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Session Aim

Report the findings and implications of research conducted to investigate contextual variables to reform teacher preparation as reported by project personnel at IHEs that were recipients of the 325T federal funds through OSEP.
CEEDAR Center

- Funded by OSEP for five years
- Cooperative Agreement with the University of Florida
- Directed by Dr. Mary Brownell
- Began Jan 1, 2013
- Intensive technical assistance to 20 states (5 this year)
CEEDAR Center

Leadership

✧ Mary Brownell, Director
✧ Paul Sindelar and Erica McCray, Co-Directors
✧ Meg Kamman, Project Coordinator

Partners

✧ American Institutes for Research
✧ University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning
✧ Council of Chief State School Officers
✧ New Teacher Center, Goodlad Institute for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington
✧ Organizations and other advisors

Project Officers: Dr. Bonnie Jones and Dr. David Guardino
CEEDAR’s Mission

To create aligned professional learning systems that provide effective opportunities for teachers to master core and specialized instruction in inclusive settings—and for leaders to establish the conditions in schools that sustain high quality instruction—to enable students with disabilities to achieve college and career ready standards.
Research Questions

How did 325T grantees address their project goals (program coherence)?

What contextual factors both facilitated and hindered the revision and enhancement of program redesign?
We know that special education teacher preparation continues to evolve
Purpose of 325T Projects

Redesign and restructure teacher preparation programs

Implement EBPs within redesigned, inclusive teacher preparation programs

Improve learning outcomes of students with high-incidence disabilities in schools and districts not meeting federal targets for AYP
Seventy-two IHEs were awarded funding under the 325T program

Cohort 1: 22 in 2007
Cohort 2: 20 in 2008
Cohort 3: 12 in 2009
Cohort 4: 9 in 2010
Cohort 5: 9 in 2011
Instrument #1: Survey

1. For each of the following statements indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that your 325T project has been aligned with your state’s licensure or certification requirements to meet the highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements of section 602 (10 of IDEA). (Select one response for each)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced program meets state’s HQT requirements</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced program includes revised and current state standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi reflect current state standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with State Education Agency representatives occurs at least annually</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into the state policies is provided regularly before policy revision</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An active network of IHEs is within our state re: educational policies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is the size of your institution?

- Under 5,000
- 5,001 - 10,000
- 10,001 - 20,000
- 20,001 - 30,000
- Over 30,001

8. Name and describe how resources (e.g. personnel, websites, projects, other OSEF Centers etc.) guided and supported your efforts to accomplish 325T project goals and objectives.
Instrument #2: Interview

- Contextual factors impacting redesign efforts
- Collaborative processes
- Stakeholder involvement
- Resources
- Pedagogy
- Sustainability
- Recommendations
Results
Instrument #1 Survey: Demographics

62.5% Return Rate
22% HBCU

Cohort Representation
- Cohort 1
- Cohort 2
- Cohort 3
- Cohort 4
- Cohorts 5 & 6

Geographics
- Urban
- Rural
- Suburban
Survey results: State licensure or certification requirements alignment

- 75% reported having in-state IHE networks
- 73% reported having put into policy, but only 50% reported having a structure to sustain it
100% agreed that multiple courses were enhanced as a result of the 325T award, yet, 60% felt confident that it could be sustained.
Survey results: Improvement in both curriculum and course content

Significant challenge: collaboration with Arts & Sciences
Survey results: Improved student support

- Field experiences were extended (97%), but ongoing support was relatively unchanged.
- Beginning teacher meetings reported by 35%
- New teacher mentoring systems, less than 50%
Survey results: Program Evaluation

- 100% reported data collection to inform improvements
- 98% use the data to support program changes
- 70% used EBP data sources
- 56% included P-12 student data
Survey results: Sustainability

- Resources for other federal projects (95%)
- Meetings with other grantees (90%)
- Contacts with OSEP Project Officers (80%)
Survey results:
Perceived barriers to full implementation

Barriers

Personnel Change
Policy Change
Unmet Support Needs

Barriers
Interview results

12 interviews, 143 pages of transcripts, 1286 applications of 25 codes

THEMES
- Collaboration
- Program coherence
- Resources
- Hindrances to redesign
- Impact and sustainability

L: Mm. The process has been when we were still engaged in the process to a grant, the process has been to transform the thinking of the faculty and develop an outcome, which is a curriculum that is consistent with the university’s whole practices and inclusion program. So we meant that we needed to create a core group of individuals who are committed to learning together, to spend time together, and develop a program together that we all are vested in. So I think the successes were the way in which we went about that, and I actually want to say that involving you in the beginning and involving an outside speaker in the beginning can make it bigger than us and not make it a personal or any individual’s orientation or perspective, but just that the groundwork as it being an important national movement to change the teacher preparation to be more inclusive. So it’s really changing the thinking of the faculty. We down play the resources for that… then we embarked on a core group of individuals willing to meet on a regular basis. We had two or three retreats early on which were over days and really made us dig into our thinking, our beliefs, and our practices. And it created… we know that it created the success was that we started when people were very resistant to use the word “merged” teacher training program. And they were really only willing to go as far as “integrated” and what they created was a merged program. So
Implications & Recommendations

✦ Regular communication and collaboration are essential!!!
✦ A comprehensive review of the curriculum and individual courses is essential.
✦ Collaborative planning efforts must focus on EBPs and use of existing resources.
✦ Teacher educators must work closely with SEAs as teacher effectiveness is operationalized and measured.
Implications & Recommendations

✧ Professional development efforts must be ongoing, differentiated, sequenced, and sustainable.

✧ Strategic and respectful relationships with local school districts are essential to continually examine the design of field experience.

✧ A plan for sustaining efforts has to be considered from the beginning.
QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND TAKE AWAYS......

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Mary Little, mlittleucf@aol.com
Erica D. McCray, edm@coe.ufl.edu
Donna M. Sobel, donna.sobel@ucdenver.edu
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