



The Alliance Project

Headquarters

Peabody College, Box 160
Hill Student Center, Rm. 101
(615) 343-5610
1-800-831-6134
Fax (615) 343-5611
alliance@vanderbilt.edu

Washington, DC Metropolitan Office

10860 Hampton Road
Fairfax Station, VA 22039
(703) 239-1557
Fax (703) 503-8627
Email: judysd@gte.net

June 2000

Developing a Highly Trained Teacher Workforce

Published by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), as shown below, this paper addresses several converging forces for improving preservice preparation and the competence of personnel for special education. It reviews activities of various national commissions, centers, panels, and other initiatives to improve the preparation and qualifications of teachers. It also summarizes activities of the U.S. Department of Education, particularly its Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The OSEP section describes performance indicators established to ensure an adequate supply of qualified personnel for education of students with disabilities, and which have implications for those who submit OSEP personnel preparation applications. Various factors are reviewed that have led toward a shift in funding and control of professional development activities from higher education to State education agencies.

"Professional development," as used in this paper, refers to preservice preparation and to the continuing education of practitioners. Bold type has been added to highlight topics of particular interest to Alliance participants.

Office of Special Education Programs. (1999). Developing a highly trained teacher workforce (pp. I-33 through I-47). *21st Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

INTRODUCTION

America's future depends now, as never before, on our ability to teach. If every citizen is to be prepared for a democratic society whose major product is knowledge, every teacher must know how to teach students in ways that help them reach high levels of intellectual and social competence. Every school must be organized to support powerful teaching and learning. Every school district must be able to find and keep good teachers. And every community must be focused on preparing students to become competent citizens and workers in a pluralistic, technological society (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996, p. 3).

This urgent call for effective teachers reflects lessons learned from more than a decade of education reform efforts that have left the preparation of teachers virtually unchanged. Although the professionalization of teaching was added to the reform agenda in the late 1980s (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986), initial attempts to improve the quality of teaching focused on structural and organizational components, using approaches such as increased salaries, career ladders and merit pay (Hawley, 1988). Those failed attempts at improved teaching and learning led to the inevitable conclusion that improvements in the quality of America's schools would require changes to existing systems for recruiting, preparing, and supporting America's teachers (e.g., Association of Teacher Educators, 1991; Goodlad, 1994; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Pugach, Barnes, & Beckum, 1991; U.S. Department of Education, 1997). That conclusion was bolstered by mounting research evidence that indicated the critical link between teaching practice and student achievement (e.g., Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993; Elmore, Peterson, & McCarthy, 1996; Ferguson & Ladd, 1996). As noted by Terry Dozier, former National Teacher of the Year and Special Advisor to the Secretary of Education: "The highest standards in the world, the best facilities, and the strongest accountability measures will do little good if we do not have talented, dedicated, and well prepared teachers in every classroom. . . . Our Nation's goals in education will not be achieved without the development of an excellent teacher workforce" (Dozier, 1997, p. 1).

The importance of workforce quality was given heightened priority by the release of data indicating that, overall, about a quarter of newly hired teachers lack the qualifications required for their jobs, with 75 percent of urban districts hiring teachers who lack proper credentials (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996). Some evidence suggests that inadequate teacher preparation is even more common among special educators than in the general teacher work force. Boe, Cook, Bobbitt, and Terhanian (1998) report, for example, that in 1990-91, about 10 percent of special education teachers were not fully certified in their primary teaching assignments, compared to 6 percent of general education teachers who were not fully certified. More recent data reported by States to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) shows that, for the 1995-96 school year, about 8.7 percent of special education teachers were not fully certified (U.S. Department of Education, 1998c).

These research findings, as well as national efforts to raise awareness of the importance of a highly trained workforce, most notably those of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future¹, have mobilized a variety of programs and strategies at the Federal, State, and local levels for investing in the teaching profession. For example, the Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) funds two research and development initiatives focused on teaching and policy -- the National Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, housed at the University of Washington with the collaboration of other major universities, and the National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching at the University of Maryland, a collaboration among several major universities and professional associations that work in partnership to engage in efforts aimed at improving the quality of teaching.

As the ability to address teacher quality will rely on a commitment to implement reforms at both State and local levels, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future is working in partnership with governors, State education departments, legislators, and business

¹ The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future is a bipartisan blue-ribbon panel of 26 public officials, business and community leaders, and educators. The commission was formed in 1994 to develop an agenda for improving the quality of America's teachers. It was funded originally through foundation grants, and it continues to be supported by a variety of foundations. More recently, OERI has supported some of the efforts of the commission.

leaders in twelve States to design and implement improvement strategies that respond to local needs. Further, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (which sets standards for teacher education), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (which addresses beginning teacher licensure issues), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (which provides advanced certification to qualified veteran teachers) have joined to develop a coherent set of standards to guide preservice education of teachers, entry into the field, and continued professional development (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997).

In addition to these efforts, the Department of Education has made a strong commitment to support States and local school districts in efforts to improve the quality of the teacher workforce. This section of the report outlines the activities of the Department, with a particular focus on OSEP activities that are designed to address needs of personnel who work with students with disabilities.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

"A talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom in America" is a major objective of the Department of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). As set forth in the Department's *Strategic Plan for 1998-2002*, **six core strategies** are planned for meeting this objective:

- Improving the quality and retention of new teachers;
- Financial support and interagency coordination to implement professional development strategies that will increase the skills of current teachers;
- Support of States' efforts to align licensing and certification requirements with content and performance standards;
- Teacher recognition and accountability through efforts such as the NBPTS;
- Research, development, evaluation, and dissemination of research-based strategies for improving teacher quality; and
- A biennial national report card on teacher quality.

A variety of existing Federal programs both directly and indirectly support these strategies, including the newly established Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Adult Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technical Education Act, and the School to Work Opportunities Act. Some of these programs are intended to benefit populations of students (e.g., students with disabilities, students who are limited-English-proficient). The use of Federal funds specifically to support professional development activities that improve the quality of the workforce must be consistent with the overall purposes and requirements of each program. Goals 2000 funds, for example, can be used to support professional development activities that familiarize teachers with State standards and support teacher knowledge and skills that are aligned to student expectations, within the context of statewide standards. About 60 percent of Goals 2000 funds are used to support teacher preservice and professional development activities (U.S. Department of Education, 1998a).

Two Federal programs, Title II of ESEA and Part D of IDEA, are designed specifically to support the professional development of educators. The Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program (Title II of ESEA), with a fiscal year (FY) 1998 appropriation of \$335 million, is the largest source of Federal funding for such activities. This formula grant program provides funds to State education agencies (SEAs) and State agencies of higher education (SAHEs)

to support high quality, sustained, and intensive professional development activities in core academic subjects, particularly math and science. The funds tend to support teacher improvement efforts at the district and school levels based on a comprehensive review of their professional development needs. Funds also assist institutions of higher education (IHEs) and others to develop their capacity to offer high quality professional development activities. Local education agencies (LEAs) apply to the State for subgrants, with about 95 percent of all LEAs participating in the program. Colleges and universities submit grant applications for SAHE. Three suggested uses of the Eisenhower funds include: (a) professional development in the effective use of technology as a classroom tool; (b) the formation of professional development networks that allow educators to exchange information on advances in content and pedagogy; and (c) peer training and mentoring programs for teachers and administrators. The annual performance reports for the grants require grantees to report on how Eisenhower funds are used to help meet the needs of diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities. Activities supported under Part D of IDEA to address the professional development of educators who work with students with disabilities are described in the following section, which discusses more broadly OSEP's efforts to address the need for a highly trained workforce.

OSEP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

It is a priority for OSEP to assemble a highly trained workforce to provide services to students with disabilities. A major objective for the use of discretionary funds available under the IDEA Amendments of 1997 is "to ensure an adequate supply of highly qualified personnel" (U.S. Department of Education, 1998b). The **five performance indicators** of this objective as delineated by OSEP include:

- Supply of qualified personnel: OSEP intends to obtain these data from State reports to track whether an increasing number of States are meeting their identified needs for qualified personnel.
- Research-validated effective practices: Beginning with FY 1999, OSEP plans to review funded award and institutional practices to ensure that an increasing percentage of **training programs will incorporate research-validated practices into program curricula**. Grant selection criteria that promote the use of research-validated effective program content and pedagogy and an identification of research-validated effective practices are two strategies that will support this indicator.

- Personnel employed with certification. State-reported data for 1996-97 reveal that, across all funded positions for special education teachers and related services personnel, 8.6 percent were not fully certified. The range across categories was quite wide, with a low of 1.2 percent for SEA supervisors and administrators to a high of 15.7 percent for interpreters. Other categories with a higher than average proportion of noncertified personnel include teachers for 3- through 5-year-olds (10.7 percent), teachers' aides (14.1 percent), and recreation and therapeutic recreation specialists (10.2 percent) (U.S. Department of Education, 1998a). In the future, OSEP will use data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey to track its goal of an increasing percentage of special education teachers and related services personnel with appropriate certification.
- Special education training for regular education teachers. Although, as noted above, the Department of Education provides a variety of funding streams to support professional development of teachers, based on State and local needs, these programs do not necessarily support activities that would increase the capacity of regular education teachers to address the needs of students with disabilities. New requirements, resulting from the IDEA Amendments of 1997, will require regular educators to become increasingly skilled at meeting the needs of students with disabilities. These requirements include, for example, that general educators be included in Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, that students with disabilities be provided access to the general education curriculum, and that students with disabilities participate in State and local assessment programs. OSEP intends to use data from the NCES Schools and Staffing Survey to determine if an increasing number of general education teachers and community service providers are receiving preservice and inservice training in special education and developmentally appropriate practices. **OSEP will also support preparation programs for regular education personnel to work with students with disabilities.**
- Effective personnel. As one measure of personnel quality, OSEP plans to conduct **surveys of teachers, parents, and students regarding personnel knowledge and skills, as well as self-efficacy surveys of personnel.** These survey data will be used to determine if an increasing percentage of special and regular education teachers and early intervention personnel have the knowledge and to improve educational results for children with disabilities.

Although these performance indicators are new to OSEP, the idea of supporting personnel preparation activities for educators who work with students with disabilities is not. Under Part D of IDEA, OSEP currently administers more than \$83 million in grants to help address State-identified needs for qualified personnel to work with students with disabilities. During FY 1997, these funds supported over 600 preservice and inservice training programs for special education, related services, early intervention, and leadership personnel. Grants were awarded across 14 priorities to IHEs, SEAs, and other nonprofit agencies. The personnel preparation priorities address a wide variety of areas, not just teacher preparation. The 14 priority areas include the preparation of personnel for careers in special education; preparation of related services personnel; preparation of personnel to serve infants, toddlers, and preschoolers; grants for preservice personnel training; preparation of educational interpreters; leadership personnel; special projects -- multiple topics; special projects -- national initiatives; preparation of personnel to serve children with low-incidence disabilities; preparation of personnel for careers in special education -- emotional disturbance; early childhood model inservice training projects; preparation of minority personnel; SEA programs; and model standards for beginning teachers.

Addressing the priority area of preservice personnel training, for example, 48 new and 50 continuation grants were awarded to support the preservice preparation of personnel in three areas: special education teachers, related services personnel, and early intervention and preschool personnel. Under this priority, grantees can develop new programs or improve existing programs that will increase the capacity and quality of preservice programs in one, two, or all three of these areas. Prior to FY 1996, these preservice priorities were funded under separate competitions. Recently funded projects include, for example, a Northern Illinois University training program for master's level students who will become elementary teachers for students with emotional disturbance; an interdisciplinary graduate program at Allegheny University of the Health Sciences to prepare already licensed physical therapists and occupational therapists to demonstrate competencies that promote the full inclusion of students with disabilities in educational settings; and a project at California State University-Northridge to promote the early completion of a new credential program for early childhood special education teachers who reflect the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity of the population to prepare them to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Under a special projects priority that addresses multiple topics, 18 new and 45 continuation grants were awarded during FY 1997 to support initiatives designed to develop and demonstrate new approaches for the preservice and inservice training of personnel for careers in special education and early intervention; to develop materials and approaches to prepare personnel; and to develop other projects of national significance for the preparation of personnel needed to serve infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. One of the projects funded under this priority is at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, where project staff are developing and evaluating a new personnel training model for regular educators, special educators, parents, and related services personnel in the process of individualizing educational programs for children with autism. The special project at the National Resource Center for Paraprofessionals in Education and Related Services at the City University of New York is developing, evaluating, and producing competency-based instructional materials to prepare paraeducators to work with children and youth with disabilities and other special needs that place them at risk for school failure. At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, a special project grant is supporting the identification and organization of competencies needed by secondary-level teachers and rehabilitation personnel relevant to planning and delivering transition services for youth with disabilities. That project will also develop and evaluate a conceptual model of transition-related competencies and disseminate the model nationally.

During FY 1997, OSEP also funded two new special projects of national significance focused on improving the quality of the teacher workforce. At the University of Kansas in Lawrence, grant funds are being used to develop an academy linking teacher education to advances in research, particularly in the areas of improving reading instruction for students with learning disabilities, the use of technology to enhance educational results for students with disabilities, and the use of positive behavioral supports to teach children with disabilities who exhibit challenging behaviors. The goals of the project are to improve instruction by infusing research-based interventions available to practicing teachers. A second project funded under this priority is at The Council for Exceptional Children, where project staff are working with a national advisory board and other key stakeholders to address issues in the recruitment and preparation of personnel for teaching students who have low vision or are blind.

OSEP also awarded a 2-year personnel preparation grant to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to craft **model State licensing standards for all beginning teachers (both general and special educators) to better reflect what teachers need to know and be able to do to teach students with disabilities**. This project, coordinated by INTASC, will simultaneously develop and implement standards for general and special education teachers that promise to promote complementary preparation and licensure, clarify distinctions in responsibilities among general and special educators, and allow States to collectively agree upon a common policy for licensing general and special education teachers. Currently, 31 SEAs and independent professional standards boards are working with CCSSO on this project.

As described in the following historical review of the personnel preparation program, these types of activities have been funded for 40 years, with relatively minor changes. A subsequent section of this module discusses major changes to the OSEP-supported professional development enterprise resulting from the IDEA Amendments of 1997, and some of OSEP's plans for the future in response to those changes.

Historical Overview of OSEP Personnel Preparation

Federal grant funds for the preparation of personnel to meet the needs of students with disabilities have been available since 1958 when P.L. 85-926, the Education of Mentally Retarded Children Act, authorized \$2,500 grants to IHEs for training leadership personnel in the program area of mental retardation (Kleinhammer-Tramill, Gallagher, & Earley, 1998). By 1970, funding had increased to \$29.7 million to support a highly categorical professional development program. "Funds for personnel preparation were earmarked by category, and universities submitted categorical grants to receive funding . . ." (Kleinhammer-Tramill et al., 1998, p. 3). Just prior to enactment of P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) in 1975, however, personnel preparation funds were awarded as Program Assistance Grants (PAGs) or "block grants" to special education departments, which allowed IHEs to develop noncategorical training programs with a great deal of flexibility.

With the implementation of P.L. 94-142, a mandate to increase available services to previously unserved and underserved populations resulted in a need to focus on the preparation of teachers to meet the needs of specific student populations, such as students with low-incidence disabilities, students residing in rural areas, or students with emotional disturbance. Consequently, by 1980, funding streams were again awarded categorically. These programs provided less flexibility than the PAGs and encouraged the use of stipend support for students, resulting in few attempts to address program improvement, administration, or infrastructure, all of which would enhance the quality of professional development activities (Kleinhammer-Tramill et al., 1998).

This approach to Federal personnel preparation funding was relatively consistent until 1995, when priorities for the grant program resulted in a three-component application that combined funds for related services, early childhood, and training personnel for careers in special education into a single competition. Grants were intended to support training of personnel for both low- and high- incidence disabilities. In making this change, OSEP intended to encourage inter-professional, multidisciplinary approaches to the education of students with disabilities. As detailed in the following section, the IDEA Amendments of 1997 made several major changes to OSEP's support of professional development activities.

Changes in Personnel Preparation Programs

With enactment of the IDEA Amendments of 1997 came both a renewed focus on, and a shift in the approach to, OSEP's support of professional development programs. In amending IDEA, Congress recognized that "an effective educational system now and in the future must promote comprehensive programs of professional development to ensure that the persons responsible for the education or transition of children with disabilities possess the skills and knowledge necessary to address the educational and related needs of those children" (Section 651[a][6][F]).

The amendments combined the 14 discretionary programs previously supported under Part D of IDEA, including the personnel preparation grants to IHEs, into seven authorities under two subparts of Part D, National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities. Support for addressing professional development is now included under both Subpart 1, State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities, and Subpart 2, Coordinated Research, Personnel Preparation, Technical Assistance, Support and Dissemination of Part D. One of the major changes is that under Subpart 1, federally supported personnel training activities that historically have been the domain of IHEs now include SEAs. A competitive application process for the funds is based on a State Improvement Plan (SIP) for special education, which must be included in an application for a State Improvement Grant (SIG). Awards are based on State population, State need, and available resources (Section 655). The types of activities proposed by the State are also a funding consideration.

SIGs are intended to promote systemic reforms that will improve the results for children with disabilities. They must be based on a four-pronged needs analysis that considers "those critical aspects of early intervention, general education, and special education programs (including professional development, based on an assessment of State and local needs) that must be improved to enable children with disabilities to meet the goals established by the State under section 612(a)(16)" (Section 653[b][1]). The SIGs are to be implemented through a partnership that must include the SEA, LEAs, and other State agencies providing services to students with disabilities and include a variety of other stakeholders such as parents of children with disabilities, professional organizations, and IHEs.

A substantial proportion (50-75 percent) of the SIGs must be used to support preservice and inservice professional development activities based on identified needs of States as set forth in the SIP. The Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), also required under IDEA, must be implemented regardless of whether a SIG is awarded. As required previously, the CSPD is to be designed to ensure an adequate supply of qualified special education, regular education, related services, and early intervention personnel; the CSPD can meet the personnel development requirements of the SIG. In fact, "it may serve as the framework for the State's personnel development part of the SIG grant application" (U.S. Department of Education, 1988d).

Since the implementation of these grants with the IDEA Amendments of 1997, States have used SIG funds to:

- Broker changes in IHE preservice and inservice offerings to ensure that special education instruction aligns with new State standards and educational reform efforts;
- Broker changes in IHE preservice and inservice offerings to ensure that general and special education teachers learn to modify and accommodate instructional practices to meet the needs of all students;

- Assist IHEs to expand their capacity to produce special education teachers and early intervention providers;
- Implement career ladders whereby paraprofessionals pursue special education teacher certification;
- Provide stipends, with payback clauses, on a preservice and inservice level to address personnel shortages in LEAs; and
- Develop training systems based on distance learning principles to address personnel shortages.

As noted by Kleinhammer-Tramill et al. (1998), with these changes there has been a **significant shift in the distribution of funding and locus of control over professional development activities from IHEs to the States**. Under the IDEA Amendments of 1997, Part D, Subpart 2, IHEs are still eligible to apply for personnel preparation grants similar to those that have been funded in prior years. Still, significant changes were made to this discretionary program. Personnel preparation grants to IHEs are currently authorized to meet the training needs of: (a) personnel to serve students with low-incidence disabilities; (b) leadership personnel; and (c) personnel to serve students with high-incidence disabilities. A fourth type of grant will address projects of national significance, such as the use of technology to enhance educational results for students with disabilities or the establishment of personnel preparation standards. LEAs and other entities are also eligible to apply for these grants, in addition to IHEs, which now will be expected, based on OSEP priorities, to become active partners with other entities in the delivery of professional development services. In another major change, the IDEA Amendments of 1997 require that students receiving stipend support from a Part D personnel preparation grant must agree to a two-year service commitment for every year for which assistance was received or repay all or part of the assistance.

Future Directions and Prior Results

The changes to the longstanding personnel preparation program as a result of the IDEA Amendments of 1997 represent a new understanding of the importance of how personnel are prepared to work with students with disabilities and acknowledge the important roles played by entities other than IHEs to ensure an adequate supply of quality teachers. In recognition of this shift, OSEP is in the process of expanding its planning and evaluation functions as they relate to personnel preparation. OSEP is establishing a comprehensive planning process for discretionary activities which will use a broad-based group of stakeholders to develop program agendas, including an agenda for professional development (Danielson, 1997). OSEP is also in the process of preparing descriptive historical documentation of its support of professional development activities which can help it shape that agenda. Finally, OSEP will fund a study on unmet needs for high-quality personnel to serve students with disabilities. It will address: (a) shortages in the number and quality of personnel serving students with disabilities; (b) variations in patterns of numerical shortages and quality in the work force; and (c) factors that influence identified variations.

These planned activities also represent a change in OSEP's approach to professional development activities. Despite the fact that Federal special education training grants have been available since 1958 as discussed above, **little information has been collected on the success of the training programs in meeting the overall goals of increasing the quantity and quality of the**

special education workforce. In prior years, State-reported data on the supply (of) and demand (for) special education personnel represented one of the only sources of information on personnel employed and needed to educate students with disabilities. In addition, IHEs that received a Part D training grant were also required to report the number of students "trained" under the grant. Neither data source provided an indication of the adequacy with which individuals were prepared or their quality in meeting the needs of students with disabilities. Only one recent study has evaluated the success of an OSEP-funded personnel preparation endeavor. That study evaluated the use of professional development partnerships (PDP) projects awarded to five sites as a strategy for reform of existing personnel preparation systems (O'Reilly, 1998). Major findings indicated that the partnerships were very successful in building personnel capacity and that specific types of partnerships (i.e., collaborations) showed great promise of systems change and sustainability of project impacts. Three elements necessary for successful partnerships were identified, including broad stakeholder involvement, a respected leader, and a shared mission among partnership participants. The partnerships required under the IDEA Amendments of 1997 for implementation of the SIPs are very similar to the partnerships established by the five PDP projects.

CONCLUSIONS

The Department of Education has focused considerable effort and resources on improving the quality of our Nation's teacher workforce. These efforts are supported and have been encouraged by Congress and by researchers, policy makers, professional organizations, foundations, parents, students, and community members, in recognition that better results for students depend on a better prepared teacher workforce. During public meetings leading up to reauthorization of IDEA, personnel development was a consistent high-priority concern of special education stakeholders. OSEP has been involved in promoting professional development of personnel who work with students with disabilities for the past four decades. In the future, OSEP will continue to support such activities with a slightly different focus that will result in greater involvement of States and local communities in professional development endeavors. This shift has resulted in part from research-based knowledge that has developed from the Federal government's substantial investment into research on teachers and teaching (National Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, 1998) that indicates the critical role of classroom practice in improving student achievement and in part from recognition that IHEs were not always meeting State's personnel needs.

The ability of the Department of Education and OSEP to meet their objectives of a highly trained teacher workforce for our schools will be seriously challenged by a number of conditions. First, an anticipated need to hire more than 2 million teachers over the next decade, due to increasing retirements of an aging workforce and a concomitant enrollment surge, will require a focus on policies that increase both the quality and *quantity* of classroom recruits (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997). Other challenges include an increasing diversity of the student population that is not reflected in the teacher workforce, a robust economy that attracts talented individuals into higher paying employment sectors, an increased emphasis on the use of technology in the provision of educational services, and high-stakes accountability systems which are placing heavier demands on teachers.

With most students with disabilities spending the majority of their school day in a regular classroom (U.S. Department of Education, 1997), issues of ensuring a quality workforce to meet the needs of students with disabilities are compounded. Despite recent efforts to increase the quality of the teacher workforce, general educators receive little or no preparation in addressing

the needs of students with disabilities. OSEP-supported professional development activities are the only federally funded activities that specifically acknowledge this need and encourage grantees to address it.

As reflected in the Department of Education's strategies for developing a highly trained workforce, addressing these challenges will require changes in all stages of personnel preparation, including recruitment, preservice and inservice training, and induction of new teachers into schools. These challenges and the radical shifts in the support of professional development activities resulting from the IDEA Amendments of 1997 suggest that it will be more important than ever to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of Federal efforts to address professional development needs over the next few years.

References

- Association of Teacher Educators. (1991). *Restructuring the education of teachers. Report of the Commission on the Education of Teachers into the 21st Century*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., Bobbitt, S. A., & Terhanian, G. (1998). The shortage of fully certified teachers in special and general education. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 21*, 1-21.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Cohen, C. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. T. (Eds.) (1993). *Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Danielson, L. (July 2, 1997). *Letter to colleagues on discretionary programs of IDEA*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.
- Dozier, T. (1997). *Statement by Terry Dozier, Special Advisor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training, and Lifelong Learning*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Elmore, R. F., Peterson, P. L., & McCarthy, S. J. (1996). *Restructuring in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and school organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ferguson, R., & Ladd, H. F. (1996). How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools. In H. Ladd (Ed.), *Holding schools accountable* (pp. 265-298). Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hawley, W. (1988). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or, why the first and second waves may miss the boat. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*, 416-437.
- Kleinhammer-Tramill, P. J., Gallagher, K. S., & Earley, P. (1998). *Changes in part D of IDEA: An initial analysis of benchmark policy changes and their relationship to the 1997 reauthorization*. Unpublished manuscript.

- National Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. (1998). *Federal research investment and improvement of teaching, 1980-1997*. Seattle: University of Washington, Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- O'Reilly, F. (1998). *Working together: Partnerships and collaborations for systems change: An evaluation of professional development partnerships*. Prepared for the Academy for Educational Development, Washington, DC.
- Pugach, M. C., Barnes, H. L., & Beckum, L. C. (1991). *Changing the practice of teacher education: The role of the knowledge base*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1998a). *FY 1999 annual plan, volume 2*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1998b). *Goals 2000: Reforming education to improve student achievement*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (1998c). *Data Analysis System (Integrated software system)*. Rockville, MD: Westat.
- U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (1998d). *OSEP memorandum 98-4: Guidance related to state program improvement grants to improve education for children with disabilities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1997). *The seven priorities of the U.S. Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

The Alliance Project (#8029K4085) is supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Opinions expressed herein are those of the sources and do not necessarily represent the position of the U.S. Department of Education.