

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES

of the

**HIGHER EDUCATION TASK FORCE
ON QUALITY INCLUSIVE SCHOOLING**

for

1996-1997

prepared by

**Gerald M. Mager
Chair of the Task Force
and**

**Joseph Bernazzani
Systems Change Project Assistant**

**Teaching & Leadership Programs
School of Education
Syracuse University**

Contents

	page
Preface	
1. Purposes of the Task Force	1
2. Membership of the Task Force and the Network	1
3. Events and Meetings in 1996-1997	7
4. Survey of the Task Force to Determine the Status of Institutional Program Development and Impact of the Task Force on Individual Members	8
Division One: Institutional Progress toward the Goal of Promoting Inclusive Teacher Preparation in New York State	8
Division Two: Impact on Individual Members of the Task Force	22
Division Two: Strengths and Limits of the Task Force	24
5. Projections for 1997-1998	26
6. Resource List	27

Preface

The Higher Education Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling was established in 1995, as an outgrowth of the New York State Partnership for Statewide Systems Change 2000. The academic year 1995-1996 was the first of an anticipated five year term during which the Task Force would undertake its work. This Report on the activities of the Task Force during the second year is expected to evaluate the activities to date. Importantly, all matters contained in this Report should be regarded as work-in-progress. The Report will summarize these endeavors for ourselves as members of the Task Force and the Network of Statewide Representatives, for the leaders of the Partnership 2000 project, and for interested associates in the profession and community.

Questions and comments regarding the Task Force and the contents of this Report may be directed to the Chair of the Task Force.

Gerald M. Mager
Chair of the Task Force
Teaching & Leadership Programs
School of Education
Syracuse University
150 Huntington Hall
Syracuse, New York 13244-2340
phone (315) 443-2685
e-mail: gmmager@sued.syr.edu

Purposes of the Task Force

The central purpose of the Task Force is stated in the proposal for the New York Partnership for Statewide Systems Change 2000:

Goal #4: Expand Inclusive Teacher Education approved programs leading to certification in both general and special education throughout New York State.

The Task Force would be charged to develop protocol models for inclusive teacher education at three different age/grade levels (early childhood, elementary, and middle/high school).

(p. 15 of the proposal)

At the first meeting of the Task Force, in 1995, the Partnership 2000 project was described, and the work of the Task Force was situated within this larger effort. Four immediate roles that the Task Force would play toward the larger purpose were outlined:

- > stimulate the thinking of the members in regard to teacher preparation for inclusive schooling; that is to educate ourselves in this matter;
- > provide and create models for teacher preparation programming;
- > provide support and critique of institutional plans as they were developing; and
- > share our efforts with the review agencies of the State Education Department to facilitate new program proposal review and approval.

Membership of the Task Force and the Network

Two levels of involvement have been sustained in the work of the Task Force. Those institutions that are actively working on developing an inclusive teacher preparation program are included in the "Task Force." Those that have not yet made that commitment, but remain interested in this work, are included in the "Statewide Network."

The Institutions and Members of the Task Force

Institutions were asked to identify at least two individuals who might serve on the Task Force. Having two or more members would serve to insure that at every meeting at least one representative would be present, fostering continuity of involvement for the institution, and allowing the Task Force to progress with its work unencumbered by irregular participation. Several institutions have yet to identify a second representative, and are being encouraged to do so.

Below are listed the institutional and individual members of the Task Force for 1996-1997.

Adelphi University

Joseph W. Hrubes, Professor
Department of Special Education

Buffalo State College

Katherine C. Sacca, Associate Professor
Exceptional Education Department

Sarah D. Weidler, Associate Chair

	Elementary Education & Reading
	David Pomerantz, Associate Professor Exceptional Education
Cazenovia College	Stephanie F. Leeds, Associate Professor Director of Child Studies
	Kathryn Barbour, Associate Professor Director, Liberal Studies Program Assistant Dean for Technology and Special Programs
	Sue Lehr, Assistant Professor Child Studies
College of St. Rose	Jim Burns, Head Special Education & Reading Department
	Rosemary Cameron, Associate Professor Elementary Education
Fordham University	Nancy Ellsworth, Associate Professor Graduate School of Education
	Joanna Uhry, Assistant Professor Graduate School of Education
Hofstra University	Ruth F. Gold, Professor Special Education Chair, Counseling, Research, Special Education & Rehabilitation
	Diane C. Schwartz, Professor Education
LeMoyne College	Janet Duncan, Assistant Professor Department of Education
	Jane Swiderski, Instructor Department of Education
Marymount College	Joan M. Black, Associate Professor Chairperson, Education Program
	Neil Garofano, Associate Professor

Medgar Evers College - CUNY

Pauline Bynoe, Instructor

Garfield Danclar, Instructor

Mount St. Mary's College

Merrily Miller, Professor
Chair, Division of Education

National Institute for Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

Gerald C. Bateman
Director, MS in Secondary Education Program

Judy Egelston-Dodd, Professor

Peter A. Lalley
Director, CBGS

Nazareth College

Deborah First

Kate DaBoll-Lavoie

Craig Hill
Director, Undergraduate Special Education

Queens College

Lee Ann Truesdell, Associate Professor
Special Education

Linda Gibson, Associate Professor
Special Education

The Sage Colleges

Linda Davern, Assistant Professor
Education Department

St. Bonaventure University

Kim S. Riggs, Assistant Professor
Special Education

Kevin Miller, Assistant Professor
Special Education

St. John's University

Barbara J. Nelson
Associate Dean

Deborah Saldana, Assistant Professor

St. Joseph's College

Sr. Miriam H. Corr, Professor
Child Study

Ann Powers
Chairperson, Child Study Department

SUNY New Paltz

Nancy Dubetz, Assistant Professor

	Department of Elementary Education
	Andrew Beigel
Utica College of Syracuse University	Laura Dorow, Assistant Professor
	Lois Fisch, Assistant Professor
Parent Representative	Deborah Moon
Practitioner Representative	Diane Albano Ravenna-Coeymans-Selkirk Central Schools
Task Force Staff	Joseph P. Bernazzani, Jr. System Change Project Assistant Syracuse University
	James W. Black System Change Project Associate Nazareth College
	Matthew Giugno Coordinator, Systems Change Project Associate, VESID Special Education Services New York State Education Department
	Charlene Gurian, Office for Special Education Services Training, Information & Dissemination Unit
	Alicja Jarzab System Change Project Assistant Syracuse University
	Gerald M. Mager Chair of the Task Force Professor, Teaching & Leadership Syracuse University
	Luanna Meyer Co-Director, Systems Change Project Professor, Teaching & Leadership Programs Syracuse University
	Melissa Price Coordinator, Systems Change Project Syracuse University

The Institutions and Members of the Statewide Network

The Statewide Network of Institutional Representatives is a collection of individuals who indicated their interest in the goals of the Task Force, and wished to be associated with its work. All Network communications are managed through the electronic mail medium, having access to which served as a criterion for membership in the Network.

Below are listed the institutional and individual members of the Statewide Network.

College of Staten Island	David Podell, Associate Professor Jed Luchow, Associate Professor
CUNY - Brooklyn College	Christine E. Pawelski, Assistant Professor Alberto Bursztyn, Assistant Professor
LIU - Brooklyn Campus	Laurie R. Lehman, Assistant Professor Ionas Sapountzis, Assistant Professor
LIU - CW Post College	Joel Mittler, Associate Professor
Marymount Manhattan College	Helene Napolitano
The Sage Colleges	Kathleen Gormley, Associate Professor Connell Frazer, Chair, Education Department Tim Feeney, Instructor
St. Lawrence University	James Shuman, Chair, Department of Education
St. Thomas Aquinas College	Anne Gross, Associate Professor Meenskohi Gajria, Associate Professor
SUNY - Fredonia	Melinda Karnes, Chair, Education Department Gregory F. Harper, Dean, Division of Educational Studies
SUNY - Oswego	Bobbi Schnorr, Associate Professor Joanne Eichinger, Associate Professor
SUNY - Potsdam	Eileen Raymond, Assistant Professor Anjali Misra, Associate Professor
New York State Education Department	Kate Gulliver, Higher Education Academic Program Review Office

Events and Meetings of 1996-1997

The Task Force met five times in 1996-1997. At each of those meetings, a full agenda of discussions, presentations, and activities was pursued.

- > On September 27th, in Albany, the Task Force held its first meeting of the year. Debra Colley, from the State Education Department was introduced to the Task Force. New members were welcomed to the Task Force: Merrily Miller from Mount St. Mary's College, and Deborah Moon representing parents, and Diane Albano representing practitioners. Further attention was paid to developing three statements: on inclusion, on teacher preparation for inclusion, and on the knowledge, values, and practices needed for inclusive teaching. Resources were shared. An opening discussion on "campus issues in planning, proposing, and implementing a teacher preparation program for inclusive schooling" was held in small groups of similar size institutions.
- > On November 15th, in Albany, the Task Force met again. Kate Gulliver, representing the Office of Program Review joined the Task Force. New drafts of the three statements developed earlier were distributed. David Pomerantz presented the program proposed by Buffalo State College. Nancy Dubetz and Andrew Beigel presented the program proposed by SUNY New Paltz. Discussion was held about the use of our statements as "standards" for review and feedback on the program presentations.
- > On January 31st, at the Lubin House in New York City, the Task Force met for the third time this year. Peter Byron of the State Education Department spoke about the need for teachers in bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language special education fields. Four guests from Surfside School, P.S. 329, formed a panel to discuss their experiences as teachers and leaders in inclusive school settings. James Burns and Rosemary Cameron presented the program proposed by the College of St. Rose. The new text, Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators (Blanton, L. P., et al. 1997. Denver: Love Publishing, was distributed.
- > On February 18th, at the Association of Teacher Educators Annual Meeting, in Washington, DC, representatives of the Task Force presented four papers reflecting the work of the Task Force. Those four papers are:
 - Mager, G. M. The New York State Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling: Commitments and Goals.
 - First, D. R., BaBoll-Lavoie, K., & Hill C. The New York State Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling: Inclusion in Concept and Practice.
 - Dorow, L., Fisch, L., Uhry, J. K., & Ellsworth, N. Knowledge, Values, and Teaching Practices Needed for Inclusive Teaching.
 - Beigel, A., Dubetz, N., & Black, J. Institutional Issues in Moving toward Teacher Preparation for Inclusion.
- > On March 7th, in Albany, the Task Force met for the fourth time. Mr. Fred Wellington, representing the Office of Teaching, spoke about changes in teacher certification as might be anticipated. Craig Hill and Deborah First presented the program proposed by Nazareth College of Rochester. Guests Ellen Nuffer and Jane Percival presented "Teacher Education in an Era of Inclusion," describing the teacher preparation program at Keene State College. Plans were discussed for the Task Force participation at the Statewide Conference in May.

- > On May 13th-14th, at the Desmond Hotel in Albany, the Task Force participated in the Statewide Conference. A session was scheduled to meet with practitioners from across the state; this session did not develop as planned. Guests Diane Ferguson from the University of Oregon, and Charles Mackey from the Office of Teaching in the State Education Department spoke with the Task Force. Plans for a survey of the Task Force institutions and members were discussed.

**Survey of the Task Force
to Determine the Status of Institutional Program Development
and Impact of the Task Force on Individual Members**

At the conclusion of the year, a survey was designed to assess the status of inclusive teacher preparation program development, and the value that participation on the Task Force might have had for individual members. Results from this survey would be helpful in describing the Task Force to those who are responsible for oversight of its work, and for the Task Force itself as it moves toward its goals of program design and implementation.

A two-division survey was developed and sent to the Task Force institutions in early summer. The first division asked for an Institutional Response; it addressed each institution's progress toward the goal of formulating an inclusive teacher preparation program if no such program currently existed. The second division requested an anonymous Individual Response; it examined the value of the Task Force as seen by those who have been active in its work.

Division One: Institutional Progress toward the Goal of Promoting Inclusive Teacher Preparation in New York State

Division One posed several questions to be addressed by each institution. Four of those questions are relevant to assessing the progress of the institutions toward establishing inclusive teacher preparation programs:

- A. *Describe in some detail the status of your efforts to design, propose, and implement an inclusive teacher preparation program at your institution.*
- B. *What is your current time line for completing this program development work?*
- C. *When would you expect to admit students to your program?*
- D. *As part of our agreement which established the Task Force a year-and-a-half ago, we asked the institutions to commit to establishing an inclusive teacher preparation program by the end of the five year span of the Task Force's work. Do you anticipate being able to meet that commitment?*

The following responses were submitted by the institutions in response to the four questions posed.

ADELPHI UNIVERSITY

- A. A specific course was designed and implemented three years ago entitled "Models of Inclusion: Promising Practices." This course is devoted entirely to the LRE/Inclusion concept. This past year an additional course in "Team Collaboration" has been included in the curriculum. Various other courses in the existing curriculum have been updated to include some references on this issue including one course geared to elementary education and one towards secondary education.

Adelphi University offers graduate level programs in special education leading to certification in:

- >Special Education for School Age Learners, inservice and preservice;
- > Special Education and Elementary Education, Dual Certification;
- > Special Education with a Bi-Lingual extension;
- > Special Education and Reading, Dual Certification;
- > Early Childhood Special Education, inservice and preservice;
- > Early Childhood Special Education and Elementary Education, Dual Certification;

In addition, upon completion of a Master's Degree students are eligible to complete a Certificate program in Educational Assessment.

- B. The above cited are presently in place and ongoing. However, the entire program in special education is under review for additional needed changes.
- C. The program is currently in place with student enrollments.
- D. We will continue to refine our programs as an ongoing effort.

BUFFALO STATE COLLEGE

No response.

CAZENOVIA COLLEGE

- A. Design: Our design phase is nearly completed. At present, we are calling our program the "Inclusive Elementary Education Program." We've designed it to meet current certification requirements for both elementary teachers and special education teachers. We have developed an arts and sciences core, a number of arts and sciences concentrations, the professional education core, and a proposed 4-year program sequence. Built into our design are working partnerships with classroom teachers and schools where inclusive education is being implemented. These partnerships have yet to be established.

Proposal: We have met with the Dean of the College and have received full support for the planned program. The College President is also supportive. We still need to move the program plan through the College's governance councils and to the Board of Trustees. We also need to finalize the proposal to the State Education Department.

Implementation: We are piloting two new courses (both components of this program) next academic year - one in the Fall term; the other in the Spring term. We will be meeting with the Dean of Admissions early in the fall to plan for recruitment and admissions. We are working with the Director of the Library and the Director of Audio-Visual Services to augment relevant holdings and other resources.

- B. During the Fall 1997 semester, we expect to complete course descriptions and syllabi for all required courses; present the proposal to the Task Force for feedback; present the plan to the College governance councils, and finalize the proposal to New York State Education Department. We hope to submit our proposal to New York State Education Department at the end of the Fall term.
- C. Possibly Fall 1998. (certainly by Fall 1999)
- D. Yes.

COLLEGE OF ST. ROSE

- A. To date, we have a six member (3 from elementary education and three from special education) faculty curriculum development committee on an inclusive teacher education program. This committee has been working on an undergraduate inclusive teacher ed. program for, four years. The proposed program is a truly integrated program of preparation, rather than the usual dual major. It will provide the student with a B.S. in Education and make the student eligible for elementary and special education certification.

This fall, the program will be presented to the appropriate college committees and the board. It is hoped that the program will be presented to the New York State Education Department by late Spring, 1998.

- B. Fall, 1997: Secure two school districts for the 9 credit field based element of the program. Present the program to the College's Undergraduate Committee. Possible presentation to the entire college faculty.

Spring, 1998: Presentation of the program to the College's board. Delivery of the proposed program to the New York State Education Department.

- C. Spring, 1998 - a select group of about 30 to be a "pilot."

- D. Yes. This time would see if all goes well with the needed approvals, the program ending its pilot phase and starting up with the acceptance of more students.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

- A. Fordham University has established an Inclusive Teacher Preparation Program in early childhood special education. Content is integrated in a number of courses, and the program yields dual certification in elementary education (with a focus on younger children) and special education.

In the special education program Fordham trainees who are not already certified in elementary or secondary education are required to complete nine credits in general education (including courses in curriculum, reading, and a 45 day student teaching in a general education setting) in addition to the special education requirements.

We look forward to proposing a dual certification program in elementary and special education. In addition, as a result of participating in The Higher Education Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling, faculty have been discussing how best to prepare all trainees. We look forward to continual revision in the teacher preparation program to better prepare teachers to meet the needs of all learners.

- B. Changes in the existing program are in the discussion phase. When general agreement is achieved, a formal proposal will be presented for approval by the University and the New York State Education Department.

- C. As soon as the program is in place.

- D. We are presently discussing our current programs to plan further revision. This process will be facilitated when New York State requires additional teacher preparation for Inclusion.

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

- A. We have an existing certificate program, "Consultation in Special Education" to prepare professional personnel to serve as special education consultant teachers. General education teachers may enroll in three of these courses:

- > Counseling and Guidance of Parents of Children with Disabilities;
- > Techniques of Collaborative Consultation in Special Education;
- > Techniques of Mainstreaming/Inclusion;

We are working with some elementary education faculty to develop coursework to prepare preservice teachers to work with children with disabilities. A module has already been developed and implemented for this purpose.

There is a Master of Science in Special Education which leads to certification in Special Education as well as Elementary or Secondary Education. Although this program has existed for many years there appears to be growing interest in this combined program.

- B. Our efforts to develop an inclusive teacher training program have been ongoing. The faculty has indicated that they need a clearer picture from the State Education Department concerning certification requirements in general/special education in order to modify current courses and programs and/or develop new programs.
- C. Students are currently taking Advanced Certificate in Consultation or individual courses as needed. The Special Education Module has been offered in some classes. Once the State guidelines have been ascertained, we plan to expand this undergraduate offering.
- D. We expect to continue to offer current coursework on inclusion and to increase the offerings when the State requirements have been explicated.

LEMOYNE COLLEGE

No response.

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

- A. At Marymount College students may choose to major in Elementary Education (pre-k-6), Special Education (k-12), or Secondary Education (7-12) in order to fulfill the requirements for New York State provisional teacher certification.
- As a result of the college's participation in the Higher Education Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling, Education Department faculty have been working together towards a new goal of integrating the content of courses required by elementary education, secondary education and special education majors in different ways so that graduates of the three certification programs will be more prepared to work with all students of diverse needs with understanding and skill. One recent endeavor to further promote a more inclusive teacher education program was to require all education majors to satisfactorily complete a course entitled EDU 376, Introduction to Students with Special Needs, which had originally been required only of Special Education majors. In addition to surveying the field of special education, examining effective strategies for supporting students with disabilities, and developing individualized education plans for pupils, participants of this course explore strategies for supporting learners in inclusive classrooms. Case studies, presentations by current teacher practitioners, cooperative learning projects involving research on inclusive practices and firsthand field based experiences in inclusive classrooms are important course components.
- To reinforce the important role that teacher collaboration plays in inclusive models, Education program

faculty team teach a series of sessions of the EDU 376 course in creative ways. The faculty member who is a language arts specialist has presented workshops involving the developmental stages of emergent literacy, reading and writing difficulties experienced by learners with auditory and visual processing needs, strategies for assessing the literacy needs of learners in authentic ways, and the use of the miscue analysis and retelling procedures to evaluate student interactions with text. To further the collaboration and the strong message to preservice teachers that "we're all in this together" regardless of our certification areas, the faculty specialist in math and technology has also presented sessions involving the developmental stages of math conceptualization, assessment procedures, and instructional strategies for learners of diverse needs.

To further connect preservice teachers on the elementary or secondary education major track with special education, a decision has been made that beginning with the Fall, 1997 semester, EDU 376 will be taken by education majors in the junior year in conjunction with the general education curriculum courses. This arrangement will allow the general education and special education courses to overlap in positive ways so that certain topics will be more comprehensively explored with regards to their application to students with special needs.

The infusion of theory, content and pedagogy involving students with special needs has become a natural ingredient within all program syllabi and most field experiences. Although a strong effort is being undertaken to encourage students to declare special education as a major, the importance and necessity of being prepared to address the needs of diverse learners within every classroom is being emphasized regardless of certification area. Collaboration between general and special education faculty further reinforce the importance of inclusive teacher education.

At the present time, the Education program is looking forward to applying for eligibility to provide a state registered dual certification program in elementary education and special education to further encourage preservice teachers to learn more about the needs of special learners in all classrooms. Although we've made a good deal of progress in terms of promoting inclusion as an essential practice, we will be undertaking a process of continued revision of the teacher education program to help prepare teachers for the challenges of meeting the needs of all learners.

- B. It is anticipated that an Inclusive Teacher Education program be designed and completed for state certification by June, 1998. At this time, we are contemplating requiring all elementary education majors to complete a program for dual certification in elementary education majors to complete a program for dual certification in elementary education and special education. In addition, we plan to guarantee that our secondary education program will be re-examined and modified for inclusive education as well as the elementary education program.

It is hoped that by September, 98 or September 99 the Inclusive Teacher Education will be in place on a formal basis with college catalogue descriptions and details.

- C. Fall 1998 or fall, 1999; we are targeting Fall, 1998 if possible.
- D. Yes. It is hoped that within the next two years (or sooner if possible), the Marymount Teacher Education Program will be revised throughout all courses of study for elementary education, special education, and secondary education majors so that it will be justly referred to as & "retitled" as the Teacher Education Program for Inclusive Teaching. We are considering the elimination of the elementary education major and replacing it with the inclusion program that will provide dual certification in elementary education and special education in creative and effective ways. Our secondary education major programs will be revised so that inclusion practices will be integrated throughout the curriculum courses as well.

MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE - CUNY

No response.

MOUNT ST. MARY COLLEGE

- A. We have developed an inclusive teacher preparation program which was unanimously approved by the Division of Education. As of May 1997, it was approved by our college committee system & the New York State Education Department. It will be effective (and gradually implemented to supplant present programs) for entering freshmen September 1997 (class of 2001).
- B. Program is developed in which each entering student enters the Inclusion Program. After two years (s)he may opt out into elementary only if necessary
- C. 1997-98. With new courses as of 1998-99.
- D. Yes. We are currently revising and developing requisite courses.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF / ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

- A. We are not planning to design, propose and implement an inclusive teacher prep program. The MSSE program will continue to prepare people to be certified teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. However, we do place student teachers in public school programs (as well as residential schools for the deaf). We also invite the chair of B.O.C.E.S.' deaf education program to talk about mainstreaming (as well as observe classes at our local schools).

Topics and research studies on inclusion/mainstreaming are covered in several of our courses. Through course discussions, research projects, classroom observations, and student teaching, our students do become familiar with inclusion in the public schools. Some of our graduates have accepted teaching positions in mainstreamed programs.
- B. Here is another alternative: it would be good for teachers and administrators from the local schools to meet with deaf faculty/staff members who experienced public school/mainstreamed/inclusive education to share our thoughts, advice on how to work with deaf/hard of hearing students.
- D. No. Our focus will remain on preparing people who wish to become certified to teach students who are deaf or hard of hearing. We will continue to place student teachers in mainstreamed environments for one of their assignments (we require two placements).

NAZARETH COLLEGE OF ROCHESTER

- A. For the 1996-1997 academic year we designed a restructuring of existing programs and implemented a major curriculum review. The actions taken are as follows:
 - 1) Combine the elementary only program and the dual certification program into a unified program. This resulted in a combined group of students and combining the faculty into a more cohesive group.
 - 2) We moved the college course work to elementary school buildings and more actively involve classroom teachers in the field experiences. Four sites were established. Students will take a 6 credit block of course work in the Fall and Spring semesters and another 6 credits in the first summer session. These three, 6

credit blocks occur in the junior year just before the students teaching semester in the Fall of their Senior year.

Students are in the sites for three hours two days a week for course work. During the course work time they participate in an elementary classroom for one hour. Each student is expected to do an additional two hours of work in their classroom outside the college course work time. Each site has the capacity to work in their classroom outside the college course work time. Each site has the capacity to work with 24 college students. These students are assigned as pairs to one of 12 teachers collaborating with the program. The two students remain with this teacher for the semester. The college students remain a cadre group and the next semester will move to another site. The goal in the selection process for different sites is to have representation from both urban and suburban school districts with the quality of the site consistent with our program goals. The first two semesters the sites are in elementary school buildings. For the third block in Summer Session I (May & June) the emphasis will shift to primarily middle schools, high schools, and special programs. Throughout the field placements the focus is on best teaching practices for all students. This is primarily done in the wide range of inclusive settings that exist in the participating sites. As the students move into the third field experience, emphasis is placed on the middle school, high school and other special education settings.

The student teaching semester involves placements in elementary education and special education. Students again have an opportunity to participate in a range of levels and/or within an inclusive or blended setting. Student teaching may involve a blended classroom where the student is assigned to both the special educator and the regular educator for the semester. It could involve an elementary placement and a special education placement at the middle school or high school levels.

- B. We have begun the program implementation. Presently there are 79 students in the four sites. As a transition year we will also be including an additional 15 students next semester who have part of the course work completed last year.

Curriculum review and reviewing procedures within the sites is the primary focus for this academic year. Lead people refining and strengthening the program will occur.

- C. Program was implemented for Fall 1997. Capacity is presently 100. Challenges involve having full-time personnel to maintain communication within and among the sites. Presently there are discussions on the table to expand capacity to 125 students.
- D. Yes. Presently implementing the changes. We see this as an opportunity to refine and strengthen our program involving an inclusive approach.

QUEENS COLLEGE - CUNY

- A. In winter of 1996, the Faculty of the graduate program in special education proposed to the Dean of Education a three course sequence to prepare teachers for inclusion (Foundation of Special Education, Inclusive Education, and Curriculum Adaptations in Inclusive Classrooms). Graduate students in elementary, secondary, reading, and special education and teachers in area schools were likely prospective teachers. This proposal has not been implemented.

Courses have been implemented in the graduate programs in special education and elementary education on Inclusion (SE) and Adaptations for Mainstreaming (Elementary) each year for the past three years.

Fall, 1996 presentation made to entire faculty of the School of Education about Inclusive Education.

Fall, 1996 United States Department of Education OSERS Personnel Preparation Award for preparing minority individuals as special education teachers for inclusion and multicultural education.

Several forces are currently affecting the progress of our goal toward inclusive teacher education at Queens College.

We do not have a Dean of Education. For the past two years we have been directed by an Acting Dean of Education. Our search for a Dean was not successful and we have not found anyone to serve as Acting Dean for the current academic year.

The fiscal crisis in CUNY has had enormous effects on the Queens College School of Education. Currently, we have 65 adjuncts teaching in the elementary education program and a similar number in the other departments. Overall, the Adjunct level in the School of Education is over 60%. Many faculty have retired or have left Queens in the last three years.

At the same time, enrollments in the School of Education are at very high levels. We are the largest School of Education in the NYC Metropolitan Area. There is extensive pressure to increase enrollments in order to increase the funding to Queens College.

- B. Currently, our efforts for School of Education program changes are on hold. We cannot go forward with any changes in this environment.
- C. I do not expect that we will have a program in place in the next three years. As soon as a new Dean is in place, Linda Gibson and I will meet with him or her to discuss inclusive teacher education, and the activities of the task force.

THE SAGE COLLEGES

The Sage Colleges is a confederation of four colleges. The undergraduate women's college (which is Russell Sage College) had a Special Education program in the past but this was discontinued several years ago in favor of an elementary education program with an inclusive philosophy. RSC students can continue on in Sage Graduate school for a fifth year resulting in an additional certificate in special education.

Sage Graduate School currently offers programs in elementary education, secondary education, special education and reading/special education. While there is a very high degree of consensus regarding inclusive practices among faculty, there has not yet been discussion of an inclusive master's program, although I think it is likely that people would be interested in seeing and reading about models at the master's level.

ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY

- A. We are currently revising the undergraduate teaching program infusing special education issues into all of the courses. The program will be field based with students and faculty on a school campus throughout the week interacting with all types of learners in a variety of settings. With the current revision focus the students will be certified in elementary or secondary education & will be able to begin to pursue special education certification during their senior year. Upon graduation they can then participate in the graduate level special education program and pursue a MS degree.

We are also introducing an early childhood program which will be inclusive in focus. Faculty from the elementary education department & special education department will teach the courses collaboratively.

We are also revising the graduate level special education program by including strands that students can pursue depending upon their career interests. Our intent is to allow them to develop specialized skills as well as having a general focus.

Beginning NCATE certification process.

- B. Preliminary revisions completed by Fall '98.
Begin implementation of undergraduate field based program Fall '98.
Begin early childhood program Fall '98.
- C. Fall 1998
- D. Perhaps. We will have established an inclusive teacher preparation program in the area of early childhood.

We are going to continue to revise the undergraduate program and are striving to establish an inclusive teacher preparation program by the end of five years. This process may not be completed by that time because of the major revisions being undertaken.

Our program revisions are going to the faculty committees by December 1, 1997 for approval. Following approval at the college level the program revisions will be sent to the State early in the Spring of 1998.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

No response.

ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE

- A. Our department, Child Study, prepares students for Pre-K-6 or for dual certification, PreK-6 and Special Education. All students are required to take certain courses and those for dual certification are required to take additional courses in special education. Included in the required courses for all students are six credits of special education.

We are aware as a department that all elementary school classes will be composed of children with various developmental capabilities. We are committed to prepare our students to meet the needs of all children. We see that we must prepare all our students for dual certification.

Our task is to integrate our courses more so that theories, methods, and skills can be adapted to meet the needs of all children. We have the basic structure in place.

At this time all students are advised to show how they would make adaptations in their lesson plans to meet the goals of various children in their fieldwork and student teaching experiences. During the past year, the full time faculty in the department had two meetings with our adjunct faculty. Many of the latter are teaching in the elementary schools. We discussed inclusion, definitions, philosophy, theory and techniques. Adjunct faculty discussed their experiences of inclusion - difficulties and successes.

All of us are in agreement that our students need experiences in inclusive settings but there are some school districts where inclusion has not yet taken place.

- B. This year 1996-1997, we are engaged in a self study in preparation for a Middle States evaluation. The team is expected in the Spring of 1998. We have also had a change of chairperson and so we have not spent as much time on inclusion as we would have liked. Our efforts to integrate general education and special education courses more will be addressed next year and further study and proposals will take place the following year.
- C. Our students are already in place and we are slowly initiating them into inclusive settings as much as possible.
- D. Yes. We have started and will continue to work toward full integration of all our courses.

SUNY - NEW PALTZ

The Inclusion Program, five-year BS/MS program leading to certification in Elementary Education and Special Education, at SUNY New Paltz began in the Fall of 1996 with the employment of a program coordinator. The first cohort of students, limited to twenty, began in the Fall of 1997. This cohort has some interesting demographic characteristics- the average age is 28 years, the average G.P.A. is 3.4, the majority of participants have worked in some capacity with children who are labeled as needing special education and the largest liberal arts major is either Psychology or Communication.

There were over 100 individuals who expressed an interest in entering the program in the Fall 1997 cohort. During the academic year 1996-97, there were over 300 calls of inquiry concerning the program, ranging from calls from the local area to calls from as far away as North Dakota. 30 Principals or superintendents called to inquire about the future availability of graduates. The Open Houses sponsored by admissions at SUNY New Paltz have produced approximately 250 more inquiries about the program. This Fall, 1997, the program coordinator has had over 100 inquiries for the upcoming Fall cohort. This is almost two times the number of inquiries from last year at the same time.

The program is a rigorous academic program. The participants are expected to complete all of the General Education requirements of the college, a complete liberal arts major, modified slightly to meet the needs of individuals who seek to be elementary educators, as set forth by the Department of Education of New York State. In addition the participants also take enough courses in education to successfully complete both an elementary sequence for certification and a sequence for certification in special education. The education sequences include three pre-student teaching field experiences, and two semester long student teaching experiences. The credit total for the ten semesters and one summer session is 150 credits.

The Inclusion Program has placed the concept of inclusionary education at the heart of the program. The goals for the program can best be summed up in the following phrase: "the goal of the inclusion program is to create thoughtful, caring professional teachers who can develop and then deliver a quality education to the broadest spectrum of learners in a traditional classroom.

UTICA COLLEGE OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

- A. Utica College currently offers programs in Teacher education at the undergraduate level which lead to certification in elementary education, secondary education, or English as a Second Language (ESL). Courses in the education program include observation and fieldwork in the public schools as well as regular course work. Student teachers complete an urban and rural placement in two of 22 school districts in the Mohawk Valley that have cooperative agreements with Utica College.

The education faculty at Utica College presented to the Associate Dean of Health and Human Services at Utica College and to the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (Mohawk Valley) a preliminary rough draft for a Master of Science in Education (32 credit) program. The program is designed to provide a Master's degree leading to permanent teacher certification. The values and strategies necessary for creating quality inclusive classrooms will be infused throughout all of the required coursework and practice requirements.

The education faculty plan to present the proposal to the Task Force in January 1998 and then to the Utica College community-at-large next spring.

- B. Program development to be completed by Spring 1998.
- C. Fall 1999
- D. Yes.

SUMMARY

The following is a concise recapitulation of the institutions' efforts to date. Six of the thirteen responding institutions currently have a program in existence that embraces an inclusive philosophy. Two of those six (Hofstra University and St. Joseph's College) offer prospective students a dual certification program in Elementary and Special Education. The remaining four (Mount Saint Mary College, Marymount College, Sage College, and SUNY- New Paltz) have existing programs that incorporate an inclusive philosophy in their teacher preparation programs. Six of the thirteen institutions (Utica College of Syracuse University, College of Saint Rose, Cazenovia College, Adelphia University, Fordham University, and Queens College) have either designed or proposed, but not yet implemented, a program that would address the issues of inclusive education. One institution, The National Institute for the Deaf/RIT, stated firmly: "We are not planning to design, propose, and implement an inclusive teacher prep program." However, at the current time, they have a MSSE program which prepares people to be certified teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Division Two: Impact on Individual Members of the Task Force

Division Two posed several questions to be addressed by each individual. One of those questions is relevant to assessing the impact of participating in the Task Force:

- A. *As you reflect on your individual participation in the work of the Task Force, comment about its value to you and your work in teacher education. Can you give an anecdote or two which illustrate your points, and might help others to understand?*

The following responses were submitted by individuals in response to the question posed.

1. It has assisted me in recognizing that inclusion is here to stay. It had convinced me to change my syllabi so that all ed. majors learn of the KSA's of disabled children.
2. As a general educator, I have found our meetings to be extremely informative. While I knew a lot about issues and needs of bilingual and ESL learners, I knew little about addressing the needs of children with special needs. I have used our meetings to educate myself and to talk informally with colleagues in special education about a number of challenges I face as an elementary general educator such as how to work with preservice students who have special needs.

In addition, the Task Force has helped keep me abreast of the important changes occurring in New York State regarding teacher certification, which has influenced my work in our general ed. elementary preservice program and our soon-to-begin inclusion preservice program.

3. Meeting other professionals and discussing programs was a valuable experience for me. I was not aware of the variety of programs in length, scope and content.
4. The task force encourages us to keep to the task of strengthening our teacher education program. We scheduled two meetings this year between our full time faculty and adjunct faculty to discuss inclusion, the experiences of inclusion in the surrounding schools and suggestions for preparing our students to meet the needs of all children.
5. Participation has been very valuable--both formal agenda and informal conversations contribute to my thinking to meet such interesting people and to learn of others' programs, efforts have been invigorating.
6. It has helped in designing a program for our college. It has also helped me refocus efforts and assignments for my classes and fieldwork.
7. It has really helped in designing a program for our college.
8. Learning about field-based experiences has encouraged me to be more creative and innovative in planning new field projects with my students as an instructor of literacy methods courses. Although our program is highly field-based, creating an inclusive teacher education program necessitates viewing learning in increased authentic ways...

Hearing about the struggles of organizing team teaching efforts, it has motivated me to plan for organized team teaching with Education program faculty in different ways...sharing teaching sessions and assignments...and encouraging all faculty to infuse approaches for inclusive teaching within all courses.

Participating in the ATE presentation revealed to me how far we've come and how much further we can and should go with inclusive teacher education.

9. I have benefited greatly from my participation in a variety of ways. Mostly it provides first-hand knowledge of what's possible--what others are doing and how problems are solved.

Recently a fellow member of the Task Force shared her syllabi for a course entitled "Collaboration" which all preservice teachers take as a required course. I am hoping that I can introduce a similar course at my institution which has been very resistant to change.

10. The interactions among the participants and the sharing of ideas, concerns, problems, etc. were most valuable. I have been feeling much frustration at my college in trying to make changes in the general education programs. It helped to know we are not alone and that some of the "excuses" transcend schools eg., "There are too many requirements already. We can't add any courses" and "We infuse the information."
11. I feel that the Task Force has provided me with two things: 1) Information related to inclusive teacher education programs and 2) Contact with others involved in such programs. These items have been very valuable in designing our inclusive teacher ed. program here at our college.
12. The Task Force has helped us to learn how others in the field are approaching this issue, and it has helped us to clarify the similarities and differences in our thinking.

Division Two: Views of the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Task Force

Division Two posed several questions to be addressed by each individual. Two of those questions sought their assessment of the Task Force itself:

- A. *What do you see as the strengths of the Task Force in promoting the goal of inclusive teacher preparation in New York State?*
- B. *What do you see as the weaknesses or limits of the Task Force in Promoting the goal of inclusive teacher preparation in New York State?*

The following responses were submitted by individuals in response to the two questions posed.

- 1. A. Requirement that each program change its' present curriculum and strategies for student.
- B. There doesn't seem to be enough distinction between "good" teaching and "special ed."
- 2. A. By presenting a variety of models of teacher education programs, the Task Force as helped me plan for changes in our current elementary program and our future Inclusion program. The networking with colleges around the state has been fabulous. I've come to know a number of them well, and feel I can ask for advice if needed. Support networks will be critical to the implementation quality of inclusive teacher ed. programs around the state.
- B. We probably don't meet enough to really have a significant impact. Working on the ATE papers with colleagues from other universities proved to be a more substantial experience for me because I had more contact with these individuals than is structured into the current Task Force meetings.
- 3. A. Strength: We have a common goal. We are fortunate with our leadership, focus and knowledge.
- B. Administration and colleagues need to listen and to comment on our change. This does not happen regularly because of fall teaching schedules and other varied duties.
- 4. A. The discussions among the participating colleges encourage new ideas and new insights to strengthen our programs. Each situation is different but an idea presented by one place can be taken and modified to meet the needs of another college.
- B. Each place is different. What may work in one area may not work in another. Geographical areas are very diverse. Perhaps those institutions from same area could share more to be more effective in a particular area.
- 5. A. Collegiality, information, support, war stories, development of shared beliefs/ experiences.
- B. No response.
- 6. A. Collaboration and input from a variety of knowledgeable sources. Support and immediate feedback from SED. Availability of information from SED.
- B. Not enough time to accomplish everything. We're spending too much time reviewing programs and not enough time on what should be cutting--edge development including work on a new certification, Inclusive Teaching, to replace or complement the current dual certification model.

7. A. Sharing ideas, hearing about other programs, making contacts, great bringing in leaders from other states.
- B. Need to spend as much time as possible talking about the basics of inclusion and how to change teacher education. Not enough time. Need to spend more time on really thinking about educational change.
8. A. The networking with faculty of the different colleges has been invaluable and has afforded me the opportunity to:
- learn about different models;
 - learn about how faculty are dealing with similar issues;
 - feel that I'm not in this alone...there is so much interest and support to promote inclusive teacher education;
 - be updated and current on State Education mandates/issues... I really appreciate the State Education connection;
 - feel supported by State Education to create the Inclusive Teacher Education Program;
 - meet high quality and talented teacher educators such as Jerry Mager.
- B. I think we need more opportunities to meet with school district personnel and administrators to promote the school college collaboration in creating more inclusive classrooms for children as well as training models for preservice teachers. Time often runs out when we meet from 10:00 - 3:00...I think planning one or two meetings will result in more productive meetings...even though the short meetings have been valuable and important.
9. A. One of the major strengths of the Task Force is the leadership and vision of the chair. This commitment to inclusive schooling and all that it means is inspirational. I appreciate his humanistic approach.
- B. Until we can make strong recommendations for accreditation and certification policy I've been fighting the constraints of program requirements that are difficult to change. At my institution preservice el. ed. teachers do not have a single elective and it is impossible to change existing programs. Once the State requires more inclusive teacher preparation I am certain necessary changes will quickly be put in place.
10. A. I had hoped that we could get the SED to require either specific courses or even dual certification of all teachers. Unfortunately this was not to be - yet!
- B. I had hoped that we could get the SED to require either specific courses or even dual certification of all teachers. Unfortunately this was not to be -- yet! Without support from the State in the form of regs or certification requirements, I see little change in the future. One ray of hope is the want-ad section of our local paper(s). Many programs are looking for elem. and middle school teachers who have dual certification. I haven't seen similar requirements for high school teachers.
11. A. The major strength has been to start and continue, a dialog among NYS education personnel in regards to what inclusive education is and how we need to prepare all teachers.
- B. I had hoped that we could get the SED to require either specific courses or even dual certification of all teachers. Unfortunately this was not to be -- yet! Without support from the State in the form of regs or certification requirements, I see little change in the future. One ray of hope is the want-ad section of our local paper(s). Many programs are looking for elem. and middle school teachers who have dual certification. I haven't seen similar requirements for high school teachers.
If I had to use the term "weakness" I guess I would say that we met on a rather limited schedule. Perhaps our two day sessions will give the group more contact time.
12. A. It helps us gain support within the university for other efforts and it provides an active forum for

discussions.

B. I think it's doing a good job.

Projections for 1997-1998

The second year served to move the work of the Task Force ahead substantively and in spirit. The program presentations, the introduction of new resources, the panel discussions, and the review of our own stances on inclusion and inclusive teacher preparation provided stimulus and challenge.

At the final meeting of the year, those present projected a number of activities that they would like to undertake in the coming year, including but not limited to:

- > inviting and engaging with guest speakers who represent different programs already developed and implemented;
- > adding to and refining the list of resources;
- > inviting representatives from elementary and secondary schools to share experiences with inclusive teaching and schooling, and to provide comment on our plans;
- > developing a clearer set of statements on inclusion and the qualities of teacher preparation programs for inclusive teaching;
- > supporting, reviewing, and providing feedback to one or more drafts of programs developed by institutions represented on the Task Force;
- > engaging the Statewide Network in the substantive issues of inclusion and program design;
- > promoting the formation of partnerships with local educators, as a means of identifying high quality field placements for inclusive teacher preparation;
- > re-considering the membership of the Task Force; inviting new members and disengaging those who are inactive or no longer wish to participate;
- > conducting campus site visits to serve the purposes of Task Force members; and
- > conducting a higher education leadership institute to share the work of the Task Force more broadly in New York State.

Resource List

We have developed a resource list on which to build and through which we might continue to educate ourselves. Below are listed most of the items we have accumulated over the two years of meetings. The list generally follows APA Style, but undoubtedly contains some errors, and in some places does not provide complete

references.

Adelphi University. M.S. Programs in Special Education.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J. J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. Remedial and Special Education, 10(2), 17-22.

Berrers, M., & Knoblock, P. (Eds.). (1987). Program models for mainstreaming: Integrating students with moderate to severe disabilities. Rockville: Aspen.

Bondy, Ross, Sindelar, & Griffin. (1995). Elementary and Special Education Learning to Work Together. Team Building Processes, Teacher Education and Special Education. Vol. 18. University of Florida.

Bowman, J. T. (1987, January-March). Attitudes toward disabled persons: Social distance and work competence. The Journal of Rehabilitation, 41-44.

Brady, M., & Gunter, P. (Eds.). (1985). Integrating moderately and severely handicapped learners. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Brown, F., & Lehr, D. (1989). Persons with profound disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Capper, C. (1990). Students with low incidence disabilities in disadvantaged, rural settings. Exceptional Children, 56, 338-345.

Case, A. D. (1992). The special education rescue: A case for system thinking. Educational Leadership, 10, 32-34.

Cates, D., & Kinnison, L. (1993). Preparing teachers of children with multiple disabilities for the 21st century: An international perspective. International Journal of Special Education, 8(1), 55-59.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1995). What every special educator must know. The international standards for the preparation and certification of special education teachers. Reston, Virginia. (Phone (703) 620-3660).

Danilar, G. Education Dept, Medgar Evers College. Syllabus for EDUC 266 Transition Services and Supported Employment for Individuals with Developmental Disabilities/Mental Retardation.

Ellis, E. S. General and Special Education Master Teacher Perceptions of Elementary School Inclusion Teacher Competencies. University of Alabama, Box 870231, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487.

Ellis, E. S. University of Alabama. Program description. The Multiple Ability Paradigm: A whole theme approach to teacher education. Box 870231, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487.

Ellis, Rountree, & Casaren. (1995, June). The Multiple Abilities Program (MAP): Integrated general and special education teacher preparation. Alabama Curriculum for Exceptional Children, Vol. 12.

Falvy, M. A. (Ed.). (1995) Inclusive and heterogeneous schooling: Assessment, curriculum and instruction. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, Publishing Co.

Froelinger, V. J. (Ed.). (1981). Today's hearing impaired child: Into the mainstream of education.

Washington: Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.

Fullwood, D. (1990). Chances and choices: Making integration work. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Giangreco, M. F., Clowenger, C. J. G., & Iverson, V. S. Choosing options and accommodations for children: A guide to planning inclusive education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Gold, R. Hofstra University. Syllabus for SPED 264 Techniques of Mainstreaming Inclusion.

Hardiman, M. L., Drew, C. J., & Winston-Egan, M. (1996). Human Exceptionality. 5th ed. Allyn & Bacon.

Journal for a Just and Caring Education. Corwin Press, Inc. Sage Publications. Phone (805) 499-9774.

Koegel, L. K., Koegel, R. L., & Dunlap, G. (1996). Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kubic, S. (1993, September). From rhetoric to action: Inclusion in the state of Utah. The Utah Special Educator, 1-5.

Kuzmeshus, J. (Ed.). (1996). We teach them all: Teachers writing about diversity. Portchester, NY: National Professional Resources Issue.

Lilly, M. (1985). The next 30 years in special education. In M. Brady & P. Gunter (Eds.). Integrating moderately and severely handicapped learners. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1989). Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Malakpa, S. (1993). Removing barriers and building bridges between persons with, and those without disabilities. International Journal of Special Education, 8(1), 60-68.

Meyer, E., Vergason, G. A., & Whelan, R. R. (Eds.) (1996). Strategies for teaching exceptional children: Exceptional children in inclusive settings. Denver: Love Publishing Co.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). Winner's all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA: The National Association of State Boards of Education.

O'Brian, J., Forest, M., Snow, J., Pearpoint, J., & Hasbury, D. (1989). Action for inclusion: How to improve schools by welcoming children with special needs into regular classrooms. Toronto: Inclusion Press.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1995, December). Special Issue on Inclusion. 77(4).

Rainforth, B., York, J., & Macdonald, C. (1992). Collaborative teams for students with severe disabilities: Integrating therapy educational services. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Roach V., Ascroft, J., Stamp, & A. Kysilko, D. (Eds.). (1995). Winning ways: Creating inclusive schools, classrooms and communities. Alexandria, VA: NASBE.

Sailor, W., Anderson, J. L., Halvorsen, A.T., Dopering K., Filler, J., & Goetz L. (1989). Comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Siegel, L. M. (1994). Least restrictive environment: The paradox of inclusion. Pennsylvania: LRP Press.

Special Education/Certification Working Group of The Northeast Common Market Project.

The Special Educator and Inclusive Education. LRP Publications (Newsletter).

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1992). Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1985). Examining and fostering integrated school experiences. In M. Brady & P. Gunter (Eds.). Integrating moderately and severely handicapped learners. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. 2nd Ed. Divergent approaches: Controversial issues confronting special education. Allyn & Bacon.

Villa, R. A. & Thousand, J. S. (Eds.). (1995). Creating an inclusive school. ASCD.

Wheelock, A. For the Massachusetts Advocacy Center. Crossing the tracks.

York, J. University of Minnesota. Syllabus for Collaboration for Inclusion.

York, J., Vandercook, T., & Macdonald, C. (1989). Regular class integration: Feedback from teachers and classmates. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.