CHAPTER THIRTEEN

TEACHER EDUCATION

Many of the topics in this review have implications for the design and delivery of teacher education programmes so as to take account of the challenges of educating SWSEN. In this chapter, after outlining some of the main issues in teacher education, a series of country descriptions will be provided.

13.1 Issues in Teacher Education

Those responsible for the design and implementation of training programmes for professionals involved in the education of SWSEN have to give consideration to a range of factors, chief of which are the following:

• *The nature of initial teacher education (ITE) for general education teachers and special education teachers.* Issues here include: (a) should there be categorical or a non-categorical programmes for teachers of SWSEN? (b) what relationship should there be between ITE programmes for special education teachers and general education teachers? (c) should special education teachers be trained as general education teachers before being trained as special education teachers? (d) what should be the content of such training courses? (e) who should set expectations for such training?

• *Specialist qualifications for professionals working in an advisory or consultancy capacity.* Here consideration has to be given to such issues as (a) what roles are the various professionals expected to perform? (b) what prerequisite professional experience should they have before receiving their training? (c) at what level should such training be pitched? (d) what should be the content of such training courses?

• *The training of paraprofessionals.* Issues here include: (a) what roles are these people expected to perform? (b) what prerequisite qualifications and/or experience should they have? (c) at what level should their training be pitched? (d) who should deliver their training?

• *Professional development for professionals working with SWNEN.* Issues include: (a) should there be a prescribed set of professional development expectations for the various professional groups? (b) who should be responsible for setting such
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26 Training programmes for SENCOs (in England) and educational psychologists are covered in Chapter Thirteen.
expectations? (c) who should design and deliver such professional development, in what locations?

In the remainder of this chapter, many, but not all, of the above issues will be traversed. Space and time limitations, as well as gaps in available information, preclude a systematic comparison of various countries’ approaches to the issues.

13.2 Country Descriptions
This section summarises some of the main features of teacher education programmes in nine countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Greece, Scotland, Sweden, England, and the United States. The latter two will be dealt with in more detail.

Australia. According to Forlin (2006), in her review of inclusive education in Australia, and citing Loreman et al. (2005), teachers have concerns about their perceived inability to cater for the needs of SWSEN when placed in regular classes. In particular, they feel they lack skills in modifying or differentiating the curriculum, providing suitable instruction, or using suitable assessment strategies. According to these authors, many of the four-year ITE courses in Australia included compulsory courses on inclusive education, but most of the post-graduate one- or two-year end-on courses did not. Of the total of 73 ITE courses reviewed, 45.5% included a compulsory element of study on an aspect of special or inclusive education, with a further 12% offering elective units.

Forlin pointed out the difficulties in obtaining consistency in ITE across Australia, with over 400 programmes in 36 universities. While some jurisdictions require registration of teachers (e.g., Queensland and NSW), others do not. In the former case, registration bodies have greater control over the content of training courses, being able to require specific units of study related to diversity. Other states rely on teacher education institutions to make their own decisions about the content of courses.

In the following, brief summaries of two states’ provisions will suffice. The source for this material is http://inca.org.uk/australia-initial-special.html#7.527

In Queensland, qualification as a special education teacher usually requires the completion of a pre-service teacher preparation programme, such as a Bachelor of
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27 This source is INCA, the International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks: Internet Archives, a website funded by the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency in England and managed and updated by the International Information Unit at NFER. It is the primary source of several of the countries’ provisions summarised in this chapter.
Education specialising in special educational needs, or a pre-service programme, followed by completion of a postgraduate qualification in learning support, special needs or inclusive education. All ITE programmes in Queensland address issues of inclusivity and diversity of student need. There is only one initial teacher training programme focused exclusively on special educational needs, based at Griffith University. There are, however, a number of ITE programmes that provide a specialisation/major in special needs/inclusive education. In addition, there are a number of postgraduate programmes for established teachers. The Queensland Board of Teacher Registration Professional Standards for pre-service teachers include requirements that graduates will exhibit such as skills (a) creating supportive and intellectually challenging learning environments to engage all learners, (b) drawing upon pedagogical, curriculum and assessment knowledge and skills to engage all learners, and (c) using knowledge about learners, and (d) learning to create meaningful learning opportunities that lead to desired learning outcomes for individuals and groups.

In Victoria, to become a special education teacher it is usually necessary to complete a postgraduate diploma or degree in special education, after completing an initial degree in teaching. The Victorian Department of Education and Training also requires special education graduates to have completed the equivalent of at least 45 days of appropriate practical experience, including a minimum of 30 days of supervised special education school experience and professional practice in a variety of settings. In addition, the Department runs teacher professional development programmes, which are specially designed for practising teachers. The duration of one such professional development course is seven hours per day over three days. The course provides participants with the skills and knowledge to enable them to write and implement an IEP for students with special needs. Topics covered include: (a) eligibility criteria for the Victorian Disabilities and Impairments Programme’s aims and responsibilities, (b) the impact of specific disabilities and impairments on learning, (c) writing long, intermediate and short term goals, (d) prioritising what needs to be taught, (e) assessment and evaluation of student progress, (f) teaching and learning strategies, and (g) developing behaviour management plans.

Belgium. Preparation in ITE in Belgium includes general information and basic knowledge about SWSEN, with some practical training in the final year. Training is
very practical and includes knowledge about teaching techniques, curricular adaptations, knowledge about particular disabilities (sensory impairments, intellectual disabilities, etc.) and specific techniques such as sign language (Riddell et al., 2006).

Canada. Since education comes under the jurisdiction of Provincial governments, a description of two provincial arrangements for teacher education relating to special education will be sufficient to give some idea about Canadian arrangements. The source for this material is http://inca.org.uk/canada-initial-special.html.

In British Columbia, to teach in the public school system or in a government agency, two qualifications are usually required. These are an undergraduate degree in education or in one of the social sciences, with a specialisation in working with people who are disabled, and a teaching certificate. ITE focused on special education is provided through a number of post-secondary institutions, such as the University of Victoria, which offers a Bachelor’s degree in education with a focus on special education, and UBC, which provides courses in special education within a undergraduate degree in education. The Ministry of Education works with professional organisations to set standards for specialists working in the education system, such as speech language therapists, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, sign language interpreters and orientation and mobility instructors.

In addition, the Special Education Branch of the Ministry of Education has responsibilities to foster the professional development of teachers, administrators, and support staff related to meeting the educational needs of such students. School districts are expected to provide in-service training to ensure that all staff can develop the skills and understanding needed to work in an inclusive environment and that staff remain current in their knowledge and understanding of special education. The Ministry of Education supports school districts with in-service training through the provision of funds specifically for staff development. Teachers and other professionals are also expected to maintain and develop their knowledge.

In Alberta, special needs teachers generally have a Bachelor of Education degree with a specialisation related to special education. In addition, institutions such as the University of Alberta in Edmonton offer a one-year Diploma in Inclusive Education programme for teachers interested in the area of special educational needs. This
programme contains such core subjects as: assessment and instruction of exceptional learners, behavioural management of severely disruptive children, consultation and collaboration in special education, and advanced assessment and instruction of exceptional learners.

**Finland.** According to Hausstatter & Takala (2008), universities offer a one-year special teacher training programme after a master’s degree (usually a Masters in Education) The core of the special education qualification includes consideration of (a) difficulties in learning to read, write and do mathematics, (b) socio-emotional and behavioural challenges, (c) communication challenges, (d) professional cooperation in the design of IEPs, and (e) cooperation with parents. However, inclusion is not prominently represented, but is embedded in many courses.

**Greece.** According to Riddell et al. (2006), in Greece, there are no central standards or regulations for ITE, each university determining its own programme. However, ITE usually includes some input on SWSEN or learning difficulties and visits to special schools. Five years of teaching experience is needed before teachers can apply to do specialist training in SWSEN. This is a thorough two-year programme and is aimed at primary teachers. Secondary teachers can do a forty-hour course that provides them with general information about SWSEN; some secondary teachers also have a postgraduate degree in SWSEN. The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2001) indicated that there is a shortage of properly trained special needs teachers affecting the support available to mainstream teachers working in inclusive classrooms. Ordinary teachers, it was reported, have great difficulty in implementing the IEP, with the problem being particularly acute in rural areas.

**Scotland.** As with several of the countries reviewed, the primary source of information here is INCA (http://inca.org.uk/scotland-initial-special.html) In Scotland it is not possible to train specifically as a special needs teacher during ITE. Specialisation in this area is gained through continuing professional development courses. However, some ITE programmes do offer courses in SWSEN. All teachers working with children with SWSEN must be qualified initially to teach in mainstream primary or secondary schools and registered with the General Teaching Council Scotland as primary or secondary teachers. Further specialist qualifications can be gained following completion of the probationary period, although teachers can be employed in teaching children with
special educational needs without these additional qualifications. However, teachers of deaf or partially deaf children in special schools or special classes are required by the Schools (Scotland) Code 195613 to be qualified teachers and to hold a special qualification to teach deaf children. Broadly similar requirements apply to teachers in special schools or special classes working with others, such as children who are blind or are mentally or physically handicapped. There is no mandatory requirement for an appropriate specialist teaching qualification where children are taught in a mainstream setting.

In-service professional development is offered in a variety of ways; nationally through Scottish Executive Education Department seminars, or courses offered by teacher training institutions, education authorities, and locally in consortia of schools or individual educational establishments. (All teachers in Scotland are required to undertake 35 hours of professional development per year, according to the General Teaching Council for Scotland.) Postgraduate courses in SWSEN are available at many faculties of education in Scottish universities. These range from a general Master's degree in Special Educational Needs to more specific specialist courses, such as a Master's degree in speech therapy.

**Sweden.** According to Riddell et al. (2006), in Sweden the education of SWSEN is a priority area that permeates aspects of ITE programmes. The 2001 reforms of initial teacher training strengthened the position of special education needs within mainstream training. All students receive the equivalent of half a term training in special educational needs and should also be offered the opportunity to study special educational needs as an area of specialisation. However, government policies requiring extensive knowledge of the education of SWSEN have been ‘difficult to implement because of an overly full curriculum’ (Emanuelsson et al., 2005, p.127). In addition, students can take further specialised options in SWSEN. In-service training is compulsory for teachers and courses available in SWSEN offer support on working with pupils with particular needs and on classroom strategies for inclusion. Sweden also has also training programmes for *begeleiders* (special needs coordinators).

**Norway.** In a recent article, Hausstatter & Takala (2008) compared special teacher education in Finland and Norway. They noted that in Norway some 21 university colleges and universities offered some kind of special needs teacher training, with 13 of them offering a masters-level qualification in this area. The major training in special
education is at the master’s level, but these do not have a common core of content, although perspectives on inclusion are often present.

United Kingdom (England and Wales).\textsuperscript{28} As mentioned earlier, developments here will be explored in some detail, given their particular relevance to New Zealand. Special educational needs teachers are specifically employed to work with SWSEN. For example, they may work with students who are physically disabled, sensory impaired (i.e., deaf/blind), have speech and language difficulties such as dyslexia, have a mental disability such as autism, are emotionally vulnerable, have behavioural difficulties, or have a combination of these disabilities. They may also work with gifted and talented individuals.

A key aspect of their work is to identify individual needs and be responsible for creating a safe, stimulating and supportive learning environment that enables students to succeed in their learning, and it may involve the following work activities:

- teaching either individuals or small groups of pupils within or outside the class;
- preparing lessons and resources;
- marking and assessing work;
- developing and adapting conventional teaching methods to meet the individual needs of pupils;
- using special equipment and facilities, such as audio-visual materials and computers, to stimulate interest in learning;
- using specialist skills, such as teaching Braille to pupils with visual impairments or sign language and lip reading to students who have hearing impairments;
- collaborating with the classroom teacher to define appropriate activities for the pupils in relation to the curriculum;
- assessing children who have long or short-term learning difficulties and working with colleagues to identify individual pupils' special needs;
- liaising with other professionals, such as social workers, speech and language therapists, physiotherapists and educational psychologists;
- liaising closely with parents and guardians;
- organising learning outside the classroom in activities such as community visits, school outings or sporting events;
- assisting in severely disabled pupils' personal care/medical needs;
- administration, including updating and maintaining records on pupils' progress;
- attending statutory annual reviews, or other related meetings such as Looked After Child (LAC) reviews, regarding students with an SEN, which may involve reviewing statements of special educational needs;
- receiving in-service training;
- behaviour management.

\textsuperscript{28} Sources include:
http://ww2.prospects.ac.uk/p/types_of_job/special_education_needs_teacher_job_description.jsp
http://www.tda.gov.uk
To become a special educational needs teacher in England and Wales, Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) is required. There is a one-year statutory induction for all newly qualified teachers, which includes those who start teaching in special educational needs as their first position after qualifying.

From 2002, those awarded QTS must demonstrate that they can: (a) understand their responsibilities under the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice, and know how to seek advice from specialists on less common types of special educational needs, (b) differentiate their teaching to meet the needs of pupils, including those with special educational needs, and (c) identify and support pupils who experience behavioural, emotional and social difficulties. Standards for the Induction Support Programme require that those awarded qualified teacher status must: (a) understand the duties and responsibilities schools have under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 to prevent discrimination against disabled pupils, (b) spend time with the school’s Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)\(^29\) to focus on specific and general special educational needs matters, and (c) demonstrate that they plan effectively to meet the needs of pupils in their classes with special educational needs, with or without statements.

There are additional mandatory requirements for special educational needs teachers who specialise in teaching pupils with visual, hearing or multi-sensory impairment. These qualifications are available only from specific approved institutions and can be completed full time or part time. Courses are also available for qualified teachers to teach pupils with other special educational needs. Some of these focus generally on special educational needs, while other courses are more specific, focusing on a particular learning difficulty, such as dyslexia or autism. These courses are generally part-time, lasting several months.

Further postgraduate professional development is possible. Options include certificates as well as a Diploma or Masters in Special Educational Needs. Course content and titles vary according to the type of special education or disability being covered. Courses are usually offered part-time but some full-time courses are also possible. In-service training is also available. Many local authorities provide special needs courses for teachers working in the field. There is a special educational needs element to all ITE courses.

\(^{29}\) See Chapter Fourteen for further information about SENCOs.
As well as the development of a SENCO award (see Chapter Fourteen), the Department of Children Schools and Families has taken steps such as the following to develop workforce knowledge, skills and understanding of SWSEN (Rose, 2009):

**Working with the Training and Development Agency for Schools:**
- Encouraging initial teacher training providers to build on their coverage of SWSEN by offering specialist units for primary undergraduate ITE, launched in June 2008 to aid dissemination. These include a Unit entitled ‘Learning and teaching for dyslexic pupils’. Similar units for secondary undergraduate courses and for postgraduate teacher training courses were rolled out in September 2009.
- Developing materials enabling subject/curriculum tutors to check their knowledge of SWSEN and disability in relation to their subject area.
- Promotion of enhanced opportunities for student teachers to gain experience of working in special schools or other specialist provision.
- Promoting the use of specialist materials for the induction of new teachers’.

**Working through the National Strategies:**
- Investing further in the Inclusion Development Programme, which started in 2008, to raise the knowledge, awareness and confidence of teachers and other school staff in working with children with SWSEN. Materials issued so far have focused on training on children’s communication difficulties (including dyslexia), autism, with materials focused on students with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties to be issued in 2010.

**Other initiatives:**
- Developing Trusts to promote best practice in relation to dyslexia, communication needs and autism, in partnership with voluntary sector organisations.
- Encouraging special schools to provide outreach services to mainstream schools.

Finally, in this outline of developments of teacher education in England and Wales, the conclusions of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004) publication, *Removing barriers to achievement*, is worth describing in some detail. After noting that since every teacher should expect to teach SWSEN, they must be equipped with the skills to do so effectively. This will require action at three levels:

- Core skills for ALL teachers in ALL schools
- Specialist skills in SOME local schools
- Advanced skills for SOME teachers in ALL schools

**Level I. Improving core skills – for all teachers.** ITE should provide a good grounding in the core skills needed for teaching in today’s diverse classrooms, including: (a) planning and teaching for inclusion and access to the curriculum, (b) behaviour management and awareness of the emotional and mental health needs of pupils, (c) assessment for learning, and (d) an understanding of where professional advice may be needed. The DfES undertook to work with (what became) the Training
and Development Agency for Schools to explore the scope for introducing practical guidance on how inclusive practice might be embedded across the ITE curriculum. It also recommended that newly qualified teachers continue to develop the skills of inclusive teaching during their induction year.

**Level II. Developing advanced skills – in all schools.** In order to support their colleagues in delivering improvements for children with SWSEN in the classroom, the Department wanted to develop staff with advanced skills in special educational needs (i.e., SENCOs), describing them as key members of the senior leadership team, able to influence the development of policies for whole school improvement. As well local authorities were encouraged to create a new cadre of staff with particular expertise in special educational needs and dealing with students’ emotional, mental and behavioural difficulties.

**Level III. Developing specialist skills – within each community of schools.** In order to support the inclusion of children with increasingly complex difficulties, the Department wanted to build up the specialist expertise within each community of schools. It proposed doing this by working with higher education institutions to support the development of specialist qualifications for those wishing to specialise in special education needs in the mainstream or special sectors. It was envisaged that these qualifications would cover both the theory and practice of working with children with particular needs, such as behavioural, emotional and social difficulties or severe learning difficulties.

As well, the Department noted that it had developed induction-training materials on special educational needs for teaching assistants working in both primary and secondary schools.

*United States.* According to INCA ([http://inca.org.uk/usa-initial-special.html](http://inca.org.uk/usa-initial-special.html)) and Ackerman et al. (2002), around 700 colleges and universities in the US have ITE programmes to prepare students to become special education needs teachers. Most states require special education teachers to complete a Bachelor's Degree programme, although some will require a Master's Degree for special education licensure. Other states require licensure in general education first, then additional coursework in special education. All are designed to ensure that students meet the requirements of state licensing regulations. Colleges and universities are not only accredited by their state,
but those providing the teacher training programmes at these institutions may also choose to seek accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In addition, during general ITE, trainee teachers normally have the option of undertaking specific optional courses relating to special education.

Training institutions accredited by NCATE have to meet rigorous standards established by those working in the field. The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the professional organisation representing those who work with children with disabilities, has developed guidelines for special education teacher training programmes that are used by the NCATE. These require students in special education teacher training programmes to study the following areas:

- Philosophical, historical and legal foundation of special education
- Characteristics of learners
- Assessment, diagnosis and evaluation
- Instructional content and practice
- Planning and managing the teaching and learning environment
- Managing student behaviour and social interaction skills
- Communication and collaborative partnerships
- Professionalism and ethical practice
- Experience with children, including a student teaching placement lasting between eight to 10 weeks.

As INCA (2010) points out, there is a great deal of variation in individual states' requirements and standards for the licensing of special needs teachers. Some require teachers of SWSEN to have a categorical licence, while some expect them to hold a non-categorical/generic licence. The holder of a latter can teach a student with any disability, while a categorical licence enables a teacher to teach children with a particular disability, such as hearing impairments or physical disabilities. Most states use a blend of both types of licence. To take one example, the state of Kentucky, requires a categorical licence. Teachers of students with special educational needs usually have an ‘Exceptional Children Licence’, which allows them to teach or
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collaborate with teachers to design and deliver programmes for children from primary to Grade 12. Their training usually includes one or more of the following specialisations: (a) learning and behaviour disorders, (b) moderate and severe disabilities, (c) hearing impaired, (d) hearing impaired with sign proficiency, (e) visually impaired, or (d) communication disorders.

Ackerman et al. (2002) noted that there is debate over categorical or non-categorical licensure, with proponents of the former arguing that each disability category is substantially different from others and that teachers should be highly specialised in that area, while proponents of the latter arguing that teachers should be prepared to teach all children and should have the expertise to address differing abilities and disabilities.

Ackerman et al. pointed to two other controversial issues in US approaches to teacher education in special education. Firstly, given the critical teacher shortage in special education, alternative licensure programmes have evolved in recent years. Thus, for example, army personnel are being trained for a second career in teaching and drastically intensified and accelerated summer programmes are replacing four-year licensure programmes. Also, some districts have been filling special education positions with teachers who have either no prior education experience or have only general education experience and providing provisional or conditional licensure to these newly hired teachers. (For a review of best practices in these ‘alternative route’ special education teacher preparation programmes, see Wasburn-Moses & Rosenberg, 2008). Secondly, there have been moves in higher education to merge special education teacher education programmes into the general education programmes, doing away with special education altogether. As argued by Arthaud et al. (2007), the move towards inclusive education requires greater collaboration among general education and special education teachers, and this should be reflected in teacher preparation programmes The arguments for and against this teacher education structure are similar to those for categorical versus non-categorical licensure.

Finally, in this section on US teacher education, attention should be drawn to the recommendations of the influential President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002). In a hard-hitting criticism of existing teacher education programmes in the US, the Commission argued that ‘curricula and methodologies utilised in colleges
of education are not empirically connected to improved student achievement’ (p.53). As a consequence, ‘the current system of pre-service and in-service education is not sufficient to produce personnel who can ensure students with disabilities achieve satisfactory outcomes’ (ibid.). To correct this situation, the Commission urged colleges of education to ‘move from folk wisdom, weak research and opinion on what are important characteristics of effective teachers and begin to focus on helping to strengthen the teacher competencies that have clear data for producing student gains’ (ibid.). Further, ‘both pre-service and professional development training must ensure that instruction in pedagogy is research-based and linked directly to student learning and achievement’ (ibid.).

On the basis of these and other arguments, the Commission advanced a range of recommendations, including the following:

‘Recruit and train highly qualified general and special education teachers. States and districts must devise new strategies to recruit more personnel who are highly qualified to educate students with disabilities. State licenses and endorsements for all teachers should require specific training related to meeting the needs of students with disabilities and integrating parents into special education services. States must develop collaborative, career-long professional development systems that conform to professional standards.

Create research and data-driven systems for training teachers of special education. Formal teacher training should also be based upon solid research about how students learn and what teacher characteristics are most likely to produce student achievement. State Education Agencies (SEAs) and institutions that train teachers and administrators should implement data-driven feedback systems to improve how well educators educate children with disabilities.

Institute ongoing field experiences. Post-secondary institutions and state and private organizations that train teachers should require all students to complete supervised practicum experiences in each year of their training. These practices provide them with a comprehensive view of the full range of general education, special education and inclusive settings or service delivery models for students with disabilities.

Require rigorous training in reading. States and school districts must implement more rigorous requirements for training educators in scientifically based assessment and intervention in reading. General and special education teachers must implement research-based practices that include explicit and systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Require public reporting. Title II of the Higher Education Act should require programs for teacher education, administrative personnel to publicly report the performance of general education and special education program graduates relative to educating students with disabilities.

Increase special education and related services faculty. Institutions of higher
education should recruit and train more fully qualified professors of special education to address the shortage of special education and related services doctorate holders who are qualified to teach our nation’s future educators and prepare them to achieve better results for diverse learners.

**Conduct research.** The Department of Education, in collaboration with other federal agencies, should conduct research to identify the critical factors in personnel preparation that improve student learning and achievement in schools. While recent research has begun to determine critical factors in instruction, more high-quality research is needed on instructional variables that improve achievement by students with disabilities’ (pp.50-51).

### 13.3 Summary

1. **Teacher education in the field of SWSEN involves consideration of four main areas:**
   a. The nature of initial teacher education (ITE) for general education teachers and special education teachers.
   b. Specialist qualifications for professionals working in an advisory or consultancy capacity.
   c. The training of paraprofessionals.
   d. Professional development for professionals working with SWNEN.

2. There is considerable variability with respect to all of these issues between and even within countries.

3. Many countries are adapting their teacher education programmes to take account of the recent emphasis on inclusive education.

4. Many jurisdictions are prescribing in considerable detail what is expected of various training programmes.

5. In England and Wales, a three-level model of teacher education is being implemented. This involves developing the following:
   a. Core skills for ALL teachers in ALL schools
   b. Specialist skills in SOME local schools
   c. Advanced skills for SOME teachers in ALL schools

6. In the US, there is debate over categorical vs non-categorical licensure and the extent to which special and general teacher education should and can be merged.

7. In the US, the 2002 President’s Commission was highly critical of colleges of education for not ensuring that their curricula and methodologies were
empirically connected to improving student achievement and, accordingly, recommended sweeping reforms in teacher education.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN

COLLABORATION

Kotahi te kohao  There is but one eye
O te ngira       of the needle
E Kahuna ai     Through which passes
Te miro ma      The white thread
Te Miro pango   The black thread
Te miro Whero   The red thread

Evaluating SWSEN requires collaboration among many people – several professionals and parents in particular. Indeed, there are few areas of education that call upon so much collaboration and teamwork. This is particularly true in inclusive education where, ideally, general classroom teachers may work with various combinations of specialist teachers; special needs advisers; educational psychologists; therapists and other specialists; community agencies such as welfare services, police and advocacy groups; paraprofessionals; technology consultants; and, of course, parents (Rainforth & England, 1997). Indeed, there are many threads to pass through the eye of the needle. To put it more technically, collaboration can be defined as a process that enables groups of people with diverse expertise to combine their resources to generate solutions to problems over a period of time (Idol et al., 1994).

In this chapter, eight topics will be addressed: (1) different forms of educational support, (2) the importance of collaboration, (3) principles of collaboration, (4) co-teaching, (5) paraprofessionals, (6) special needs advisers, (7) educational psychologists, and (8) service integration. The role of parents will be discussed in the next chapter.

14.1 Different Forms of Educational Support to Teachers

Collaborative approaches to educating SWSEN are increasingly becoming embedded in education systems around the world. This is well illustrated in the following outline of the sources of support for regular class teachers in their work with SWSEN in 23 European countries (European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, 2003). Several interesting patterns of support emerge: (a) 17 of the countries utilised outside agencies, including psychological services (e.g., Austria Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, and Norway), (b) 16 referred to specialist teachers within schools (e.g., Cyprus, Finland, Iceland, Portugal, and Sweden), and (c) 8 utilised teachers from special schools to support their regular class teachers (e.g., Austria,
Austria. Support was mainly provided by specialist teachers from special schools or from visiting services. They supported both the class teacher and the pupil. Classroom and specialist teachers worked as a team, sharing the planning and organisation of the educational work. Professionals from visiting services offered temporary direct support to included pupils presenting specific disabilities.

Belgium. Support was mainly provided by specialist teachers from special schools and from Centres for Pupil Guidance. They provided information, advice and support to the class teacher. It was possible to find remedial teachers working as school staff members. They mainly supported pupils presenting short-term difficulties, but more and more providing direct support to class teachers and the school, trying to coordinate provision of support, working methods and educational programmes.

Cyprus. Support was provided by specialist teachers fully or partially attached to the school and by specialists, such as speech therapists, who had specific time allocated to each school. Outside the school, central services, such as inspectors, SENCOs, education and psychology specialists, or health and social services, also provided the necessary support.

Czech Republic. Support was mainly provided by specialist teachers or other professionals, such as psychologists. They provided advice and support to class teachers, parents and direct support to the included pupil. Support was provided through special educational centres or pedagogical psychological advice centres according to the specification of the pupil’s need. These specialist advice and guidance centres were in charge of determining, proposing and providing support and of elaborating the individual educational plan in close co-operation with the class teacher, the parents and the pupil (in accordance with his/her impairment and level of active participation).

Denmark. Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher working as a school staff member. They co-operated inside the class with the class teacher on a part-time basis. ‘Group teaching’ outside the classroom was another possibility where the pupil needs regular support in more than one subject. Local pedagogical psychological services were in charge of determining, proposing and following the type of support to be provided to the pupil in close co-operation with the mainstream school.

England and Wales. All schools had a member of staff who was the designated special educational needs co-ordinator with a wide range of responsibilities, articulated in the Special Educational Needs Code of Practices, including: overseeing provision, monitoring pupils’ progress, liaising with parents and external agencies, and supporting colleagues. Support was also provided by external agencies – specialist support services (from the education department and the health authority), colleagues in other schools, and other LEA personnel. Peripatetic staff worked increasingly with teachers, in order to develop teaching approaches and strategies within the school, rather than directly with pupils.

Finland. Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher working as a school staff member. A counselling teacher, school social worker or school nurse, depending on the local educational authorities, could also provide support to the school in general, to the teacher and/or the pupil. A pupil welfare team was set up involving the pupil, their parents, all teachers and any other experts involved in order to prepare an individual educational programme to be implemented in the mainstream school. There also existed a ‘pupil support group’ involving all professionals and the principal of the school to ensure good educational conditions and progress.

France. Support was mainly provided by specialist professionals from various services. They supported included pupils on a short- or long-term basis. They also helped the class teacher and the school staff. Specialist teachers from special support networks also provided support to pupils presenting temporary or permanent learning difficulties.

Germany. Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher from a special school or from a social service. Support was diverse and included preventive measures, joint education actions in mainstream schools, education co-operation between special and mainstream schools etc.. There could also be a support teacher working as a school staff member. They were mainly teachers specialising in language or behaviour problems. They worked mainly with pupils inside or outside the classroom according to the pupils’ needs.

Greece. Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher from a special school. Their work consisted of directly helping the pupil, assisting the teacher with the variety of teaching materials and in differentiating the curriculum – informing other pupils and ensuring good co-operation between the
school and the family.

**Iceland.** Support was mainly provided by a remedial teacher working as a school staff member. Other types of support were also provided by specialist teachers, psychologists or other professionals from the local municipalities. They provided general advice on the curriculum and on the teaching of the main subjects; guidance for pupils and psychological counselling. Their aim was to support teachers and head teachers on daily schoolwork and school improvement.

**Ireland.** Support could be provided by a specialist or resource teacher working as a school staff member. They were dealing with pupils with assessed learning disabilities. Support could also be provided by a remedial teacher working as a school staff member. Their main aim was to work with pupils with difficulties in reading and mathematics. All primary and post-primary schools had such a teacher. Another type of support was a visiting teacher from the Visiting Teacher Service (Department of Education). They worked with individual pupils, both inside and outside the classroom, and advised teachers on teaching approaches, methodology, programmes and resources. They also provided support for parents. The Psychological Service of the Department of Education and Science provided assessment and advisory service for mainstream schools with a focus on pupils with emotional and behaviour problems and with learning difficulties.

**Italy.** Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher working as a school staff member. They acted as class teachers, providing support in the mainstream school after obtaining parental authorisation. Support teachers shared responsibility with the class teacher concerning the work to be done with all pupils. Implementation of an individual education plan was one of their main tasks. They also supported pupils inside the classroom; pupils with disabilities were not to be pulled out of their classes unless absolutely necessary.

**Liechtenstein.** Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher from a special school. They mainly provided support to pupils but also to teachers and parents.

**Lithuania.** Support was mainly provided by specialist teachers, school psychologists, speech therapists, social pedagogues from special schools or from pedagogical psychological services. Specialist teachers provided class teachers with information and practical support: elaborating an individual educational programme, selecting educational materials etc. Support could also be provided by a remedial teacher, speech therapists, school psychologists working as school staff members. These specialists were mainly available in mainstream schools in big cities or towns; there was still a lack of specialists in rural areas. Pedagogical psychological services at local or national levels provided assessment of pupils and guidance for education of included pupils.

**Luxembourg.** Support was mainly provided by specialist support professionals from the SREA (Ambulatory Remedial Department). They were professionals in education and rehabilitation and shared responsibilities with class teachers with regard to direct support to the pupil. Class teachers were always in charge of the organisation of the class.

**Netherlands.** Support was mainly provided by a support teacher from a special school. They worked with the class teachers to develop educational programmes, to prepare and provide additional materials, to work with pupils individually and to contact parents. Support may also be provided through mainstream schools with experience in inclusion. Support focused on information to teachers, assessment and providing teaching materials. Support teachers may also be one of the mainstream schoolteachers providing direct help and support to the pupil.

**Norway.** Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher working as a school staff member. They co-operated with the class teacher part-time or full time. Support could also be provided by an assistant in the classroom. There was close cooperation between the three of them. The local educational psychological services were the ones to advise school and parents on the content and organisation of the education required for the pupil. They were the people mainly responsible for advising teachers on the daily work.

**Poland.** Teachers working with disabled pupils received support from the National Centre of Psychological and Pedagogical Support or from regional Teaching Methodology Centres. These centres provided training courses for teachers. Mainstream schools were to provide psychological and pedagogical support to pupils, parents and teachers, organising, for example, remedial classes.

**Portugal.** Support was mainly provided by specialist teachers, or other professionals either from local support teams or internal school staff members. National policy gave priority to the second situation. The aim was to create co-ordinated teams which would provide guidance to class teachers. They co-
operated with the head teacher and the school to organise the necessary educational support; they co-operated with class teachers in order to reorganise the curriculum in a flexible way; to facilitate differentiation of educational methods and strategies; to support teachers and pupils and contribute to educational innovation.

*Spain.* Support was mainly provided by a specialist support teacher working as a school staff member. They worked in primary and secondary schools and played an important role with the pupil and the teacher, planning together the curriculum differentiation and its implementation. They also supported families and worked in cooperation with other professionals. Another type of support was a remedial teacher for learning support, present in all primary schools. Support could also be provided by local psychological pedagogical support teams. They were responsible for the assessment of pupils, advising teachers and school staff on the measures to be taken, following pupils’ progress and involving families.

*Sweden.* Support was mainly provided by a specialist teacher working as a school staff member. Municipalities were responsible for providing and financing support to schools. If needed, support to build up knowledge in the municipalities could be provided at a national level through the Swedish Institute for Special Needs Education.

*Switzerland.* Support was mainly provided by support teachers, specialist teachers or specialist professionals from special schools or mainstream schools (milder forms of SEN). They provided support to included pupils and their teachers.

### 14.2 The Importance of Collaboration

Collaboration has three main benefits for SWSEN:

1. It has potential to create synergy – where ‘the whole is greater than the sum of the parts’.
2. It has the potential to provide opportunities for the participants to learn new ways of addressing barriers to learning.
3. It increases the coordination of services for SWSEN.

As indicated by Mitchell (2008), to release the potential of collaboration, participants have to learn the skills of working as a team member for at least part of their work. For those who have been used to working alone as a sole professional, it is a big step to develop new ways of working in which one is expected to share responsibility and expertise with other professionals in other disciplines. The ‘private’ now becomes the ‘public’; what was once implicit and unexpressed in professional practice now has to become explicit and explained to others. One’s autonomy may even seem to be lessened, as one has to adapt to other people’s ideas and personalities.

### 14.3 Principles of Collaboration

Successful collaborative arrangements depends on several factors (Friend & Cook, 1992; Mitchell, 2008; Idol, et al., 1994):

- Establishing clear, common goals for the collaboration.
- Defining the respective roles and who is accountable for what, but accepting of joint responsibility for the decisions and their outcomes.
• Adopting a problem-solving approach – with a sense that all those in the collaborative arrangement share ownership of the problem and its solution.
• Establishing an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect for each other’s expertise.
• Being willing to learn from others.
• Aiming for consensus decision-making.
• Asking for and giving immediate and objective feedback to others in a non-threatening and non-judgemental manner.
• Giving credit to others for their ideas and accomplishments.
• Developing procedures for resolving conflicts and managing these processes skilfully.
• Arranging periodic meetings to review progress in the collaborative arrangements.

14.4 Co-teaching
Sometimes known as cooperative teaching, this occurs in inclusive education settings when a general education teacher and a special education teacher combine their expertise to meet the needs of all learners in the class. Both assume the roles of equal partners. It does not normally mean that the special education teacher takes exclusive responsibility for SWSEN and the general teacher the rest of the class. Rather, it means respecting each other’s expertise in order to benefit all students in the class. From the descriptions of the European countries above, Italy most closely fits this pattern of collaboration. In addition to the points in the previous section, to make co-teaching work, there needs to be:

• active support from the school’s leadership;
• adequate, regular joint planning time;
• agreement on procedures for handling learners’ disruptive or off-task behaviours;
• agreement on lesson objectives and structures, including teaching strategies and assessment methods;
• clear communication with parents about the co-teaching arrangement.

(Dieker & Barnett, 1996; Reeve & Hallahan, 1996; and Walter-Thomas et al., 1996)

In their meta-analysis of the effects of co-teaching on student outcomes, Murawski & Swanson (2001) reviewed 89 articles published between 1989 and 1999. Only six of these provided enough information for effect sizes to be calculated and these ranged from 0.24 to 0.95, with an average of 0.40. Thus, on the basis of a small database, co-teaching is moderately effective at best. There is a need for more experimental research to be conducted, especially in the light of the regularity with which co-teaching is cited in the literature as an effective service delivery option in inclusive classrooms.
14.5 Paraprofessionals
Paraprofessionals—referred to variously as ‘teaching assistants’, ‘teacher aides’ and ‘learning support assistants’—are commonly utilised in special and, increasingly, in inclusive education. Despite this significant and growing role, Giangreco & Doyle (2002) claimed that too many of them have been inadequately appreciated, compensated, oriented, trained, and supervised. They lamented the fact that there are negligible data on student outcomes related to the utilisation of paraprofessionals. Many questions need to be addressed, both at the policy and research levels. For example, to what extent should paraprofessionals be involved in direct teaching SWSEN? What impact does their presence have on such students? How does the utilisation of paraprofessionals’ support affect teacher engagement? And what should be done to improve paraprofessional supports?

As summarised by Riddell et al. (2006), a number of studies have found that effective and inclusive pedagogies were supported by a team approach in classrooms where teachers and teaching assistants (TAs) worked together to support all children. However, whilst recognising how important this strategy has been in promoting classroom inclusion, Riddell et al. noted that commentators also recognise the complexities of managing TAs in the classroom and the fact that teachers are untrained in managing classroom teams. In addition, there is a risk of increased learner dependency. According to Groom & Rose (2005) there is no single model of classroom teamwork that should be endorsed but the aspects of the TA role that contributed to effective practice included:

• time for establishing individual positive relationships with students;
• good listening skills;
• working with pupils in class, in a one-to-one, and across contexts including lunchtimes/playgrounds;
• qualities of fairness, patience and tolerance;
• understanding of students’ difficulties;
• access to a range of support strategies (Groom and Rose, 2003: 12)

In their review of special education in the ACT, Shaddock et al. (2009) spent some time in discussing the role of Learning Support Assistants (LSAs). They noted that Australian research shows that in classrooms where there are students who are complex and/or challenging the LSA was much appreciated (e.g., Shaddock, et al. 2007). However, despite the generally strong support for LSAs, there are concerns
about the role:

• there is insufficient role clarity, training and professional development opportunities;
• system policy around the skills LSAs need to assist teachers with curriculum and pedagogy are unclear;
• there are issues around the current and future availability of appropriately qualified and experienced LSAs.
• LSAs perform a wide range of roles for which not all may have adequate training;
• the involvement of LSAs can have unintended, negative effects on student engagement, learning, independence and/or social acceptance;
• in some situations, LSAs are exploited personally, professionally and/or in terms of salary and conditions;
• the presence of LSAs has been associated with teachers devolving responsibility to them for students with a disability;
• some teachers do not have the skills to direct and supervise LSAs; and
• role confusion, blurring and overlap are frequently reported. (Shaddock et al. 2007, p.213).

Shaddock et al. (2009) went on to point out that the lack of research support for the positive impact of LSAs on student learning outcomes has prompted the search for alternatives to LSAs and/or to more carefully define their roles. They cited the following proposal from Giangreco et al. (2004):

• using the resources currently devoted to LSAs to employ more teachers, improve teacher professional learning and networking, reduce class sizes and/or purchase therapy, equipment, consultancy and other supports for inclusive practice;
• establishing a mobile pool of LSAs who are available for time-limited involvement and whose support is systematically phased out and replaced with mainstream supports;
• clarifying the LSA role to be indirect support for the teacher;
• implementing peer-support strategies that replace some roles currently performed by LSAs; and
• consulting students about the way they would prefer to receive support.

In the US, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 clarified the job of paraprofessionals with an official title and job description. Prior to this act, qualifications for teacher’s assistants were made at the district and state level. Section 119 of the NCLB Act governs the qualifications of paraprofessionals for schools receiving federal funds. This law states that paraprofessionals must have an associate’s degree (equivalent to two years of study in an institution of higher
education) and pass a 'state or local academic assessment,' including knowledge of assisting in the instruction of reading, writing and mathematics. These requirements created a distinction between aides and paraprofessionals, with the paraprofessional job description becoming much more defined. Paraprofessionals are allowed to engage in one-on-one tutoring, manage instructional materials, act as a translator and provide assistance with computers and library activities. They must remain under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. They can still perform non-instructional duties and work with non-disabled children so long as the time spent is balanced evenly.

14.6 Special Needs Advisers
Various countries have developed cadres of professionals to act as advisers/consultants to teachers of SWSEN. They provide an indirect service delivery model, in that the consultant does not necessarily work directly with students, except to occasionally demonstrate a teaching strategy. The essence of this approach is that a special education teacher/adviser (or some other specialist) provides advice and guidance to the general classroom teacher on the programme to be followed by any SWSEN. Both teachers normally meet outside classroom teaching time (admittedly, a logistical problem, which has to be solved by the school leadership: see Idol, 1997) and discuss any curricular, teaching and assessment adaptations required for such students. As well, the special education adviser may provide additional instructional materials and help to modify the classroom environment. In all of this the classroom teacher carries the main responsibility (see Elliott & McKenney, 1998). To make this consultation model work, the special education teacher must be thoroughly familiar with the curriculum being followed in the classroom and the classroom teacher must continue to have chief responsibility for educating all students in his or her class.

In this section, two countries’ provisions will be discussed: England and Australia.

England. Here, a special educational needs teacher working in a mainstream school can become a Special Education Needs Coordinator (SENCO). Applicants for that position usually need two-plus years of post-qualification experience. The SENCO is expected to have a good understanding of the three stages of special educational
needs: school action, school action plus, formal assessments and statementing\textsuperscript{31}. The SENCO is usually the head of the special needs department and is responsible for day-to-day provision for pupils with special educational needs. This involves coordinating work with a range of agencies and parents, gathering appropriate information on children with special needs and ensuring individual education plans are in place. A SENCO in mainstream schools will allocate learning support assistants or teaching assistants to support individual students in the classroom and may hold the budget for these resources. A SENCO may also be the deputy head teacher or head teacher.

From 1 September 2009, new regulations from the Department for Children, Schools and Families required all new SENCOs to achieve the national award for SEN coordination\textsuperscript{32}. The Training and Development Agency for Schools has developed a framework of nationally approved training for teachers new to the role of SENCO. Training will take approximately a year to complete and SENCOs will have up to three years to achieve the qualification. To achieve the National Award for SEN Coordination the Department for Children Schools and Families requires that teachers should meet all the learning outcomes from a specified list of 13 topics, as follows:

1. Statutory and regulatory frameworks and relevant developments at national and local level
2. High incidence SEN and disabilities and how they can affect pupils’ participation and learning
3. Using evidence about learning, teaching and assessment in relation to pupils with SEN to inform practice
4. Working strategically with senior colleagues and governors
5. Strategic financial planning, budget management and use of resources in line with best value principles
6. Strategies for improving outcomes for pupils with SEN and/or disabilities
7. Developing, using, monitoring and evaluating systems
8. Using tools for collecting, analysing and using data
9. Deploying staff and managing resources
10. Providing professional direction to the work of others
11. Leadership and development of staff
12. Drawing on external sources of support and expertise

\textsuperscript{31} See Chapter Five, section 5.5 for a description of these three stages.
\textsuperscript{32} http://www.tda.gov.uk/about/newsletter/sep2009/Articles/workingforchange.aspx
Consulting, engaging and communicating with colleagues, parents and carers and pupils to enhance pupils’ learning and achievement.

For example, #3 specifies that training should enable SENCOs to:

- Analyse, interpret and evaluate critically, relevant research and inspection evidence about teaching and learning in relation to pupils with SEN and/or disabilities and understand how such evidence can be used to inform personal practice and others’ practice.

- Identify and develop effective practice in teaching pupils with SEN and/or disabilities, e.g. through small-scale action research based on evaluating methodologies, developing critiques and, where appropriate, developing new hypotheses.

- Have a critical understanding of teaching, learning and behaviour management strategies and how to select, use and adapt approaches to remove barriers to learning for pupils with SEN and/or disabilities.

- Have a critical understanding of approaches, strategies and resources for assessment (including national tests and examinations) and how to select, use and adapt them to personalise provision and remove barriers to assessment for pupils with SEN and/or disabilities.

Australia. In their recent review of special education in the ACT, Shaddock et al. (2009) proposed the development and trialling of a school-based, Learning Support Coordinator (LSC), a role designed to improve classroom pedagogy with a particular focus on students functioning in the lowest quartile. They cited recent Australian research in support of this role; for example, Shaddock et al. (2007) found that schools in which an experienced special educator managed learning support across the school achieved good outcomes for students with a disability.

Shaddock et al. (2009) noted that some school systems in Australia (Western Australia and NSW) were beginning to employ LSCs who have special education knowledge and experience and who have school-wide responsibilities for raising the quality of teaching and learning, with particular focus on students who struggle with the curriculum. In Western Australia, for example, the LSCs’ functions included:

- facilitating the work of Learning Support teams;

- consulting and collaborating with teachers with regard to meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities and learning difficulties;

- supporting classroom teachers to develop, implement and monitor learning plans for individual and groups of students with disabilities or learning difficulties; and

- modeling effective teaching and supporting classroom teachers who have students requiring significant teaching and learning adjustments.

The Western Australian LSCs are appointed from existing staff in schools and
receive ongoing training and participate as part of the Building Inclusive Classrooms Professional Learning Program. This involves an initial 12 days of fully funded professional learning in their first two years.

In recommending the development of LSC positions in the ACT, Shaddock et al. (2009) noted that although LSCs were not widespread there, some schools had organised their services and appointed staff who fulfilled similar roles. They also noted that in WA and NSW the LSCs were ‘disability, and learning difficulties-specific’. Instead, ‘one implication of the ACT’s broader understanding of inclusivity is that if the LSC approach were to be adopted ‘a major aim would be to build pedagogical capacity at the school and classroom level’ (p.116). This would mean LSCs supporting classroom teachers to meet ‘the individual learning needs of any students, for example, students with a disability or learning difficulty; those experiencing temporary difficulties with learning because of personal or family circumstances; and, if necessary, students with gifts and talents who were not performing to potential’ (ibid.).

14.7 Educational Psychologists
In many countries, educational psychologists (referred to as ‘school psychologists’ in some countries, and ‘school counsellors’ in Australia) are considered to play a vital role, not only in the education of SWSEN, but also in education more generally. In their review of special education in the ACT, Shaddock et al. (2009), for example, commented on ‘the need for a more strategic use of these valuable, generic, resources for schools’ (p.208).

In the UK, the 2001 Code of Practice described the educational psychologist as having ‘a key role in assessment and intervention and in providing support and advice to parents’ (p.36) in early years education. At the school level, the Code of Practice had this to say:

the educational psychologist can be a very important resource for the school. The psychologist’s knowledge of the school and its context is key. Through regular consultation with schools educational psychology services can provide help in clarifying problems and devising problem solving strategies; in carrying out specialised assessments, including techniques in managing behaviour, and evaluating individual pupil progress. In addition to working with individual children, the educational psychologist can work with groups of pupils or teachers and learning support assistants at the classroom or whole school level, for example assisting schools with the development of SEN and behaviour policies, helping to develop knowledge and skills for school staff and assisting with projects to raise achievement
and promote inclusion (p.136).

In their recent review of the functions and contributions of educational psychologists in England and Wales, Farrell et al. (2007) placed it in the context of the *Every Child Matters* (ECM) legislation. They pointed out that the ECM agenda makes outcomes for children central to the recently established integrated children’s services that form a team around the child and family in the context of community and school. Outcomes for children are specified through aims, targets, indicators and inspection criteria, which are grouped around five main areas:

*Be healthy*: children and young people are (a) physically healthy, (b) mentally and emotionally healthy, (c) sexually healthy, (d) live healthy lifestyles, and (e) choose not to take illegal drugs.

*Stay safe*: children and young people (a) are safe from maltreatment, neglect, violence and sexual exploitation; (b) are safe from accidental injury and death; (c) are safe from bullying and discrimination, (d) are safe from crime and anti-social behaviour in and out of school, and (e) have security, stability and are cared for.

*Enjoy and achieve*: children and young people (a) are ready for school, (b) attend and enjoy school, (c) achieve stretching national educational standards at primary school, (d) achieve personal and social development and enjoy recreation, and (e) achieve stretching national educational standards at secondary school.

*Make a positive contribution*: children and young people (a) engage in decision-making and support the community and environment, (b) engage in law-abiding and positive behaviour in and out of school, (c) develop positive relationships and choose not to bully or discriminate, (d) develop self confidence and successfully deal with significant life changes and challenges, and (e) develop enterprising behaviour.

*Achieve economic well-being*: Children and young people (a) engage in further education, employment or training on leaving school, (b) are ready for employment, (c) live in decent homes and sustainable communities, (d) have access to transport and material goods, and (e) live in households free of low incomes.

The majority of respondents in the review indicated that educational psychologists’ work contributed to meeting each of the above five ECM outcomes through individual assessment, consultancy, intervention and training. There was a universally held view that educational psychologists had been too heavily involved in statutory assessments and that this had prevented them from making more effective contributions to maximising the ECM outcomes for children. Nevertheless, all respondent groups identified an important role for educational psychologists as working with individual children who have severe, complex and
challenging needs. Respondents typically referred to educational psychologists’ academic background and training in psychology as being the factors that enabled them to offer a distinctive contribution. Most respondent groups valued highly the contact that they had, but would have welcomed more, particularly in the area of therapy and intervention.

As well, Farrell et al. pointed out a number of other ways in which the developments embodied within the ECM agenda impact on the role of educational psychologists. Among the most significant, they felt, was the restructuring of local authorities into children’s services, which combined educational and social services. This involves locating the work of educational psychologists more centrally within community contexts where schools form only one of the settings in which they would work. A further consequence was a renewed emphasis on the importance of multi agency work.

Among the recommendations advanced by Farrell et al. (2007) were that (a) ‘all educational psychology service development plans should be based around meeting the five ECM outcomes and that annual reviews of services should assess the extent to which these plans have been successfully implemented’, and (b) ‘educational psychologists and other agencies working with children should engage in joint planning around the five outcomes so that each agency can assess the potential and actual contribution that they can make’ (p.10).

Since 1978, in the US, the National Association of School Psychologists (2010) has promulgated successive revisions of guidelines for the provisions of school psychological services. In its latest iteration, the Association presented a model for the delivery of comprehensive school psychological services across 10 domains (see Figure 14.1). These domains reflect the following principles:

- A foundation in the knowledge bases for both psychology and education, including theories, models, research and techniques.
- Use of effective strategies and skills to help students succeed academically, socially, behaviourally, and emotionally.
- Application of knowledge and skills by creating and maintaining safe, supportive, fair and effective learning environments and enhancing family-school collaboration for all students.
- Knowledge, skills and professional practices reflect understanding and respect for human diversity and promote effective services, advocacy, and justice for all children, families and schools.
• Integrate knowledge and professional skills across the 10 domains that result in direct, measurable outcomes for children, families and schools.


Figure 14.1 Model of comprehensive and integrated school psychological services in the US

In summary, the 10 domains are as follows:

**Data-based decision-making and accountability**: knowledge of varied models and methods of assessment and data collection methods for identifying strengths and needs, developing effective services and programmes, and measuring progress and outcomes.

**Consultation and collaboration**: knowledge of varied models and strategies of consultation, collaboration, and communication applicable to individuals, families, groups, and systems.

**Interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills**: knowledge of biological, cultural, and social influences on academic skills, human learning, cognitive, and developmental processes; and evidence-based curricula and instructional strategies.

**Interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills**: knowledge of biological, cultural, developmental, and social influences on behaviour and mental health, and evidence-based strategies to promote social-emotional functioning and mental health.

**School-wide practices to promote learning**: knowledge of school and systems
structure, organization, and theory; general and special education; technology resources, and evidence-based school practices that promote learning and mental health.

Preventive and responsive services: Knowledge of principles and research related to resilience and risk factors in learning and mental health, services in schools and communities to support multi-tiered prevention, and evidence-based strategies for effective crisis response.

Family-school collaboration services: knowledge of principles and research related to family systems, strengths, needs, and culture; evidence-based strategies to support family influences on children’s learning and mental health; and strategies to develop collaboration between families and schools.

Diversity in development and learning: Knowledge of individual differences, abilities, disabilities, and other diverse characteristics, including factors related to culture, context, and individual and role differences, and evidence-based strategies to enhance services and address potential influences related to diversity.

Research and program evaluation: knowledge of research design, statistics, measurement, varied data collection and analysis techniques, and programme evaluation sufficient for undertaking research and interpreting data in applied settings.

Legal, ethical, and professional practice: knowledge of the history and foundations of school psychology, multiple service models and methods; ethical, legal, and professional standards, and other factors related to professional identity and effective practice as school psychologists.

14.8 Service Integration

It is clear from the material reviewed so far in this chapter that the challenge of educating SWSEN is a multidisciplinary enterprise, requiring the highest possible levels of collaboration, both at the individual level and at the system level. In the preceding section, for example, reference was made to educational psychologists and other agencies working with children engaging in joint planning around the five Every Child Matters outcomes.

According to Shaddock et al. (2009), a feature of leading practice throughout the world is a move towards ‘integrated support’, ‘service integration’ or ‘wraparound services’, all of which are concerned with the delivery of specialised services in a more coordinated and integrated manner (see, for example, Peterson, 2009). Such coordination can take place at an institutional level, at an agency level, or at a government level.

In South Africa, the writer was impressed by the idea of institution-level support teams – an idea that many other countries have adopted in various forms. In the South
African model, the primary function of these teams is to put in place ‘properly co-ordinated learner and educator support services that will support the learning and teaching process by identifying and addressing learner, educator and institutional needs’ (Department of Education, 2001).

A key to the success of such teams is the support and encouragement offered by the school principal and other senior leaders. The chief function of school-wide teams is to develop a school-wide supportive culture and policies on learners with special educational needs, as well as focusing on identifying and supporting individual learners. Such teams need a dedicated leader/facilitator and a recorder of decisions and plans, utilising advanced technology where available to facilitate communication (Ademan & Taylor, 1998).

According to Schaddock et al. (2009), the literature on service integration highlights the following factors:

- the active involvement of the child and support for parents as the primarily responsible party;
- conceptualisation of schools as the predominant living and learning environment for youth and as a community resource;
- co-location of services where possible;
- alignment of client assessments and case management; and
- clear and realistic objectives of service integration; leadership support; time allocation for joint planning; and clarity around administrative arrangements, funding and resources.

14.9 Summary

1. Educating SWSEN requires collaboration among many people – several professionals and parents in particular.

2. Collaborative approaches to educating SWSEN are increasingly becoming embedded in education systems around the world. This is well illustrated in the sources of support for regular class teachers in their work with SWSEN in 23 European countries, which included school-based specialists, community-based agencies and special schools.

3. Successful collaboration depends on such factors as establishing clear goals, defining respective roles, adopting a problem-solving approach and establishing mutual trust and respect.
4. **Co-teaching occurs in inclusive education settings when a general education teacher and a special education teacher combine their expertise to meet the needs of all learners in the class.**

5. **Paraprofessionals are generally inadequately appreciated, compensated, oriented, trained, supervised, and researched. Since 2001, paraprofessionals in the US have had more defined job descriptions and are expected to have a college level qualification.**

6. **Various countries have developed cadres of professionals to act as advisers/consultants to teachers of SWSEN, providing advice and guidance to the general classroom teacher on the programme to be followed.**

7. **In many countries, educational psychologists are considered to play a vital role, not only in the education of SWSEN, but also in education more generally and in community contexts.**

8. **A feature of leading practice throughout the world is a move towards ‘integrated support’, ‘service integration’ or ‘wraparound services’, all of which are concerned with the delivery of specialised services in a more coordinated and integrated manner. Such coordination can take place at an institutional level, at an agency level, or at a government level.**