401000-00010

Cramer, E., Liston, A., Nevin, A., & Thousand, J. (2010). Co-teaching in urban secondary school districts to meet the needs of all teachers and learners: Implications for teacher education reform. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, *6*(2), 59-76.

Crawford, S., O'Reilly, R., & Luttrell, S. (2012). Assessing the effects of integrating the reflective framework for teaching in physical education (RFTPE) on the teaching and learning of undergraduate sport studies and physical education students, *Reflective Practice*, *13*(1), 115-129, https://doi:10.1080/14623943.2011.626025

Creswell, J. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Five qualitative approaches to Inquiry. In L. Habib, K. Koscielak, B. Bauhaus, & M. Masson (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed., pp. 69-110). Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Crotty, M. (1998). *For and against culture. The foundation of social research. Meaning and perspective in the research process* (pp. 66-78). Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*(1), 1-44.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0022487105285962

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1–2), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348024

deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In K. de Marrais & S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research* (pp. 51-68). Erlbaum.

Depaepe, F., & König, J. (2018). General pedagogical knowledge, self-efficacy and instructional practice: Disentangling their relationship in pre-service teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *69*, 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.003

Dieker, L. A., Rodriguez, J. A., Lignugaris/Kraft, B., Hynes, M. C., & Hughes, C. E. (2014). The potential of simulated environments in teacher education: Current and future possibilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *37*(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413512683

Doe v. Maher, 795 F.2d 787 (1986).

Dotger, B., Dekaney, E., & Coggiola, J. (2019). In the limelight: Utilizing clinical simulations to enhance music teacher education. *Research Studies in Music Education*, *41*(1), 99-116. https://doi:10.1177/1321103X18773102

Dotger, B., Masingila, J., Bearkland, M., & Dotger, S. (2015). Exploring iconic interpretation and mathematics teacher development through clinical simulations. *Journal of Math Teacher Education*, *18*, 577-601. https://doi:10.1007/s10857-014-9290-7

Dotger, B. H., & Bennett, J. (2010). Educating teachers and school leaders for school–family partnerships. In D. Hiatt-Michael (Ed.), *Promising practices for connecting families with schools* (pp. 129–150). Information Age.

Dotger, B. H., Dotger, S. C., & Maher, M. J. (2010). From medicine to teacher: The evolution of the simulated interaction model. *Innovative Higher Education*, *35*, 129-141. https://doi:10.1007/s10755-009-9128-x

Dotger, B. H., Harris, S., & Hansel, A. (2008). Emerging authenticity: The crafting of simulated parent teacher candidate conferences. *Teaching Education*, *19*(4), 337-349. https://doi:10/1080/10476210802438324

Drews, F. A., & Backdash, J. D. (2013). Simulation training in health care. *Reviews of Human Factors and Ergonomics*, *8*, 191-234. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1557234X13492977

Driver, M. K., Zimmer, K. E., & Murphy, K. M. (2018). Using mixed reality simulations to prepare preservice special educators for collaboration in inclusive settings. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *26*(1), 57-77.

Dunst, C. J., & Dempsey, I. (2007). Family–professional partnerships and parenting competence, confidence, and enjoyment. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, *54*(3), 305–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120701488772

Edelson, S. M. (2001) Self-Management. *Autism Research Institute*. http://www.autism.com/ind_self-mangament.asp

Education of the Handicapped Act of 1970. Public Law 91-230. § 16301 et seq. (1970).

Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, 20 U.S.C. § 1401 et seq. (1975).

Edwards, R., & Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Elbaum, B., Blatz, E. T., & Rodriguez, R. (2015). Parents' experiences as predictors of state accountability measures of schools' facilitation of parent involvement. *Remedial and Special Education*, *31* (1), 15-27. https://doi:10.1177/0741932515581494.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of of 1965. 20. U.S.C. (1965).

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 137 S. Ct. 988, 580 (2017).

U.S. (2017).

Esquivel, S. L., Ryan, C. S., & Bonner, M. (2008). Involved parents' perceptions of their experiences in school-based team meetings. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *18*(3), 234-258. https://doi:10.1080/10474410802022589

Farrand, K. M., Troxel Deeg, M., Rogers, O., Mullady, A. M., Williams, S. S., & LeSueur, B. T. (2019). Enhancing collaborative practices with preprofessional occupational therapists and early childhood special education student teachers: A pilot study. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1482

Fedders, A. M. (2011). *The effect of video self-monitoring on novice special educators'' implementation of advanced direction instruction reading techniques* (Publication No. 3495674 [Doctoral dissertation, University of California]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Fitzpatrick, M., & Knowlton, E. (2009) Bringing evidence-based self-directed intervention practices to the trenches for students with emotional and behavioral disorders, preventing school failure. *Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *53*(4), 253-266. https://doi:10.3200/PSFL.53.4.253-266

Forness, S. R., Serna, L. A., Nielsen, E., Lambros, K., Hale, M. J., & Kavale, K. A. (2000). A model for early detection and primary prevention of emotional or behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *23*(3), 325–345.

Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D., & MacSuga-Gage, A. (2013). Pre-service teacher training in classroom management: A review of state accreditation policy and teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *37*(2), 106-120.

Friend, M. (2018). *Special education contemporary perspectives for school professionals* (5th edition). Pearson.

Friend, M. (2000). Myths and misunderstandings about professional collaboration. *Remedial and Special Education*, *21*(3), 1030–1032.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2017). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. Pearson.

Fukkink, R. G., Trienekens, N., & Kramer, L. J., (2011). Video feedback in education and training: Putting learning in the picture. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*(1), 45-63. https://doi:http://dx.doi.org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9144-5

Fullerton, A., Ruben, B. J., McBride, S., & Bert, S. (2011). Evaluation of a merged secondary and special education program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*(2), 45-60.

Gable, R., Donelson, S., Sheth, M., Wilson, C., & Park, K. (2012). Important, usage, and preparedness to implement evidence-based practices for students with emotional disabilities: A comparison of knowledge and skills of special education and general education teachers. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *35*(4), 499-519.

Gallagher, P. A., Vail, C. O., & Monda-Amaya. L. (2008). Perceptions of collaboration a content analysis of student journals. *Teacher Education and Special Education 31*, 12–20. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/088840640803100102

Gershwin Mueller, T., Massafra, A., & Robinson, J., & Peterson, L. (2019). Simulated individualized education program meetings: Valuable pedagogy within a preservice special education program. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*(3), 209-226. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0888406418788920

Gibson, D., Christensen, R., Tyler-Wood, T. & Knezek, G. (2011). SimSchool: Enhancing teacher preparation through simulated classrooms. In M. Koehler & P. Mishra (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 2011--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1504-1510). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved May 27, 2020, from https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/36508/.

Girod, M., & Girod, G. (2008). Simulation and the need for quality practice in teacher preparation. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *16*, 307-337. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/200074728?accountid=12832

Goetz, A., & Jepsen, A. (2019). *Navigating school discipline and juvenile justice matters for children with disabilities* [PowerPoint]. Ninth Annual National PACER Symposium about Children and Young Adults with Mental Health and Learning Disabilities.

Goodwin, R. (1987). The fifth amendment in public schools: A rationale for its application in investigations and disciplinary proceedings. *William and Mary Law Review*, *28*(4), 683-709.

Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975).

Graff, C. S. (2021) Co-investigation and co-education in "family as faculty" approaches: A repositioning of power. *Theory into Practice, 60*(1), 39-50. https://doi:10.1080/00405841.2020.1829380

Graff, C. S., Manlove, J., Stuckey, S., & Foley, M. (2020) Examining pre-service special education teachers' biases and evolving understandings about families through a family as faculty approach. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 65*(1), 20-37. https://doi:10.1080/1045988X.2020.1811626

Green, C. L, Walker, K. V., Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2007). Parents' motivation for involvement in children's education: An empirical test of a theoretical model of parent involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*, 531–544. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.532

Greeno, J. G., Collins, A. M., & Resnick, L. B. (1996). Cognition and learning. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (p. 15–46). Macmillan

Griffin, C. C., Kilgore, K. L., Winn, J. A., Otis-Wilborn, A., Hou, W., & Garvan, C. W. (2009). First-year special educators: The influence of school and classroom context factors on their accomplishments and problems. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *32*(1), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406408330870

Grossman, P., Smagorinsky, P., & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education*, *108*(1), 1-29. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/1085633

Guo, Y., Justice, L. M., Sawyer, B., & Tompkins, V. (2011). Exploring factors related to preschool teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(5), 961-968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.008

Halter, C. P. (2006). *The reflective lens: the effects of video analysis on preservice teacher development* (Publication No. 3211280) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego]. Abstracts International. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9sn014bc

Hamilton-Jones, B. M., & Vail. C. O. (2014). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: pre-service teachers' beliefs and perspectives. *International Journal of Special Education*, *29* (1), 76–86.

Harvey, M. W., Yssel, N., Bauserman, A. D., & Merbler, J. B. (2010). Preservice teacher preparation for inclusion: An exploration of higher education teacher-training institutions. *Remedial and Special Education*, *31*, 24-33. https://doi:10.1177/0741932508324397

H.D. v. Central Bucks School District*,* 59 IDELR 275 (2012).

Hixon, E., & So, H. (2009). Technology's role in field experiences for preservice teacher training. *Educational Technology & Society*, *12*(4), 294–304.

Holcomb, J. B., Dumire, R. D., Crommett, J. W., Stamateris, C. S., Fagert, M. A., Cleveland, J. A., & Mattox, K. L. (2002). Evaluation of trauma team performance using an advanced human patient simulator for resuscitation training. *Journal of Trauma*, *52*, 1078–1085. https://10.1097/00005373-200206000-00009

Hollis-Walker, L., & Colosimo, K. (2011). Mindfulness, self-compassion, and happiness in non-meditators: A theoretical and empirical examination. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 222–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.033

Honig v. Doe, 484 U.S. 305 (1988).

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*, 105–130. htpps://doi:10.1086/499194

Horner, R. H., & Yell, M. L. (2017). Commentary on Zirkel: Judicial rulings specific to FBAs and BIPs under the IDEA and corollary state laws: An update. *The Journal of Special Education*, *51*, 57–59.

Hosford, R. E. (1981). Self-as-a-model: A cognitive social learning technique. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *9*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/001100008000900113

Huang, Y., Kellett, U. M., & St. John, W. (2010). Cerebral palsy: Experiences of mothers after learning their child's diagnosis. J*ournal of Advanced Nursing*, *66(*6), 1213–1221. https://doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05270.x

Huhra, R. L., Yamokoski-Maynhart, C., & Prieto, L. R. (2008). Reviewing videotape in supervision: A developmental approach. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *86*(4), 412-418. https://doi:http://dx.doi.org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00529.x

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. (1997).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990, 20 U.S.C. § 1401 et seq. (1990).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 Regulations, 34 CFR § 300.1 et seq. (2004).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 Regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 300.530 (g) (2006)

Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977).

Ishimaru, A. M. (2020). *Just schools: Building equitable collaborations with families and communities.* Teachers College Press.

Issenberg, S. B., Mcgaghie, W. C., Petrusa, E. R., Gordon, D. L., & Scalese, R. J. (2005). Features and uses of high-fidelity medical simulations that lead to effective learning: a BEME systematic review. *Medical Teacher*, *27*(1), 10–28. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/01421590500046924

Ivey, A. E., & Authier, R. J. (1978). *Microcounseling; Innovations in interviewing, counseling, psychotherapy and psycho-education.* Charles C. Thomas.

Jacobowitz, T., & Michelli, N. M. (2008). Diversity and teacher education: What can the future be? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing context* (3rd ed., pp. 1009-1016). Routledge.

Jakubecy, J. J. (2002). *Group decision making and information pooling during the manifestation determination* (Publication No. 3056836) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Johnson, J. (2015). Qualitative sales research: an exposition of grounded theory. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *35*(3), 262-273.

Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Harvard Graduate School of. Retrieved May 17, 2009, from http Education://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org_/articles/ NRTA/Harvard_report.pdf

Johnston, J., Foxx, R., Jacobson, J., Green, G., & Mulick, J. (2006). Positive behavior support and applied behavior analysis. *Behavior Analysis*, *29* (1), 51-74.

Jones, M. L. (2009). A study of novice special educators' views of evidence-based practices. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *32*(2), 101–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409333777

Joseph, G. E., & Brennan, C. (2013). Framing quality: Annotated video-based portfolios of classroom practice by pre-service teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 41*(6), 423–430.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kalk, K., Luik, P., Taimalu, M., & Täht, K. (2014). Validity and reliability of two instruments to measure reflection: A confirmatory study. *Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, *18*(2), 121-134. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1535599217?accountid=12832

Katsiyannis, A., & Maag, J. (2001). Manifestation determination as a golden fleece. *Exceptional Children*, *68* (1), 85-96.

Katsiyannis, A., & Smith, C. R. (2003). Disciplining students with disabilities: Legal trends and the issue of interim alternative education settings. *Behavioral Disorders*, *28(*4), 410-418.

Kauffman, J., & Landrum, T. (2013). *Characteristics of emotional and behavioral disorders of children and youth*. Merrill Prentice-Hall.

Kena, G., Aud, S., Johnson, F., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., and Kristapovich, P. (2014). *The Condition of Education 2014* (NCES 2014-083). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Kingery, P. M. (1990). Self-efficacy and the self-monitoring of selected exercise and eating behaviors of college students. *Health Education*, *21*, 26-29. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00970050.1990.10616167

Kneebone, R. (2003). Simulation in surgical training: Educational issues and practical implications. *Medical Education*, *37*, 267–277. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2003.01440.x

Knight, J. (2019). Instructional coaching for implementing visible learning: A model for translating research into practice. *Educational Science*, *9*, 1-16. https://doi:10.3390/educsci9020101

Kornhaber, R., Wilson, A., Abu-Qamar, M., Mclean, L., & Vandervord, J. (2015). Inpatient peer support for adult burn survivors-a valuable resource: a phenomenological analysis of the Australian experience. *Burns*, *41*(1), 110-117.

Korotitsch, W. J., & Nelson-Gray, R. O. (1999). An overview of self-monitoring research in assessment and treatment. *Psychological Assessment*, *11*(4), 415–425. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/1040-3590.11.4.415

Korthagen, F. A., & Kessels, J. P. (1999). Linking theory to practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, *28*(4), 4-17. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X028004004

Krammer, K., Ratzka, N., Klieme, E., Lipowsky, F., Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (2006). Learning with classroom videos: Conception and first results of an online teacher-training program. *Zentralblatt für Didaktik der Mathematik 38*, 422–432. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/BF02652803

Krezmien, M. P., Leone, P. E., & Chilles, G. M. (2006). Suspension, race, and disability: Analysis of statewide practices and reporting. *Journal of emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *14* (4), 217-226.

Kurth, J. A., Mastergeorge, A. M. (2012). Impact of setting and instructional context for adolescents with autism. *The Journal of Special Education*, *46,* 36-48. https://doi:10.1177/0022466910366480

Kurtts, S., Hibbard, K., & Levin, B. (2005). Collaborative online problem solving with preservice general education and special education teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *13*(3), 397-414.

Kyzar, K. B., Gershwin Mueller, T., Francis, G. L., & Haines, S. J. (2019). Special education teacher preparation for family-professional partnerships: Results for a national survey of teacher educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *42*(2), 320-337. https://doi:10. 1177/0888406419839123.

Lake, J. F., & Billingsley, B. S. (2000). An analysis of factors that contribute to parent-school conflict in special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, *21*, 240-256. https://doi:10.1177/ 074193250002100407

Lan, W., & Morgan, J. (2003). Videotaping as a means of self-monitoring to improve theater students' performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 71,* 371-381. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00220970309602070

Lee, G. C., & Cheng-Chih, W. (2006). Enhancing the teaching experience of pre-service teachers through the use of videos in web-based computer-mediated communication (CMC): Journal of the Association for Programmed Learning ETTI. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *43*(4), 369-380. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/210671041?accountid=12832

Leko, M. M., Brownell, M., Sindelar, M. T., Kiely, P. T., & Theresa, M. (2015). Envisioning the future of special education personnel preparation in a standards-based era. *Exceptional Children, 82*(1), 25-43. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1719015849?accountid=12832

Leko, M. M., Brownell, M. T., Sindelar, P. T., & Murphy, K. (2012). Promoting special education preservice teacher expertise. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *44*(7), 1-16. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1315133965?accountid=12832

Leko, M. M., & Smith, S. W. (2010). Retaining beginning special educators what should administrators know and do. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 45(5)*, 321-325.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers. The education schools project*. http://edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf

Levy, E. (2007). *Gradual release of responsibility: I do, we do, you do.* https://www.washoeschools.net/cms/lib/NV01912265/Centricity/Domain/257/Certified%20Hiring/GradualReleaseResponsibilityJan08.pdf

Lewis, M. M. (2017). Were the student's actions a manifestation of the student's disability? The need for policy change and guidance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *25*(50), 1-24.

Lewis, T., McIntosh, K., Simonsen, B., Mitchell, B., & Hatton, H. (2017). Schoolwide systems of positive behavior support: Implications for students at risk and with emotional/behavioral disorders. *American Educational Research Association*, *3*(2), 1-11.

Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive school-wide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *31*, 1–24.

Lighthall, G. K., & Barr, J. (2007). The use of clinical simulation systems to train critical care physicians. *Journal of Intensive Care Medicine*, *22*(5), 257–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/0885066607304273

Loewenberg Ball, D., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(5), 497–511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Longmore, P. (1987). Review: Uncovering the hidden history of people with disabilities: *Reviews in American History*, *15*(3), 355-364.

Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). *Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school*. The Civil Rights Project. https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/upcoming-ccrr-research/losen-gillespie-opportunity-suspended-2012.pdf

Losen, D., Hodseon, C., Keith, M. A., Morrison, K., & Belway, S. (2015). *Are we closing the school discipline gap?* The Center for Civil Rights Remedies. https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/are-we-closing-the-school-discipline-gap/AreWeClosingTheSchoolDisciplineGap_FINAL221.pdf

Lyons, J. (2012). Learning with technology: Theoretical foundations underpinning simulations in higher education. In M. Brown, M. Hartnett, & T. Stewart (Eds.), *Ascilite 2012 Proceedings* (pp. 1-5). Massey University. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/wellington12/2012/images/custom/asclite2012_proceedings.pdf

Maag, J. W., & Katsiyannis, A. (2006). Behavior intervention plans: Legal and practical considerations for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, *31*(4), 348-362.

Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(13), 1753-1760.

Martin, J., Marshall, L. H., & Sale, P. (2004). A 3-year study of middle, junior high, and high school IEP meetings. *Exceptional Children*, *70*, 285-297. https://doi:10.1177/088572880402700204

Mason v. Board of Education, *56 IDELR 14 (2011).*

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2014). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective differentiated instruction* (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & McDuffie, K. (2005). Case studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges.

Intervention in School and Clinic, *40*(5), 260-270. https://doi:http://dx.doi.org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/10534512050400050201

McDuffie, R. A., Foote, M. Q., Bolson, C. Turner, E. E., Aguirre, J. M., Gau Bartell,T., Drake, C., & Land, T. (2014) Using video analysis to support prospective K-8 teachers' noticing of students' multiple mathematical knowledge bases. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Educ*, *17*, 245–270. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10857-013-9257-0

McKenzie, R. G. (2009). Elevating instruction for secondary-school students with learning disabilities by demystifying the highly qualified subject matter requirement. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *24(*3), 143–150. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2009.00288.x

McLeskey, J., Barringer, M-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M. C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017, January) *High-leverage practices in special education*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children and CEEDAR Center. https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CEC-HLP-Web.pdf

McMahon, G. T., Monaghan, C., Falchuk, K., Gordon, J. A., & Alexander, E. K. (2005). A simulator-based curriculum to promote comparative and reflective analysis in an internal medicine clerkship. *Academic Medicine*, *80*(1), 84-89.

McPherson, R., Tyler-Wood, T., McEnturff Ellison, A. & Peak, P. (2011). Using a computerized classroom simulation to prepare pre-service teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *19*(1), 93-110. Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from https://www-learntechlib-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/primary/p/31438/.

Menlove, R., Garnes, L., & Salzberg, C. (2004). Why special educators leave and where they go. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *27*(4), 373–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700405

Merrell, K., & Walker, H. (2004). Deconstructing a definition: Social maladjustment versus emotional disturbance and moving the EBD field forward. *Psychology in the Schools*, *41*, 899-910.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (District of Columbia 1972).

Murray, M., Curran, D., & Zellers, E. (2008). Building parent/professional partnerships: An innovative approach for teacher education. *Teacher Education*, *43*, 87–108. https://doi:10.1080/08878730701838819

Murray, M. M., Handyside, M., Straka, L. M., & Arton-Titus, T. V. (2013). Parent empowerment: Connecting with preservice special education teachers. *School Community Journal*, *23*(1), 145–168. http://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx

Murray, W., Good, M. L., Gravenstein, J., van Oostrom, J., & Brasfield, W. (2002). Learning about new anesthetics using a model-driven, full human simulator. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing*, *17*(5), 293–300. https://doi:10.1023/a:1021294002356

Myers, D. L., Romero, Z., Anzaldua, N., & Trinidad, M. L. (2011). Exercise intervention at a Hispanic-serving institution. *College Student Journal*, *45*, 428-438.

Nagro, S., deBettencourt, L., Rosenberg, M., Carran, D., & Weiss, M. (2017). The effects of guided video analysis on teacher candidates' reflective ability and instructional skills. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *4*(1), 7-25. https://doi:10.1177/0888406416680469

Nagro, S. A., & Cornelius, K. E. (2013). Evaluating the evidence base of video analysis: A special education teacher development tool. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *36*(4), 312–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413501090

National Consortium on Leadership and Disability for Youth. (2007). *Disability history timeline: Resource and discussion guide*. National Consortium on Leadership and Disability for Youth.

National Disabilities Rights Network: Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Disabilities. (2012). *School is not supposed to hurt: U. S. Department of Education must do more to protect school children from restraint and seclusion*. http://stophurtingkids.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/School-is-Not-Supposed-to- Hurt-2012.pdf

Neff, K. D. & Germer, C. (2017). Self-compassion and psychological wellbeing. In J. Doty (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of compassion science*, Chap. 27 (pp. 1-29). Oxford University Press.

Neff, K. D., Rude, S. S., & Kirkpatrick, K. (2007). An examination of self-compassion in relation to positive psychological functioning and personality traits. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 908-916.

Ofstedal, K., & Dahlberg, K. (2009). Collaboration in student teaching: Introducing the collaboration self-assessment tool. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *30*(1), 37-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/10901020802668043

Olivos, E. M., Gallagher, R. J., & Aguilar, J. (2010). Fostering collaboration with culturally and linguistically diverse families of children with moderate to severe disabilities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *20*, 28–40. https://doi:10.1080/10474410903535372

Oosterheert, I. E., & Vermunt, J. D. (2003). Knowledge construction in learning to teach: The role of dynamic sources, *Teachers and Teaching*, *9*(2), 157-173, https://doi:10.1080/13540600309376

Ospina, S. M., Esteve, M., & Lee, S. (2018). Assessing qualitative studies in public administration research. *Public Administration Review*, *78*(4), 593-605.

Patterson, K. B., Webb, K. W., & Krudwig, K. M. (2009) Family as Faculty Parents: Influence on Teachers' Beliefs About Family Partnerships, *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 54:1*, 41-50, DOI: 10.3200/PSFL.54.1. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.3200/PSFL.54.1.41-50

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Pauken, P. D., & Daniel, P. T. K. (2000). Race discrimination and disability discrimination in school discipline: A legal and statistical analysis. *West's Education Law Reporter, 139*, 759–790.

Pellegrino, A., Weiss, M., & Regan, K. (2015). Learning to collaborate: General and special educators in teacher education. *The Teacher Educator*, *50*(3), 187-202. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/08878730.2015.1038494

Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 343 F. Supp. 279, 307 (E.D. Pennsylvania 1972).

Perry, B. L., & Morris, E. W. (2014). Suspending progress: Collateral consequences of exclusionary punishment in public schools. *American Sociological Review, 79*(6), 1067-1087. https://doi:10. 1177/0003122414556308

Peters, K., & Halcomb, E. (2015). Interviews in research. *Nurse researcher*, *22*(4), 6-7. https://doi:10.7748/nr.22.4.6.s2

Phillion, J., Miller, P. C., & Lehman, J. D. (2005). Providing field experiences with diverse populations for preservice teachers: Using technology to bridge distances and cultures. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *7*, 3-9. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1207/s15327892mcp0703_2

Pomerance, L., Greenberg, J., & Walsh, K. (2016). *Learning about learning report: What every new teacher needs to know.* National Council on Teacher Quality. www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Learning_About_Learning_Report

Porter, R. (2002). *Madness: A brief history*. Oxford University Press.

Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher*, *29*(1), 4–15. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.3102/0013189X029001004

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 794.

Reimann, M. (2017). *Willowbrook, The institution that shocked a nation into changing its laws*. https://timeline.com/willowbrook-the-institution-that-shocked-a-nation- into-changing-its-laws-c847acb44e0d

Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Puri, R., & Goel, N. (2011). Supporting children's mental health in schools: Teacher perceptions of needs, roles, and barriers. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *26*(1), 1-13.

Ricci, L. A., Zetlin, A., & Osipova, A. V. (2017). Preservice special educators' perceptions of collaboration and co-teaching during university fieldwork: Implications for personnel preparation. *Teacher Development*, *21*(5), 687-703. https://doi:10.1080/13664530.2017.1293561

Rich, P. J., & Hannafin, M. J. (2008). Decisions and reasons: Examining preservice teacher decision-making through video self-analysis. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *20*, 62–94. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/BF03033432

Richards, K., & Hemphill, M. (2018). A practical guide to collaborative qualitative data analysis. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 37*(2)*,* 225-231.

Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2004, August). *The 36th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward public schools*. www.pdkintl.org/kappan/ k0409pol.htm#exec

Rosen, G. (1968). *Madness in society: Chapters in the historical sociology of mental illness.* The University of Chicago Press.

Rosenberg, M. S. (1996). Current issues facing teacher education and special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *19*, 209–210.

Rosenthal, T. L., & Bandura, A. (1978). Psychological modeling: Theory and practice. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis* (2nd ed., pp 621-658). New York: Wiley.

Ryan, J. B., Katsiyannis, K., Peterson, R., & Chmelar, R. (2007). IDEA 2004 and disciplining students with disabilities. National Association of Secondary School Principals*. NASSP Bulletin*, *91*(2), 130-140.

Santagata, R., & Guarino, J. (2012). Preparing future teachers to collaborate. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *21*(1), 59-69. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1243100589?accountid=12832

Santagata, R., & Taylor, K. (2018). Novice teachers' use of student thinking and learning as evidence of teaching effectiveness: A longitudinal study of video-enhanced teacher preparation. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 11-28. https://citejournal.org/volume-18/issue-1-18/mathematics/novice-teachers-use-of-student-thinking-and-learning-as-evidence-of-teaching-effectiveness-a-longitudinal-study-of-video-enhanced-teacher-preparation

Sauvé, L., Renaud, L., Kaufman, D., & Marquis, J. S. (2007). Distinguishing between games and simulations: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, *10*, 247-256. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/1287039637?accountid=12832

Scheuermann, B., & Johns, B. (2002). Advocacy for students with emotional or behavioral disorders in the 21st century. *Behavioral Disorders*, *29*(1), 57-69.

Scheuermann, B., Peterson, R., Ryan, J., & Billingsley, G. (2016). Professional practice and ethical issues related to physical restraint and seclusion in schools. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *27*(2), 86-95.

Scott, B., Barnes, C., & Wagner, D. (2012). Chameleonic or consistent? A multilevel investigation of emotional labor variability and self-monitoring. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(4), 905-926. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/23317619

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A meta-synthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, *73*, 392-416. https://doi:10.1177/001440290707

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Pub L. No. 93-112, 87 Stat. 394 (Sept. 26, 1973)

Seidel, T., Stürmer, K., Blomberg, G., Kobarg, M., & Schwindt, K. (2011). Teachers learning from analysis of videotaped classroom situations: Does it make a difference whether teachers observe their own teaching or that of others? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 259-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.009

Shapiro, J. P. (1994). *No pity: People with disability forging a new civil rights movement.* Times Books.

Shepherd, K. G., Fowler, S., McCormick, J., Wilson, C. L., & Morgan, D. (2016). The search for role clarity: Challenges and implications for special education teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *39*(2), 83-97. https://doi:10.1177/0888406416637904

Sherin, M. G., & van Es, E. A. (2005). Using video to support teachers' ability to notice classroom interactions. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *13*(3), 475-491. https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/docview/200008828?accountid=12832

Skiba, R. (2014). The failure of zero tolerance. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, *22*(4), 27-33.

Smith, D. D., Robb, S. M., West, J., & Tyler, N. C. (2010). The changing education landscape: How special education leadership preparation can make a difference for teachers and their students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *33*(1), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409358425

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*, 681- 684.

Spooner, F., Algozzine, B., Wood, C. L., & Hicks, S. C. (2010). What we know and need to know about teacher education and special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *33*(1), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409356184

Srikala, N., & Schlessinger, S. (2017). When theory meets the "reality of reality": Reviewing the sufficiency of the social model of disability as a foundation for teacher preparation for inclusive education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *44*(1), 81-100.

Stoddard, K., Braun, B., & Koorland, M. (2011). Beyond the school- house: Understanding families through preservices experiences in the community. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 55*(3), 158–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2010.499394

Storni, C. (2010). Multiple forms of appropriation in self-monitoring technology: Reflections on the role of evaluation in future self-care. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *26*(5), 537-561, https://doi:10.1080/10447311003720001

Stürmer, K., Seidel, T., & Holzberger, D. (2016). Intra-individual differences in developing professional vision: Preservice teachers' changes in the course of an innovative teacher education program. *Instructional Science*, *44*(3), 293-309. https://doi:http://dx.doi.org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11251-016-9373-1

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 24,* 23-50.

Sykes, G., Bird, T., & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*, 464–476. https://doi:10.1177/0022487110375804

Tran, V. T., Porcher, R., Tran, V. C., & Ravaud, P. (2017). Predicting data saturation in qualitative surveys with mathematical models from ecological research. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *82*, 71-78.

Tripp, T. R., & Rich, P. J. (2012). The influence of video analysis on the process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*, 728-739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.011

Turnbull, H. R., Wilcox, B., Stowe, M., Raper, C., & Hedges, P. L. (2000). Public policy foundations for positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *2*(4), 218-230.

Tyler, T. A., & Brunner, C. (2014). The case for increasing workplace decision-making: Proposing a model for special educator attrition research. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *37*(4), 283–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406414527118

United States Senate: Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee. (2014). *Dangerous use of seclusion and restraints in schools remains widespread and difficult to remedy: A review of ten cases.* https://www.help.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Seclusion%20and%20Restraints%20Final%20Report.pdf

United States Government Accountability Office. (2009). *Seclusion and restraints: Selected cases of death and abuse at public and private schools and treatment centers*. https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09719t.pdf

Union of the Physically Impaired. (1976). *Fundamental principles of disability*. Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation. https://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/library/UPIAS-fundamental-principles.pdf

U.S. Const. amend. V.

U.S. Const. amend. VIII.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights. (2014). *Civil rights data collection data snapshot: School discipline*. http://ocrdata.ed.gov/Downloads/CRDC-School-Discipline-Snapshot.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (2016). *Dear colleague letter on behavioral supports*. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/ files/dcl-on-pbis-in-ieps-08-01-2016.pdf

Valle, J. W. (2011). Down the rabbit hole: A commentary about research on parents and special education. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *34*(3), 183–190. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948711417555

Villa, R. A., Thousand, J. S., & Nevin, A. I. (2004). *A guide to co-teaching: Practical tips for facilitating student learning*. Corwin.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Harvard University Press.

Wagner, M. (1995). Outcomes for youths with serious emotional disturbance in secondary school and early adulthood. *The Future of Children: Critical Issues for Children and Youths*, *5*, 90-112.

Wagner, M., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A. J., Epstein, M. H., & Sumi, W. C. (2005). The children and youth we serve: A national picture of the characteristics of students with emotional disturbances receiving special education. *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Disorders*, *13*, 79–96.

Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., Javitz, H., & Valdes, K. (2012). A national picture of parent and youth participation in IEP and transition planning meetings. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *23*(3), 140–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207311425384

Walker, J., & Brigham, F. (2017). Manifestation determination decisions and students with emotional/behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *25*(2), 107-118.

Walker, J., & Dotger, B. (2012). Because wisdom can't be told: Using comparison of simulated parent-teacher conferences to assess teacher candidates' readiness for family-school partnership. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(1), *62-75*. https://doi:10.1177/0022487111419300

Walker, J. D. (2013). *Manifestation determination reviews and school team decision-making with students with emotional/behavioral disabilities* (Publication No. 3592007) [Doctoral Dissertation, George Mason University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Walker, T. (2018). *Are schools ready to tackle the mental health crisis*? http://neatoday.org/2018/09/13/mental-health-in-schools/

Wang, J., & Hartley, K. (2003). Video technology as a support for teacher education reform. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *11*, 105-138.

Washburn-Moses, L. (2009). An exploration of pre-service teachers' expectations for their future roles. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *32*, 5-16. https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0888406408330865
Article information

Watters, A. (2015). *Educational technology and Skinner's box*. Retrieved from http://hackeducation.com/2015/02/10/skinners-box

Webb, K., & Krudwig, K. (2005). North Florida Personnel Development Partnership: Family as Faculty program. In Council for Exceptional Children, *Federal outlook for exceptional children* (pp. 96–97). Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Weber, K., Gold, B., Prilop, C., & Kleinknecht, M. (2018). Promoting pre-service teachers' professional vision of classroom management during practical school training: Effects of a structured online-and video-based self-reflection and feedback intervention. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *76*, 39-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.08.008

Weber, M. (2006). Reflections on the new individuals with disabilities education improvement act. *Florida Law Review*, *58*, 7-51.

Weiner, B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory of motivation: A history of ideas. *Educational Psychologist*, *45*, 28–36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00461520903433596

Weiss, E. M. (1998, October 11). *A nationwide pattern of death*. The Hartford Courant. http://www.charlydmiller.com/LIB05/1998hartfordcourant11.html

Weiss, M. P., Pellegrino, A., & Brigham, F. (2017). Practicing collaboration in teacher preparation: Effects of learning by doing together. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *40*(1), 65-76. https://doi:10.1177/0888406416655457

White, R., & Mason, R. (2006). Youth gangs and youth violence: Charting the key dimensions. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *39*(1), 54–70. https://doi.org/10.1375/acri.39.1.54

Whitaker, S. D. (2003). Needs of beginning special education teachers: Implications for teacher education. *Teacher Education and Special Education,* 26*,* 106-117.

Whitford, K. D., Katsiyannis, A., & Counts, J. (2016). Discriminatory discipline: Trends and issues. *NASSP Bulletin. 100*(2). https://doi-org.unco.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0192636516677340

Wigle, S., & Wilcox, D. (2003) Changing roles and responsibilities of special educators; implications for teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *25*(1), 27-37. https://doi:10.1080/01626620.2003.10463290

Wood v. Strickland, 420 U.S. 308 (1975).

Wolf, S., & Peele, M. (2019). Examining sustained impacts of two teacher professional development programs on professional well-being and classroom practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *86*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.07.003

World Health Organization (2020). *Coronavirus (COVID-19) advice for the public.* https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public

Yell, M., & Rozalski, E. (2008). The impact of legislation and litigation on discipline and student behavior in the classroom. *Preventing School Failure*: *Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *52*(3), 7-16. https://doi 10.3200/PSFL.52.3.7-16.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033*). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033_sum.pdf

Young, K. R., West, R. P., Smith, D. J., & Morgan, D. P. (1995). *Teaching self-management strategies to adolescents.* Sopris West.

Zagona, A. L., Kurth, J. A., & MacFarland, S. Z. C. (2017). Teachers' views of their preparation for inclusive education and collaboration. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *40*(3), 163–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417692969

Zahorik, J. A. (1984). Can teachers adopt research findings? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *35*(1), 34–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718403500110

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university based teacher education. J*ournal of Teacher Education*, *62*(1-2), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(5), 376–382. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112445789

Zilz, W. (2006). Manifestation determination: Rulings of the courts. *Education and the Law*, *18*(2-3), 193-206.

Zirkel, P. A. (2007). Suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities: The latest requirements. *West's Education Law Reporter*, *214*, 445-449.

Zirkel, P. A. (2010). Manifestation determination under the new Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: An update. *Remedial and Special Education*, *31*(5), 378-384.

Zirkel, P. A. (2015a). Manifestation determinations under the IDEA: The latest cases. *Communique*, *43*(5), 8-10.

Zirkel, P. A. (2015b, January/February). Manifestation determinations under the IDEA: The latest cases. *National Association of School Psychologists*, 43(5), https://unco.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.unco.idm.oclc.org/other-sources/manifestation-determinations-under-idea-latest/docview/1675652103/se-2?accountid=12832

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Demographic information:

Age:

Education:

Experience with education and teaching prior to preservice program:

Experience with MD meetings:

Experience with formal instruction in collaboration and conflict resolution:

Year of program:

QUESTIONSs:
RQ 1

What strengths would you like to share related to the instruction phase (e.g. lecture, activities, example and non-example) of the training to teach you collaborative skills to use during a MD meeting?

What weakness would you like to share related to the instruction phase of the training to teach you collaborative skills to use during a MD meeting?

What strengths do you see in using simulations to enhance on your collaboration skills?

What weaknesses do you see in using simulations to enhance your collaboration skills?

What strengths do you see in using video analysis to reflect on your teaching practices?

What weaknesses do you see in using video analysis to reflect on your teaching practices?

RQ 2

How would you describe your confidence utilizing collaborative and conflict resolution strategies during a MD team meeting prior to participating in the training including direct instruction, simulations with video analysis?

How would you describe your confidence utilizing collaborative and conflict resolution strategies during a MD meeting after participating in the training including direct instruction, simulations with video analysis?

What additional instruction, information or support do you need to feel comfortable participating collaboratively in MD meetings?

RQ 3

How do you think direct instruction can impact a teacher's ability or confidence to implement collaborative and conflict resolution strategies across various experiences you may encounter in the field?

How do you think simulated meetings can impact a teacher's ability or confidence to implement collaborative and conflict resolution strategies across various experiences you may encounter in the field?

How do you think VA can impact a teacher's ability or confidence to implement collaborative and conflict resolution strategies across various experiences you may encounter in the field?

RQ 4

What final thoughts can you share on your participation and personal outcomes from the training including direct instruction, simulated meetings and VA?

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Principal Investigator: Laura Trapp

Committee Action: **IRB EXEMPT DETERMINATION – New Protocol**

Action Date: 08/31/2020

Protocol Number: 2006005936
Protocol Title: An Analysis of Using Direct Instruction, Simulated Manifestation Determination (MD) meetings and Video-Analysis in Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Coursework
Date: 08/31/2020

Expiration Date:

The University of Northern Colorado Institutional Review Board has reviewed your protocol and determined your project to be exempt under 45 CFR 46.104(d)(701) (702) for research involving

Category 1 (2018): RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS. Research, conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, that specifically involves normal educational practices that are not likely to adversely impact students' opportunity to learn required educational content or the assessment of educators who provide instruction. This includes most research on regular and special education instructional strategies, and research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom mangagment methods.

Category 2 (2018): EDUCATIONAL TESTS, SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, OR OBSERVATIONS OF PUBLIC BEHAVIOR. Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met: (i) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; (ii) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or (iii) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review to make the determination required by 45 CFR 46.111(a)(7).

You may begin conducting your research as outlined in your protocol. Your study does not require further review from the IRB, unless changes need to be made to your approved protocol.

As the Principal Investigator (PI), you are still responsible for contacting the UNC IRB office if and when:

UNIVERSITY OF
NORTHERN COLORADO

Institutional Review Board

- You wish to deviate from the described protocol and would like to formally submit a modification request. Prior IRB approval must be obtained before any changes can be implemented (except to eliminate an immediate hazard to research participants).
- You make changes to the research personnel working on this study (add or drop research staff on this protocol).
- At the end of the study or before you leave The University of Northern Colorado and are no longer a student or employee, to request your protocol be closed. *You cannot continue to reference UNC on any documents (including the informed consent form) or conduct the study under the auspices of UNC if you are no longer a student/employee of this university.
- You have received or have been made aware of any complaints, problems, or adverse events that are related or possibly related to participation in the research.

If you have any questions, please contact the Research Compliance Manager, Nicole Morse, at 970-351-1910 or via e-mail at nicole.morse@unco.edu. Additional information concerning the requirements for the protection of human subjects may be found at the Office of Human Research Protection website - http://hhs.gov/ohrp/ and https://www.unco.edu/research/research-integrity-andcompliance/institutional-review-board/.

Sincerely,

Nicole Morse

Nicole Morse
Research Compliance Manager

University of Northern Colorado: FWA00000784

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Project Title: Teach, Practice, Analyze, and Reflect: Preservice Teacher Perceptions and Experiences with Simulated Manifestation Determination Meetings

Researcher: Doctoral Student, Department of Special Education, Laura Trapp
E-mail: scho5945@bears.unco.edu

Advisor: Dr. Tracy Gershwin, PhD, Department of Special Education
Email: tracy.gershwin@unco.edu

I am a doctoral student at the University of Northern Colorado and am researching ways to improve preserve teacher preparation programs. The purpose of this study will be to investigate the perceived usefulness of course instruction that includes direct instruction, simulated MD meetings and video-analysis to support teachers' knowledge, skills and confidence to collaborate and participate in MD meetings. Following participation in the training, participants will be individually interviewed to examine their perceptions of the training and personal confidence with implementing collaborative skills in MD meetings or as a future teacher.

I would like to request your participation to provide a phone interview at the conclusion of your experience. The interview will consist of 13 questions, and the possibility of brief follow up questions used for clarification of ideas, related to your experiences with the instructional tools used during the course unit of MD meetings and collaboration. The phone interviews will be approximately 30 minutes and will be audio recorded and transcribed for the purpose of correctly reporting the information shared; however, audio recordings and transcripts of the interview will be confidential. All audio recordings and transcriptions will be kept in a password protected flash drive and accessed from a password protected computer. Your name will not be used when sharing information learned through the interview; if necessary to safeguard confidentiality we will assign each participant a number.

Potential risks in this project are minimal. The study will focus on the effects of instructional strategies as a part of the teacher candidates' pre-service teacher preparation experience learning MD procedures and collaboration, therefore there are no foreseeable risks to the participant. *Please know that as students completing instruction as a part of their course content that the interview is voluntary therefore and there will be no risk of penalty for lack of participation in the study*. This research study may benefit the field of special education by improved pre-service teacher preparation programs and improved advocacy for best practices related to MD meetings.

Please feel free to contact me via phone or e-mail if you have any questions or concerns about the study. Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study and if you begin participation you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact Nicole Morse, Office of Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO; 970-351-1910 or nicole.morse@unco.edu.

_____

Subject's Signature Date

_____

Researcher's Signature Date

APPENDIX D

PRE-ASSESSMENT

Pre-Assessment

1) Name

2)Please select any of the following items that describe your experiences with individuals with exceptionalities. Check all that apply.
I have an exceptionality myself.
I have worked at a school.
I have volunteered at a school.
I have worked in a school supporting students with exceptionalities.
I have volunteered at a school supporting students with exceptionalities.
I have a family member who received/receives special education services/504 supports.
I have a family member who has an exceptionality but didn't qualify for special education services/504 supports.
I have a friend who received/receives special education services/504 supports.
I have a friend who has an exceptionality but didn't/doesn't receive special education services/504 supports.
I have friends with siblings or family members with exceptionalities.
I have watched tv shows, movies or read books about individuals with exceptionalities.
I have taken a course in college about individuals with exceptionalities.

3) Please select any of the following items that describe your experiences with individuals with exceptionalities. Check all that apply.
I have personally struggled with my own challenging behavior.
I have worked in a school and observed challenging behavior of students.
I have personally supported a student's challenging behavior in a school or residential setting.
I have personally witnessed a student's challenging behavior in a school or residential setting.
I have personally supported a student's challenging behavior in the community setting (i.e. church, park, etc.)
I have personally witnessed a student's challenging behavior in the community setting (i.e. church, park, etc.)
I have a family member who struggles with challenging behavior.
I have a friend who struggles with challenging behavior.
I have taken a college course about supporting individuals with challenging behavior.
I would describe myself as having little to no experiences with challenging behavior

Questions 1-7 pertain to your level of confidence regarding various skills. Please share how confident you are performing each of the following skills:

	How confident am I with my ability to :			
	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
1) Collaborate (e.g. paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions,				

provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families.	
2) Collaborate (e.g. paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.	
3) Utilize collaborative skills (e.g. paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.	
4) Use conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.	
5) Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.	
6) Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable)during a MD meeting.	
Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.	

Please share any additional information you feel is important prior to participating in the "Collaboration through the Manifestation Determination Process" unit.

APPENDIX E

POST-ASSESSMENT

Post-Assessment: Direct Instruction, Simulated MD Meeting, and VA

Name

Questions 1-7 pertain to your level of confidence regarding various skills. After receiving direct instruction related to collaboration, conflict resolution and the Manifestation Determination process please share how confident you are performing each of the following skills:

	How confident am I with my ability to :			
	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
1) Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) with families.				
2) Collaborate (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) other educational professionals.				
3) Utilize collaborative skills (e.g., paraphrase, reflect, consider body language, ask open ended questions, provide verbal specific acknowledgments) in order to participate in a Manifestation Determination meeting.				
4) Use conflict resolution skills (e.g., investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) to support disagreements with families.				
5) Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) with other educational professionals.				

	How confident am I with my ability to :			
	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
6) Utilize conflict resolution skills (e.g. investigate, allow team members a space to vent, negotiate, be vulnerable) during a MD meeting.				
7) Knowledge of the Manifestation Determination process.				

8) Please share any “ah-ha” moments you would like to share about your learning during the direct instruction phase of the “Collaboration through the MD Process” Unit.

APPENDIX F

COMPONENTS OF THE TRAINING

Components of the Training

Content	Description

Introduction to Objectives	Objectives:
	- Examine and describe the purpose and procedures for the MD process
	- Create a collaborative space where all meeting participants share equally
	  o Use your voice!
	  o Encourage team member voices
	- Use student information to guide discussion and decisions

Session 1: The MD Process	Objectives:
	- Describe the purpose of a MD
	- Name the two- prong test
	- Provide an overview of the MD process
	- Identify your role in the MD process
	- Practice with MD cases
	
	Participants are encouraged to:
	- Advocate- Be proactive vs. reactive
	  o Be aware of suspension days, don't just rely on one person to document this information
	  o Ongoing collaborate with administrators, parents, colleagues, students
	  o Remember special education services are dynamic, there is no rule that says you have to wait until the MD to revamp programming. If suspensions are occurring something isn't working. Work with your team and data to develop a better plan.
	  o Ensure all members of the team have a basic understanding of the purpose
	  o Read and document students strengths and areas of need present in your classroom
	- Advocate-Continue to learn
	  o Share what you know with colleagues
	  o Stay informed on best practices for discipline for students with disabilities

	o Become knowledgeable of the characteristics of disability eligibility criteria-Yes, a student is more than their label, but you will be asked to link these two in the MD meeting - Data- Reference and rely on data to drive questions, discussions and conclusions Participants are provided a power point lecture outlining the MD process. Active learning strategies included throughout included: - Use your own words: Turn to your neighbor and explain specific procedure (i.e., what happens if failure to implement the IEP) to follow if… - Case study examples: Use case law to "Be the Judge" scaffolded as Think-Share and then Think-Pair-Share
Session 2: Collaborative Behaviors	Objectives - Self-reflect on personal unconscious bias that could impact ones view of behavior and collaboration - Define Collaboration - Identify at least two collaborative behaviors to use when sharing ideas when in a MD meeting - Identify at least two collaborative behaviors for engaging team members Participants are encouraged to: - Advocate- Be proactive vs. reactive o Become aware of your biases and do the work necessary to neutralize implicit biases. Provided strategies to try such as pausing and building self-reflection into the day. o Participate in ongoing collaboration with administrators, parents, colleagues, students o Ensure all members of the team have a basic understanding of the purpose o Read and document students strengths and areas of need present in your classroom

- Advocate-Continue to learn
    - Practice pausing and self-reflection but seek other strategies to support learning more about biases.
    - Utilize collaboration skills before the meeting
    - Practice strategies outside of formal training- set goals

Participants are provided a power point lecture discussing the role of biases and describing specific collaborative behaviors (i.e., paraphrasing, reflecting, body language, open ended questions, and verbal specific acknowledgements). Active learning strategies included throughout including:

- Value Glasses- Using a folded sheet of paper participants were provided 2 minutes to reflect on their upbringing and note and values they hold because of those experiences.
- Story time-Flipping their value glasses reflection over, the instructor described experiences of behavior in schools, stopping throughout to ask participants to reflect and note their responses to the stories. Guiding questions used included
    - Do you think that is right?
    - What are you thinking right now?
    - What are you feeling right now?
    - What does this remind you of?
    - Do you have any connections to what is being shared?
- Biases: Behavior:Consequences- Participants were instructed to unfold their paper that was used for the value glasses and story time activity. Supported by the instructor's example, participants were asked to use a three column format to write at least one of the reflections they included from the story time as the behavior. From there they looked at their biases or value glasses side of the paper and examined if there was a possible belief of value that influenced their story time reflection. Lastly, in the third column they included the consequence of the behavior.
- Building background: Examine the definition of collaboration and journal examples of the definition key words.

-

Session 3: Conflict Resolution Skills	Objectives - Identify at least one conflict strategy to use when participating in a MD meeting - Analyze the use of collaborative behaviors taught as a tool for supporting conflict situations - Use rubric to guide practice of collaborative behaviors in a small group class discussion Participants are encouraged to: - Advocate- Be proactive vs. reactive o Be open, upfront and honest. o Become an investigator- ask questions o Consider what work can be done before the meeting to prevent conflict and promote collaboration. For instance, room arrangement, creating a common goal, use an agenda or have meeting norms. o Limit jargon o Consider the use of an action planning sheet to promote teamwork after the meeting - Advocate-Continue to learn o Promote consensus- a solutions all parties can live with o Allow time to blow off steam- use reflection and questions here too o This like a negotiator-highlight areas of agreement, weigh the pros and cons, make discussion visual o Be vulnerable- use "I" messages and own your mistakes Participants are provided a power point lecture outlining identified collaborative and conflict resolution behaviors (asking questions, allowing time, promoting consensus, use negotiation skills, own mistakes or harm). Active learning strategies included throughout including: - Wait time and prompt: Stop after each skill taught and provide time and prompts for participants to write examples and complete the collaboration rubric provided - Practice: In small groups participants are provided with a discussion prompt and collaboration rubric to engage in a discussion with the intent of practicing the skills of collaboration and conflict resolution strategies

Session 4: Simulations and Video Analysis	Objectives - Practice collaborative behaviors learned in class - Apply MD provisions to a simulated meeting - Identify your role in the MD process - Use collaborative skills taught in class to share your voice and advocate - Use collaborative skills taught in class to encourage other participants' voices - Watch your simulated MD meeting, reflect on your performance and goal set for next time
Simulations	Participants are encouraged to: - Advocate- Be proactive vs. reactive o Bring their collaboration rubric and use it as a reference for examples and support o Speak up and try the collaborative behaviors taught. This is a safe space to take risks and try. o Celebrate successes - Advocate-Continue to learn o Ask questions after o Seek additional supports o Continue to practice the skills and goal set Participants are provided: - Meeting agenda - Roles with unique participant information and shared information - Collaboration rubric
Video-Analysis	Participants are encouraged to: - Advocate- Be proactive vs. reactive o Celebrate their successes o Be mindful of all emotions, it may feel strange to watch yourself, accept that feeling and move forward o Focus on the way VA can support application and improvement of strengths or areas of improvement o Use the collaboration rubric

- Advocate-Continue to learn
    - Watch all behaviors in the meeting.
    - Use strengths to support future skills

Participants are provided:

- Recording of their simulation
- Collaboration rubric
- Self-reflection planning sheet

APPENDIX G

COLLABORATION RUBRIC

Notes Regarding Behaviors	**Helpful Examples**	**Circle Selection**	**Comments** (strengths, areas of need, times you wish you would have utilized a skill, rate the difficulty of applying the skill, etc.)
Collaborative Behaviors			
Directions: During our practice of collaborative behaviors please use the rubric to: 1) Note if the collaborative behavior was observed/not observed by circling the selection 2) Write down examples you observed 3) Make and notes to share			
Paraphrasing : ✣ restating the speakers message in your own words		• Observed • Not Observed	
Reflecting ✣ state a thought or feeling the speaker might be experiencing in an attempt understand and validate the speakers feelings and thoughts		• Observed • Not Observed	
Inviting Body Language ✣ using inviting and comforting body language congruent with your message		• Observed • Not Observed	

Open Ended Questions ✣ probing questions that require a team member to expand on an idea ✣ avoid yes/no questions		• Observed • Not Observed	
Verbal Specific Acknowledgements ✣ Verbally and specifically acknowledging another person's actions		• Observed • Not Observed	

APPENDIX H

REFLECTION AND PLANNING SHEETS FOR VIDEO-ANALYSIS

Reflection and Planning Sheets for Video-Analysis

Use your *collaboration rubric* completed during your observation of your video recorded MD meeting and describe the things that went well during my simulation:

Using your *collaboration rubric* and describe what would you do differently and why:

My goal for future collaboration opportunities (related to one of the collaboration or conflict resolution skills targeted) is to:

What actions will I take to reach this goal:

- Task: (What needs to be done?):
- Description of plan:
- Resources: (What is needed to get it done?)
- Timeline: