

2021

Making it Work! Increasing Collaboration between our Special Education and General Education Licensure Programs at MSU Denver

Rebecca L. Canges
Metropolitan State University of Denver, rcanges@msudenver.edu

Lisa Altemueller
Metropolitan State University of Denver, altemuel@msudenver.edu

Kara Halley
Metropolitan State University, Denver, khalley@msudenver.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digscholarship.unco.edu/jeri>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Canges, Rebecca L.; Altemueller, Lisa; and Halley, Kara (2021) "Making it Work! Increasing Collaboration between our Special Education and General Education Licensure Programs at MSU Denver," *Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*: Vol. 9 : No. 1 , Article 7.
Available at: <https://digscholarship.unco.edu/jeri/vol9/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Educational Research and Innovation by an authorized editor of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.

Making it Work! Increasing Collaboration between our Special Education and General Education Licensure Programs at MSU Denver

Rebecca Dennis-Canges
Metropolitan State University, Denver

Lisa Altemueller
Metropolitan State University, Denver

Kara F. Halley
Metropolitan State University, Denver

Teacher confidence in working with students with disabilities in a general education classroom is an essential component to being effective and has been linked to their views on the quality of their pre-service preparation program (Alur & Timmons, 2009; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). Tiwari, Das, & Sharma (2015) assert that teacher beliefs regarding inclusion are typically the fulcrum for success of inclusive education settings. According to the latest data from the National Center for Education Statistics, 64% of students (McFarland, Hussar, Wang, Zhang, Wang, Rathbun, Barmer, Forrest Cataldi, & Bullock, 2018) with disabilities spend more than 80% of their day in a general education classroom, yet general education teachers consistently report that they do not have the skills they need to effectively instruct diverse learners, including students with disabilities (Blanton, Pugach, Florian, 2011; Cook, Tankersley, Cook & Landrum, 2000; Stites, Rakes, Noggle, & Shah, 2018). Historically, teacher preparation programs have focused on preparing general education and special

education teacher candidates on two separate tracks (Pugach & Seidl, 1995; Sobel et al., 2007; Winn & Blanton, 2005). Typically, as part of their pre-service training, general education teacher candidates receive one single introductory course on working with students with disabilities that primarily focuses on the different disability categorical information and general learning characteristics of these students (Sobel et al., 2007; Turner, 2003; Winn & Blanton, 2005). Likewise, special education teacher candidates receive limited training in content areas outside of remedial strategies in literacy and mathematics (Copeland et al., 2011; Fuchs et al., 2014). Furthermore, despite the need for general and special education teachers to work together in order to successfully include students with disabilities in general education environments, preservice teacher candidates are not being prepared to collaborate in a systematic way (McLeskey, J. & Brownell, 2015; Murawski & Hughes, 2009). Based on these circumstances the ability for general and special education

teachers to work together has been negatively affected. As a result, separate preparation programs have contributed to the barriers facing inclusive education (Sobel et al., 2007; Winn & Blanton, 2005). Teacher preparation programs can play a significant role in addressing the teacher's theoretical and pedagogical questions in order to increase their self-efficacy in this area (Bialka, Hansen & Wong, 2019). In an effort to respond to the progressive changes in education and the increasing determination to include students with disabilities in general education classroom environments, the pre-service teacher preparation program at Metropolitan State University of Denver (MSU Denver) examined ways to increase the collaboration and partnership between special education and general education licensure programs in order to better prepare teachers to support the needs of all learners. Blanton, Pugach, and Florian (2011) asserted that teacher preparation programs have a vital role in ensuring teachers are prepared for inclusive classroom settings and that reevaluating the structure and content of university-based teacher preparation programs is a key part of improving inclusive education. Because increased training to support inclusion is linked with a stronger sense of self-efficacy toward inclusion (Vaz, et al., 2015), collaboration across departments of special education and general education within colleges and schools of education is vital for the success of inclusive education. The beginning and current outcomes of this work at one Institution of Higher Education (IHE) specifically with the focus of demonstrating how teacher educators can work collaboratively to reduce the silo atmosphere within teacher education, will be presented within this paper.

Background of MSU Denver Teacher Preparation Programs

MSU Denver is primarily an undergraduate, commuter institution. The MSU Denver School of Education (SOE) currently has about 1,500 students enrolled in licensure courses with approximately 25% of those students identifying as Hispanic/Latino. The SOE prepares teacher candidates for an initial teacher license in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, K-12 Physical Education, and Special Education. Initial licensure graduate programs in elementary education and special education are also offered through the SOE. The SOE in conjunction with our content area colleagues in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (CLAS) within MSU Denver prepares teacher candidates for an initial teacher license in Secondary Education English, Secondary Education Math, Secondary Education Science, Secondary Education Social Studies, and K-12 Art Education, K-12 Modern Languages Education, and K-12 Music Education Generalist. Each undergraduate program is designed to be completed within four years with total credit hours for each program ranging from 120 – 126. Initial licensure graduate programs are designed to be completed within two years. While the majority of licensure classes are offered through the SOE, our collaboration with content area colleagues in the CLAS ensures we prepare well-rounded, high quality teachers in all educational content areas.

In the United States, teacher preparation programs fluctuate in what they require of general education teachers regarding their preparation to teach students with disabilities. State requirements vary greatly (Stites, Rakes, Noggle, & Shah, 2018) with some states

requiring no special education coursework and some states requiring one course in special education as part of the general education teacher preparation curriculum (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, 2011). The state of Colorado does not currently require a certain amount of credit hours in special education content for general education teachers. In fact, according to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), it is up to the licensure program to determine which courses pre-service teacher candidates are required to take and requires each licensure program to align with standards documenting teacher candidate preparation for teaching students with disabilities. The current standards from The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2013) do not delineate a specific requirement for training in special education.

At MSU Denver, all pre-service teachers are required to take one course related to teaching students with disabilities. The primary undergraduate course students are required to take is titled SED 3600 The Education of Exceptional Learners. This course provides an overview of varying topics related to special education and students with exceptionalities. The Early Childhood Education (ECE) program has a similar course, ECE 2600: The Exceptional Child, designed to meet the needs of their particular students seeking ECE licensure. However, the ECE program will accept SED 3600 as a substitute course if the student chooses to take it. See Table 1 for the licensure programs areas that require SED 3600, ECE 2600 or no course.

Table 1 *Special Education courses taken by pre-service teacher educators at MSU Denver*

Licensure Area	ECE 2600	SED 3600	No Courses
Early Childhood Education	X		
Elementary Education & Literacy		X	
K-12 Art Education			X
K-12 Modern Languages Education		X	
K-12 Music Education			X
K-12 Physical Education		X	
Secondary Education (all content areas)		X	
Special Education generalist K-12		X	

SED 3600 is presented as a 15-week course. Throughout the semester students are introduced to important topics such as the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), The Individual Education Plan (IEP), Response to Intervention (RtI), Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), the assessment process related to eligibility, Inclusion, High-Incidence and Low-Incidence disabilities and how to provide accommodations and behavioral support so that students with disabilities are successful in school. MSU Denver offers this course with resident, hybrid, and online options. SED 3600 serves as an introductory course for students seeking special education licensure but is open to any student enrolled in the

institution who would be interested in learning more about supporting the needs of students with disabilities. While the course serves as a vital platform to expose all future teachers to the concepts surrounding the field of special education, one course is simply not enough. In fact, in a survey conducted with graduates from the MSU Denver licensure program, one student noted, "I was not prepared adequately with only one class" and another commented, "My program needed to offer more classes directly relating to students with disabilities. For example, make a class where you work with special education teachers and their students". These comments clearly indicate the need for our future teachers to have more opportunities for instruction related to working with students with disabilities.

The time has come to consider additional, innovative and inclusive approaches to improving the outcomes for students with disabilities by focusing on the preparation of general education teachers. We believe that improving the knowledge of general education teachers by way of preparation programs is the cornerstone to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Furthermore, we can only prepare future teachers to provide quality inclusive education by modeling high quality, inclusive and collaborative work in higher education teacher preparation programs. Therefore, this article will not only provide an overview of the steps taken at MSU Denver to increase the exposure pre-service teachers have to supporting the needs of students with disabilities, it will also articulate a vision for effective preparation programs for future special and general education teachers so they may be prepared to support all students included in their classroom. We begin with Phase 1 of

our project which initiated this move toward a more collaborative environment within the teacher preparation programs at MSU Denver.

Transforming MSU Denver Teacher Preparation for Inclusion

To work toward a more inclusive education for students with disabilities, it is critically important to continue to investigate teachers' views of their preparation to support the students with diverse learning needs included in their classrooms (Zagona, Kurth, & MacFarland, 2017). A small group of special education faculty at MSU Denver realized that much more needed to be done to effectively prepare teacher education graduates from all programs offered at the University. To do this, the first step was to critically examine the perspectives of graduates from the MSU Denver teacher preparation program by way of an anonymous, online, questionnaire. The following research questions guided the work:

- 1) Do general education teachers feel that their licensure program successfully prepared them to support the instructional needs of students with disabilities included in their classroom?
- 2) What suggestions do practicing general education teachers have for improving licensure programs in the area of working with students with disabilities?

Phase 1: Investigating Alumni Perceptions of their Preparation Program

In the spring of 2017, an application was submitted to the University Institutional Review Board (IRB) to obtain permission to send a questionnaire to 400 of MSU Denver's teacher degree/licensure graduates. This was originally intended to serve as a catalyst for an independent

research study related to graduates' opinions of their preparation to support the needs of students with disabilities included in their classrooms. While, the original study was not published, the results of the questionnaire sparked conversation between the special education faculty about ways to modify their program at MSU Denver. Therefore, the data that was obtained from the questionnaire guided the researchers in the collaborative conversations that lead to the phases presented in this paper.

Questionnaire Methodology

For the questionnaire, purposeful sampling was employed. Purposeful sampling allows a researcher to select information-rich cases that would present in-depth information central to the study (Patton, 2014). Therefore, a sample pool was selected using alumni data from the Teacher Education office at MSU Denver. The qualifiers for selection included a) current general education teacher, b) recent graduate from a licensure program at MSU Denver (no more than five years), and c) has experience teaching in a general education classroom that has students included who have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) indicating that the student was identified as having a disability.

Participants

In order to obtain a meaningful sample of participants, the School of Education's Data and Assessment Specialist assisted by acquiring contact information for graduates of all of the School of Education's undergraduate licensure programs excluding students with special education licenses. The survey was emailed once to 400 graduates from the MSU Denver alumni pool. From that 400, 29 responded, offering a small sample size. Table 2 shows the respondent results.

Table 2 *Respondent Results*

Licensure Area	N
Elementary School	12
Middle School	5
High School	8
Did Not Respond	3
Total	29

We recognize that the sample size was less than we expected. However, we felt it was valuable as a starting point to initiate the steps we needed to take to inform program modifications. In addition, the data results helped guide conversations with fellow licensure programs regarding the perspectives of graduates on their preparation for supporting students with disabilities. While the responses may not be representative of teachers across the United States, they parallel perspectives of insufficient preparation seen in studies regarding other teacher preparation programs (Stites, Rakes, Noggle, & Shah, 2018).

Using existing email contact data from MSU Denver Teacher Education office, alumni were sent a questionnaire via the online system Qualtrics. The questionnaire allowed responses to remain anonymous. The questionnaire contained 19 questions including seven demographic questions, two questions related to the number of students with disabilities they have supported in their classroom, three questions that required a Likert scale response about their opinion of their preparation programs in relation to working with students with disabilities, four questions directly related to the type of classes they had in their preparation program, and four open-ended questions that allowed the alumni to make comments and/or suggestions about their program. The research questions guided the

development of the questionnaire.

Questionnaire Results

After demographic questions were presented, the survey asked a fundamental question to demonstrate that the teachers had, indeed, supported students with disabilities in their general education classroom settings. That question was How many students with disabilities do you have included or mainstreamed in your class this year? Teachers that completed the survey expressed that during that year of teaching they had anywhere from 1-12 students with disabilities included in their classroom (See Table 3).

Table 3 Number of students with disabilities served in respondents general education classroom

Answer	% of Respondents
1-5	58.33%
6-11	25.00%
12 or more	16.67%

To obtain qualitative data, 4 open-ended questions were asked. The questions and participant responses are below.

During your Pre-service teacher licensure program, if you took courses that either focused or infused information about working with students with disabilities, can you describe what you learned in the class?

“I don’t remember what I learned from the infused classes regarding teaching students with disabilities. I remember we read case studies, but I don’t remember specifics about what I learned”

“It was a pretty general overview”

“I learned about basic identifiers, but not strategies that necessarily directly applied to supporting these students in my classroom.”

“A lot of laws and acronyms”

“I learned about 5 different disabilities, they were physical, not learning or behavior. I also learned how to adapt equipment.”

“Just to be inclusive with their learning and work with IEPs while making modifications.”

In what other ways do you feel your pre-service teacher licensure program prepared you to support the needs of students with disabilities?

“We had to include modifications in all of our lesson plans”

“Through mentors with SPED backgrounds.”

“The amount of real-world classroom experience was great because I was able to see different types of learners.”

“It exposed me to a variety of needs I could encounter in my classroom and challenged me to be proactive in finding ways to meet their needs.”

“By fostering an environment of openness and encouraging teacher to hear a growth mindset regarding all students.”

“I think a better job should have been done.”

“I do not feel there were any other classes that prepared me for disabilities.”

If you feel it was necessary, what could your licensure program have done to better prepare you to work with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed or included into your classroom?

“It would have helped to work with real students with disabilities or be able to watch videos.”

“I wish I had more information surrounding students with IEPs with severe emotional and behavioral problems.”

“I wish I had a tool kit of ideas in terms of what types of accommodations or modifications are called for on a student’s IEP.”

“A course on how to monitor data.”

“More ideas about differentiation.”

“Have a course specifically about inclusion in the classroom.”

“Resources or protocols that I can utilize for how to modify and accommodate instruction to meet the learning needs of my students. I was not prepared at all for my first year of teaching.”

“More work around student’s IEPs during observation hours and have a better understanding of how these students are supported in the general education classroom.”

If the preservice program you attended add courses about supporting the educational and behavioral needs of students with disabilities or included settings...what types of classes would you recommend they add?

“I would recommend watching videos of working with real students in real situations”.

“I would add a class that talks specifically about learning disabilities and behavior because they’re the most common disabilities I see and we don’t get paraeducators.”

“A course about how to monitor data, identify students with disabilities, and implement interventions would have been helpful.”

“Classroom management strategies.”

“I think they need to add more practical/hands on experiences and strategies.”

“Legal information about education and special education laws.”

“A realistic course on how inclusion looks at schools and how to be a good inclusion Teacher.”

“Field experience with a focus in supporting students with educational and behavioral needs.”

The results of the questionnaire indicate a need for a variety of supports. The authors conducted a reflexive thematic analysis by organizing the responses to the questions and looking for commonalities among them (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Some overarching themes that emerged were an educator’s need for increased experiences with tools and strategies related to supporting the needs of students with disabilities during their licensure program. In addition, more real-life experiences in working with students with disabilities as

well as special education teachers. Finally, it was noted that the respondents wanted more information on how to accommodate and modify lessons to meet the needs of their students.

While SED 3600 covers many of these topics at an introductory level, it is clear from the responses that pre-service teachers need more experience and more courses to provide them with the preparation they need to feel confident supporting the educational and behavioral needs of students with disabilities in their classroom.

Phase 2: Building a Collaborative Partnership

In order to build on the foundational information ascertained from the questionnaire, the researchers engaged in several follow-up activities to gather additional insights and facilitate collaboration with colleagues and among programs within the SOE. Those activities included:

1) Met with the full special education faculty to discuss revising SED 3600: The Exceptional Learner in the Classroom in order to address student responses in the questionnaire.

2) Created a task force within the special education faculty to fine tune student learning outcomes for SED 3600.

3) Met with Elementary and Secondary licensure preparation faculty separately during their respective program meetings to understand their perspectives and opinions on SED 3600, determine what we might need to modify, and determine ways to collaborate further. Suggestions from the elementary meeting included the need for a more “collaborating mindset” between the elementary and special education program. Elementary faculty stated they would like to

have professional development around specific content such as person-first language to ensure they are modeling consistent language and content in their classes. Additionally, elementary faculty offered to share a common lesson planning form they use with the special education faculty in the hope that the form could be used in SED 3600. During the meeting with secondary education faculty, one faculty member shared, “Disability of the week is “fine”—but, is a bit too clinical. SPED teachers are the specialists...our teachers simply need a more generalist understanding that they can apply to their classroom.” A second faculty member extended that suggestion and recommended we, “Focus on what general education teachers really need to know. While we value and understand the importance of learning about “all” disabilities...it might be more beneficial to focus in on the few areas they would be most likely to see in their classroom.”

4) Adopted a new textbook for SED 3600 which moved away from the “disability of the week” structure and focused on methods for supporting students with disabilities in collaborative and inclusive environments.

5) Researched and examined inclusive education programs in school districts seeking innovative ideas.

6) Researched and examined how other universities prepared their general education pre-service teaching candidates for supporting the needs of students with disabilities by reviewing websites for program descriptions, specific curriculum and course names/descriptions and by reviewing syllabi that were posted online.

7) Met with the Elementary department chair about ways to co-teach classes within their program to create more

opportunities for the future general education teachers to learn about supporting the educational and behavioral needs of students with disabilities.

8) Met with the Secondary Education department chair about which classes from their program would be beneficial to add to our special education licensure program.

While this process continues to be fluid, these steps have allowed us to build a more dynamic and collaborative relationship among the faculty in the SOE.

Phase 3: Moving forward

Traditionally, teachers in the United States close their classroom doors and teach their students behind the privacy of the walls of their classroom. However, efforts have called for teachers to increase their collaboration, share their experiences with other teachers and learn from each other. It is critical that our graduates see themselves as part of a collaborative team when they enter the teaching profession. Ronfeldt, Farmer, McQueen and Grissom (2015) reviewed administrative data and administered surveys for approximately 9,000 teachers to examine collaboration practices and determine whether the collaboration influences student achievement. The researchers found that teachers who participated in higher quality collaborative instructional teams produced higher achievement results in math and reading for students. Additionally, when studies have examined the effects of collaboration on teacher's attitudes, the results have shown that they feel an increased sense of self-efficacy and acceptance toward teaching all students (Montgomery & Miranda, 2014). Therefore, it is vital that we, as faculty in a teacher preparation program, model this.

Teacher educators throughout general and special education licensure programs have recognized the need to develop teachers who are able to support students with and without disabilities. As a result of our efforts of meeting with faculty from multiple departments, positive outcomes have evolved from this project that have added to an increased collaboration between the special education and general education licensure programs at MSU Denver. Listed below are a few of the changes we have begun to implement:

1) The elementary residency course will revisit articles that were originally presented in SED 3600 to have the students apply their knowledge to their final field experience and/or student teaching and residency

2) A shared folder in Onedrive was created where we, as special education faculty, will upload articles and descriptive activities that the general education faculty can have access to. That way they can refer to items in their class in order to make connections between those and SED 3600.

3) Conversations have started about co-teaching the "differentiation" class that is offered in the elementary program.

4) The Special Education licensure program has undergone modifications to include more Elementary and Secondary core classes in its required program that will include field experiences in general education classrooms that focus on curriculum and behavioral support.

5) A graduate course was created and is required of all elementary and special education initial licensure teacher candidates. This class is taught from an educational decision-making perspective utilizing a case study approach to assist teacher candidates in applying information to classroom settings. The emphasis of this

class is on the highest incidence disabilities and differentiation tools.

6) The SOE is researching educational equity audit consultants with the intent of hiring a consultant during the fall 2021 semester. This audit will include interviews with faculty, staff, and teachers as well as a review of policies and procedures in the SOE. While there are many purposes and desired outcomes for this audit, one purpose is to identify areas of strength in our collaborations across the SOE. Additionally, we hope to identify areas in which growth and change are needed in order to have more effective cross program collaborations.

Our goal is to provide our pre-service teacher candidates with a more integrative and collaborative experience during their program. While many preservice teachers report feeling ill-prepared for teaching in inclusive settings (Metsala & Harkins, 2020), if our general and special education licensure programs commit to building a strong foundation during their pre-service teaching program, our graduates will be more equipped and have a higher self-efficacy related to supporting the educational and behavioral needs of students with disabilities.

Phase 4: Next steps...A vision for effective preparation programs for special and general education teachers

Teacher preparation programs play a critical role in the development of teacher candidates. Historically, teacher preparation programs have limited the training associated with general education content, assessment practices, and academic standards for special education teacher candidates (Brownell et al., 2010; Fuchs, Fahsl, & James, 2014; McLeskey & Brownell, 2015). Instead, training remains

focused on disability categorical information, remedial intervention strategies, alternative curriculums and evaluation measures, and alternative academic standards (Brownell, et al., 2005; Brownell et al., 2010; Pugach & Warger, 1995; Turner, 2003; Winn, & Blanton, 2005). Furthermore, the training that has been provided often focuses on preparing special education teachers to work in pull out resource room or self-contained settings (Copeland, et al., 2011; McLeskey, J. & Brownell, 2015).

Similarly, general education teacher preparation programs offer training in grade-level specific discipline content, “one size fits all” assessments practices, and standards-based education with limited connection to teaching students with disabilities within general education environments. These separate approaches to preparing teachers is a problem given the number of students with disabilities being included in general education classrooms. Many teachers report feeling unprepared and hesitant to include students within general education classrooms; even doubting the students’ ability to be successful in the general education classrooms (Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006 as cited Zagona, Kurth & MacFarland, 2017; Montgomery & Mirenda, 2014). In addition, special education teachers reported feeling unprepared to effectively provide services in a consultative or collaborative model (Brownell, Ross, Colon, & McCallum, 2005). Thus, the increase in inclusive education requires general and special education teachers to be trained differently in order to assume new roles within the school setting. Based on the experience we have had with this process it is clear to us that effective teacher preparation programs

should include a more inclusive program for pre-service teachers.

Effective teacher preparation programs must include components that produce teachers who are able to work with and support all students who enter their classrooms. There is a need to ensure that teacher preparation programs provide a knowledge base of laws and educational policies related to students with disabilities to both special education and general education teacher candidates (AlMahdi & Bukamal, 2019). According to a 2011 report jointly released by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the National Center for Learning Disabilities (NCLD), teacher candidates must leave teacher preparation programs with the belief that students with disabilities are capable learners and with the knowledge and skills necessary to program effective instruction to students with disabilities (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, 2011). Teacher preparation programs need to ensure that teacher candidates become knowledgeable about teaching methods that have been proven effective within inclusive contexts such as universal design for learning, evidence-based practices, differentiation, and co-teaching (Stites, Rakes, Noggle, & Shah, 2018). Additionally, teacher preparation programs need to ensure that teacher candidates have more opportunities to engage with students with disabilities during their field and student teaching experiences so that they can make deeper connections between the knowledge they gain in their coursework and real-life experiences. These expanded opportunities will provide the much-needed experience that will lead to improved confidence, motivation, and attitudes towards working with students with disabilities within general education

environments. Through clinically rich, intentional field work, teacher candidates can move from college classroom learning to application of knowledge through pedagogy (Scheeler, Budin, & Markelz, 2016). Finally, there is a need for teacher preparation programs to focus on preparing both general and special education teachers to work collaboratively in order to help students with disabilities become full, successful members of their school communities. Therefore, teacher candidates need the opportunity to learn and practice these collaborative skills that they will ultimately put into practice in their school settings. These skills cannot be learned effectively in isolation, thus, having general and special education teacher candidates trained together throughout their preparation program would be ideal.

In fact, there are some teacher preparation programs that are amalgamating the training of both general and special educators by providing field experiences and coursework that overlaps (e.g., Banks, Andrei, & Dohy, 2019; Brownell, Ross, Colon, & McCallum, 2005; Jenkins, Pateman, & Black, 2002; Ross, Stafford, Church-Pupke, & Bondy, 2006; Van Laarhoven, Munk, Lynch, Bosma, & Rouse, 2007; Zhang, Wright, Kim, & Szilágyi, 2019). It has been noted in the research that teachers who are dual certified in Elementary and Special Education report feeling confident and prepared to teach a student in their class with and without disabilities (Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006; Montgomery & Mirenda, 2014 as cited Zagona, Kurth & MacFarland, 2017). By implementing some of the strategies mentioned above, programs that may not offer dual certification can begin to structure their coursework and programs to begin the process of collaborative mindsets.

Conclusion

In the United States, as of 2013, “95% of 6- to 21- year-old students with disabilities were taught within public schools” (Bialka, Hansen, & Wong, 2019, p.147). Improvements in the preparation of general educators is needed if outcomes for students with disabilities are to be elevated (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, 2011). This refinement must be thoughtful and intentional with connections to federal legislation such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which increasingly prioritize access to the general education curriculum for all students and include all students in measures of progress toward learning the general curriculum (Blanton, Pugach, & Florian, 2011). General educators know that while some of the teaching responsibility can and will be shared with special educators, much is expected of them on a daily basis (Ford, Pugach, & Otis-Wilborn, 2001). Therefore, providing a pre-service teacher education program that sets the stage for what is expected is vital to the next generation of educators.

Dr. Rebecca Dennis-Canges is an Associate Professor of Special Education at Metropolitan State University, Denver. She can be reached at rcanges@msudenver.edu.

Dr. Lisa Altemueller is Associate Dean for the School of Education at Metropolitan State University, Denver. She can be reached at altemuel@msudenver.edu.

Dr. Kara F. Halley is an Associate Professor of Special Education at Metropolitan State University, Denver. She can be reached at khalley@msudenver.edu.

References

- AlMahdi, O., & Bukamal, H. (2019). Pre-Service Teachers' Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education During Their Studies in Bahrain Teachers College. *SAGE Open*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019865772>
- Alur, M., & Timmons, V. (2009). *Inclusive education across cultures: Crossing boundaries, sharing ideas*. Sage: Los Angeles, CA.
- Banks, T., Andrei, E., & Dohy, J. (2019). An Inclusive Educator Licensure Pathway to Meet the Educational Needs of All Students: Dual Residence Education Action Model. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 21(1-2), 21–35.
- Bialka, C. S., Hansen, N., & Wong, S. J. (2019). Breaking the Cycle: Preparing Pre-Service Teachers for Disability-Related Discussions. *Teacher Education & Special Education*, 42(2), 147-160.
- Blanton, L. P., Pugach, M. C., & Florian, L. (2011). Preparing General Education Teachers to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities. *American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education*, <https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/resource.php?resid=227&ref=rl>
- Brownell, M., Dorene, R., Colón, E. P., & McCallum, C. (2005). Critical Features of Special Education Teacher Preparation A Comparison with General Teacher Education. *The Journal of Special Education*. 38. [10.1177/00224669050380040601](https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669050380040601).
- Brownell, M. T., Sindelar, P. T., Kiely, M. T., & Danielson, L. C. (2010). Special education quality and preparation: Exposing foundations, constructing a

- new model. *Exceptional Children*, 76(3), 357–377.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2021) One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis?, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18:3, 328–352, DOI: 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238
- CAEP (2013). Initial-Level Standards. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. February 2019. <http://caepnet.org/standards/archive-standards/2013-itp>
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Cook, B. G., Tankersley, M., Cook, L., & Landrum, T. J. (2000). Teachers Attitudes toward their Included Students with Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 67(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290006700108>
- Copeland, S. R., Keefe, E. B., Calhoun, A. J., Tanner, W., & Park, S. (2011). Preparing teachers to provide literacy instruction to all students: Faculty experiences and perceptions. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 36(3-4), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.2511/027494811800824499>
- Ford, A., Pugach, M. C., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (2001). Preparing General Educators to Work Well with Students Who Have Disabilities: What's Reasonable at the Preservice Level? *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 24(4), 275-285.
- Fuchs, W. W., Fahsl, A. J., & James, S. M. (2014). Redesigning a special education teacher preparation program: Rationale, process, and outcomes. *The New Educator*, 10, 145-152.
- Jenkins, A. A., Pateman, B., & Black, R. S. (2002). Partnerships for Dual Preparation in Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education Programs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(6), 360-372. doi:10.1177/07419325020230060601
- Lohrmann, S., & Bambara, L. M. (2006). Elementary Education Teachers' Beliefs about Essential Supports Needed to Successfully Include Students with Developmental Disabilities Who Engage in Challenging Behaviors. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31(2), 157-173. doi:10.1177/154079690603100208
- McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Wang, K., Rathbun, A., Barmer, A., Forrest Cataldi, E., & Bullock Mann, F. (2018). *The Condition of Education 2018 (NCES 2018 144)*.
- McLeskey, J. & Brownell, M. (2015). High-leverage practices and teacher preparation in special education (Document No. PR-1). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website: <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/HighLeverage-Practices-and-Teacher-Preparation-in-Special-Education.pdf>
- Metsala, J. L., & Harkins, M. J. (2020). An Examination of Preservice Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Beliefs about Inclusive Education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*,

- 43(2), 178-192.
doi:10.1177/0888406419873060
- Montgomery, A. & Miranda, P. (2014). Teachers' Self-Efficacy, Sentiments, Attitudes, and Concerns about the Inclusion of Students with Developmental Disabilities. *Exceptionality Education International*, 24(1), 18-32.
- Murawski, W. W., & Hughes, C. E. (2009). Response to intervention, collaboration, and coteaching: A logical combination for successful systemic change. *Preventing School Failure*, 53(4), 267-277.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (4th ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Pugach, M. C. & Seidl, B. L. (1995). From exclusion to inclusion in urban schools: A new case for teacher education reform. *Education and Urban Society*, 27, 379-395.
- Ronfeldt, M., Farmer, S. O., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2015). Teacher Collaboration in Instructional Teams and Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15(3), 475 - 514.
- Ross, D. D., Stafford, L., Church-Pupke, P., & Bondy, E. (2006). Practicing Collaboration: What We Learn from a Cohort That Functions Well. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 29(1), 32-43.
doi:10.1177/088840640602900105
- Scheeler, M. C., Budin, S., & Markelz, A. (2016). The Role of Teacher Preparation in Promoting Evidence-Based Practice in Schools. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 14(2), 171-187.
- Sobel, D. M., Iceman-Sands, D., & Basile, C. (2007). Merging general and special education teacher preparation programs to create an inclusive program for diverse learners, *The New Educator*, 3(3), 241-262,
doi:10.1080/15476880701484113
- Stites, M., Rakes, C., Noggle, A., & Shah, S. (2018). Preservice Teacher Perceptions of Preparedness to Teach in Inclusive Settings as an Indicator of Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 9(2), 21-39.
- Tiwari, A., Das, A., & Sharma, M. (2015). Inclusive education a "rhetoric" or "reality"? Teachers' perspectives and beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 128-156.
- Turner, N. D. (2003). Preparing preservice teachers for inclusion in secondary classrooms. *Education*, 123, 491-495.
- U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [date] from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2018144>
- Van Laarhoven, T.R., Munk, D.D., Lynch, K., Bosma, J., & Rouse, J. (2007). A Model for Preparing Special and General Education Preservice Teachers for Inclusive Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 440-455.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107306803>
- Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmer, M., Sim, A., Scott, M, & Cordier, R. (2015). Factors Associated with Primary School Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities. *PLOS ONE*, 10(8): e0137002.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137002>

- Winn, J., & Blanton, L., (2005). The call for collaboration in teacher education. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 38(2), 1–10.
- Zagona, A., Kurth, J., & MacFarland, S. (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>
- Zhang, J., Wright, A. M., Kim, E., & Szilágyi, J. (2019). A Collaborative Journey Toward Inclusive Teacher Education Programs. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 21(1-2), 37 51.