

NYS Higher Education Support Center for SystemsChange



**A Report on Four Initiatives
from 2002-2003:**

Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grants

Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants

Co-Teaching Project Grants

Partnership Enactment Grants

sponsored by the

**Higher Education Support Center
for SystemsChange**

and the

Task Force on Quality Inclusive Schooling

Peter L. Kozik

Project Assistant
Higher Education Support Center
School of Education
Syracuse University

January, 2004

Executive Summary

The Higher Education Support Center (HESC) prompts and supports New York State colleges and universities in the pursuit of two goals through its Task Force (TF) on Quality Inclusive Schooling:

- to develop and sustain high quality inclusive teacher preparation programs, and
- to engage in and support the professional development efforts of selected high need schools and districts in the seven regions of the state.

In mid-2002-2003, 53 of the nearly 120 institutions in the state with registered teacher preparation programs were TF members. That is, they made commitments to work toward these two goals in their teacher preparation programs and in their regional work with high need schools.

In 2002-2003, the HESC provided the TF and its members a number of initiatives for professional development. The initiatives ranged from planning for co-teaching, to developing partnerships for college and school district collaboration, to examining the use of Universal Design for Learning, to promoting family engagement, among others. This report summarizes four initiatives offered by the HESC and undertaken by the TF and its members:

Initiative #3A Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grants. TF members and their colleagues successfully promoted quality inclusive teacher preparation and collaboration with high needs schools in the seven regions of New York State. Each region set its own goals and designed its approach for the summer action. Five of the seven TF regions participated and were funded through this initiative. (A sixth region participated through a separate initiative.) A total of \$48,494 in awards was distributed, with awards averaging \$9700. Collaborative workshops, action research projects, and regional retreats were among the approaches taken. The result in each case was a stronger region and a more robust sense of efficacy among the regional members.

Initiative #5 Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants. With the support of this initiative Liaisons in the seven RSSC regions of New York State, provided leadership to build and sustained quality inclusive teacher preparation programs and to create successful collaboration with high needs school districts. Liaisons fostered communication among member institutions and with school districts and developed statewide networks and meeting agendas. In addition, Liaisons recruited new members, assessed membership needs, supported the progress toward full inclusive practice in colleges and universities within regions, and strengthened institutional connections with high need schools. The initiative awards provided stipends for the Liaisons, support for institutional faculty and public school personnel for research projects and in-service opportunities, and funds for expanding partnership opportunities, among other functions. A total of \$131,763 was divided among the seven regions, with awards averaging \$18,824.

Initiative #7 Co-Teaching Project Grants. This initiative provided support to TF members to develop and to implement co-teaching activities. With the award, co-teaching occurred within and among departments at institutions, with teachers in high needs districts, and with professionals at museums and educational organizations. A total of \$109,414 was awarded to the 23 co-teaching projects. The average award was \$4,757.

Initiative #8 Partnership Enactment Grants. Implementing successful partnerships with high needs schools in New York State outside the School Improvement Grant process was the focus of this initiative. The initiative provided funding of \$24,229 for five partnership projects. The average award was \$4,846. The enacted partnerships materialized in several forms, ranging from the implementation of professional development schools within schools, to creating connections at different grade levels between classroom teachers and university faculty. All the projects ended with plans for continuing the partnerships.

Table of Contents

Preface

Initiative #3A: Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grants	1
Table 1. Initiative 3A: Regional Task Force – Summer 2003 Action Grant Summary.	4
Initiative #5: Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants	5
Table 2. Initiative #5: Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants	8
Initiative #7: Co-Teaching Project Grants	9
Table 3. Initiative #7: Co-Teaching Projects Summary.....	13
Initiative #8: Partnership Enactment Grants.....	14
Table 4. Partnership Enactment Grants Summary	16

Preface

The Higher Education Support Center (HESC) prompts and supports New York State colleges and universities in the pursuit of two goals through its Task Force (TF) on Quality Inclusive Schooling:

- to develop and sustain high quality inclusive teacher preparation programs, and
- to engage in and support the professional development efforts of selected high need schools and districts in the seven regions of the state.

In mid-2002-2003, 53 of the nearly 120 institutions in the state with registered teacher preparation programs were TF members. That is, they made commitments to work toward these two goals in their teacher preparation programs and in their regional work with high need schools.

Toward these two goals, TF members and institutions designed inclusive teacher preparation programs, through which prospective teachers would learn to teach all learners. They brought contemporary challenges and cutting edge practices into college and university courses and associated K-12 classrooms, developing resources and materials for quality inclusive teacher preparation. They forged connections between the preparation of teachers and the continuing professional development needed for vital and responsive schooling systems. The HESC and the TF worked to build direct and strong links between these oft-separated components of the education enterprise.

The HESC helped create professional development opportunities specifically targeted for teacher educators. These opportunities took the form of independent research, study groups, program presentations, visitations, material reviews, and the testing of innovative practices. The HESC supported the set up of networks of teacher educators in the seven regions of the state, congruent with the seven Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs). Regional Task Force groups facilitated partnerships with regional high needs schools. They provided valuable outside perspectives on the work of schools and teachers. The HESC facilitated relationships with local BOCES units, various staff development networks, and the New York State Education Department.

In 2002-2003, the HESC provided the TF and its members a number of initiatives for professional development. The initiatives ranged from planning for co-teaching, to developing partnerships for college and school district collaboration, to examining the use of Universal Design for Learning, to promoting family engagement, among others. This report summarizes four initiatives offered by the HESC and undertaken by the TF and its members:

- #3A Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grants
- #5 Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants
- #7 Co-Teaching Project Grants
- #8 Partnership Enactment Grants

Initiative #3A: Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grants

Introduction

In support of their work, the HESC offered Initiative #3A: Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grant, funding regional efforts in planning and implementation. The programs provided under this initiative varied depending upon the needs within each of the regions. Institutions in the regions, with the leadership of the TF Liaisons, collaborated, producing programs that included investigating and developing research opportunities, providing in-service on inclusion to institutional and public school personnel, developing teacher preparation case studies, and strengthening professional development for college and university faculty.

Five of the seven TF regions participated and were funded through this initiative. See Table 1. (A sixth region participated through a separate initiative.) A total of \$48,494 in awards was distributed, with awards averaging \$9700. The awards provided stipends for faculty conference presentations and research initiatives, stipends for public school personnel, and reimbursement for costs associated with implementing in-service programs and research opportunities (such as printing, copies for literature reviews, and supplies).

Overview of the Action Grants

The Western Region concentrated on advancing its four-pronged plan for professional development: developing viable field placements, advancing urban education, building and sustaining partnerships, and inducting new teachers in schools. Through a series of small group meetings and large group retreats, the Western Region reviewed its progress in these areas, discussed current activities, and planned and assigned future work to support and advance the region's efforts. As a result of these discussions, the region has designed, developed, implemented, and reported research, strengthened urban, suburban, and rural SIG and non-SIG partnerships, and explored mentoring and other early teaching experiences.

The Mid-West Region chose to focus specifically on encouraging teacher and faculty professional development through implementing a research agenda designed collaboratively by its members. This research was initiated by institutions and by professionals from the Regional School Support Center (RSSC) and the local Special Education Training and Resource Center (SETRC). Areas of research included disproportionality, the roles and responsibilities of

paraprofessionals in inclusive settings, a curriculum audit of local teacher preparation programs, and developing interventions for students at risk of dropping out. Ultimately, discussions that occurred in the Mid-West Region served to advance the region as a viable research community, to coordinate research proposals among several representative groups, and to initiate K-12 professionals into research efforts.

The Hudson Region designed, developed, and implemented a two-day conference examining crucial issues and effective instruction related to quality inclusive education. Sessions provided by institutional faculty as well as RSSC and SETRC personnel included the analysis of assessment data for student performance, classroom management and differentiated instruction, ELA Standards, and collaboration between schools and colleges and universities. In addition, institutions met to share and discuss course syllabi, partnership activities, and successful field experiences as part of the two-day agenda. Forty (40) participants attended the institute representing eight colleges and universities and seven high needs school districts.

The Long Island Region implemented a second annual three-day Summer Institute for special and general education teachers and administrators from five local high needs districts. A total of 34 public school professionals attended the entire three-day institute. Faculty from five regional institutions provided professional development on topics ranging from “Universal Design for Learning,” to “Learning Diversity and Learning Disabilities,” to “Models of Inclusion,” to a forum on mental health. Because administrators as well as teachers and paraprofessionals attended the institute, the likelihood for follow-up on the learning achieved is high.

The Mid-State Region focused on building the infrastructure of the region by connecting colleges and universities with one another and by developing a plan to ensure quality inclusive schooling at its institutions and its partner schools. Six institutions were represented at a day-long meeting whose focus was on four outcomes: clarifying the regional mandates for TF members, providing information about the establishment of inclusive teacher preparation programs, providing information about developing formal and sustainable partnerships with high needs schools, and discussing the functioning and plan the future of the Mid-State Regional Task Force. Issues and challenges in the region as well as ideas for future pursuit and collaboration were discussed.

Although the funding for its work was drawn from a separate Initiative (Initiative #5. Recast Regional Task Force Liaisons), the East Region also undertook a summer action project. Its members participated in learning to use current case study video editing and formatting technology to create case studies for teaching purposes, concentrating on inclusive K-12 classrooms in the region.

General Observations

The programs among the regions participating in the Summer 2003 Action Grants were as varied as the regions themselves. It is fair to say that the colleges and universities in the regions concentrated on: 1) providing learning opportunities for themselves and for partner high needs schools regarding quality inclusive practice or 2) strengthening the support and efforts for institutions with inclusive programs or 3) developing research opportunities among TF members or 4) implementing a combination of these. The awards clearly sparked considerable thinking, reflection, and good work in each of the regions. In the cases of the two institutes and the Mid-West's research emphasis, practitioners from high needs schools were included in the planning and in the implementation of the summer action. In the cases of both institutes, strong formative and summative evaluation components were included in the design and development of the programs. In the cases of the Mid-West and West's research work, the numerous research designs were directly affected by the immediate impact on high needs schools. In the case of the Mid-State's gathering to revitalize and to reinvigorate the shared commitment to quality inclusive teacher preparation in the region, its efforts reflect the groundwork of developing a strong and viable regional identity.

In this second year of funding, the Regional Task Force - Summer Action Grants matured as a program in its design and its implementation. The programs that were implemented were based largely on thorough needs assessments. Regional publicity for these programs became more sophisticated and timely, and the methods of polling members and inviting likely participants reflected a growing confidence among the regions. There was a strong sense of purpose throughout the initiative. Strong evaluation components enhanced faculty's understanding of their program's impact. Increased participation by institutions in delivering professional development and in collaborating on topics to benefit educational research in the different regions was evident. Numerous connections were forged.

Future Considerations

- Because of the work that has been started and continued this year, regional representatives are clearly seeking the continuation of this initiative.

Table 1.
Initiative # 3A: Regional Task Force - Summer 2003 Action Grant Summary

Region	Institution	Liaison	Initiative Focus
Hudson	Marymount at Fordham University	Joan Black	Professional Development Institute
Long Island	New York Institute of Technology	Dolores Burton & Darra Pace	Professional Development Institute
Mid-State	Cazenovia College	Stephanie Leeds	Task Force Planning
Mid-West	Nazareth College	Ann Monroe-Baillargeon	Collaborative Research
West	Buffalo State College	Ida Jean Windell	Task Force Planning

Initiative #5: Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grants

Introduction

It had become evident in 2001-2002, that some of the most important work toward the stated goals of the TF would be best achieved through more-local, rather than statewide, decisions and actions. That year, a regional structure was fashioned to parallel to the state's Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs), such that geographically-closer colleges and universities and high need schools and districts could work more directly and substantively. Regional TF Liaisons were identified and modest fiscal support was provided for their work. The success of their efforts that year, and the clear need for more work in and among colleges and universities led to the development of Initiative #5: Recast Regional TF Liaisons for 2002-2003.

The purpose of this initiative was to develop and support leadership in the persons of the TF Liaisons in each of the seven regions of the state. In each region, selected TF Liaisons would be asked to guide and organize the efforts of the TF, working with regional colleges and universities, the identified high need schools and districts, and other agencies such as the RSSCs, parent organizations, and the Special Education Training and Resource Centers (SETRCs), as they addressed the two goals to which TF member institutions had committed. This regional leadership would build capacity within the region among the various constituencies. It would build capacity with in the larger state education system.

Specific TF Liaisons undertook numerous tasks in empowering and expanding the work of teacher preparation institutions and high needs partner schools. See Table 2. Among the tasks undertaken by these individuals were: fostering communication among all parties relevant to public school student achievement, developing institutional needs assessments, recruiting and supporting area inclusive teacher preparation programs, assisting in communication with NYSED, VESID, the regional TF membership, and developing statewide and regional meeting agendas.

The initiative awards provided stipends for the Liaisons, support for institutional faculty and public school personnel for research initiatives and in-service opportunities, and funds for expanding partnership opportunities, among other functions. A total of \$131,763 was divided among the seven regions, with awards averaging \$18,824, depending on the duration of the Liaison appointment and the region of the state served by the Liaison.

Overview of the TF Liaison Role and Activities

The values of the Recast Regional Liaison Initiative are several. In the first place, the TF Liaison structure is deliberately designed to provide the development of a regional identity. Each of the seven regions, created to parallel the RSSCs, implemented programs that were unique to its area of the state. The Mid-West Region around Rochester built a strong consortium identity with high needs schools while focusing on research efforts such as disproportionality and the use of classroom paraprofessionals. The Western Region around Buffalo focused on advancing its four-pronged action plan for professional development, concentrating on developing worthy field placements, advancing urban education, building and sustaining partnerships, and inducting new teachers into schools. The New York City Region, and the Mid-State Region including Syracuse and Utica, focused on building and strengthening the infrastructure of their regions in the midst of significant institutional and public school changes. The East Region, stretching from the Albany area to north of Watertown, advanced the institutional and public school understanding and application of inclusive practice while continuing to fulfill its mandate for supporting and expanding institutional connections. The Hudson Region, including Yonkers, focused on partnerships between colleges and universities and high needs schools and on strategies for preparing inclusive teachers and for meaningful collaboration.

Secondly, the TF Liaison initiative built capacity. The Liaisons themselves exhibited considerable initiative, strength of purpose, and leadership in fulfilling their duties. From organizing summer institutes for public school partners to facilitating searches for institutional partners by high needs schools, Liaisons served their constituents in timely and thoughtful ways. In the process, they have empowered colleagues through astute problem-solving, continual collaboration among members, and responsive agendas. In several regions, the West and Mid-West in particular, Liaison efforts have translated into viable research initiatives that promise to contribute to the body of knowledge on urban education, disproportionality, and teacher retention.

Third, the TF Liaison initiative helped secure a place for institutions of higher education in partnership with high needs schools. Subtle shifts occurred in the relationships among institutions and SIG and non-SIG schools. The development of a consortium approach to partnerships where individual high needs schools enter into agreements with entire regions of colleges and universities was implemented by the Mid-West and is under consideration in New York City. Through frequent contacts and the nurturing of individual relationships, the Hudson Region has connected colleges and universities to high need schools and has established a strong presence with the RSSC and SETRC. The Long Island Region has specifically targeted high needs schools

for continual professional development opportunities after creating an inventory of local college and university expertise. In creating the means to improve public school students' achievement, the TF Liaisons have helped to ensure strong experiences for their pre-service and masters level students.

Finally, the TF Liaison initiative set the stage of systemic changes at institutions of higher education. The TF has created a springboard for institutional advocacy and the exchange of ideas about institutional governance. As a conduit for information about matters of importance to teacher preparation faculty, the regional liaison structure has begun to engender discussion about faculty service, the design of worthy field placements, and the institutional recognition of quality inclusive practice. The Liaisons served to develop the means for communicating with deans and department chairpersons as well as to contribute to the creation of larger communities of research and shared interest.

General Observations

The TF Liaison structure clearly helped to develop greater communication between and among schools and institutions throughout New York State. In championing quality inclusive practice for its faculty and students, each regional member institution focused its attention on the development of collaborative and sustainable partnerships with high needs schools led by a Liaison dedicated to these goals. Research priorities were advanced. Networks among collaborators were created and maintained.

One meeting was convened, in spring 2003, calling the TF Liaisons together as a group. Liaisons learned from one another about how to fulfill their roles, about innovations undertaken in different regions, and about the efforts of the TF statewide. Communication was enhanced with the HESC as well.

The institution of an enhanced regional TF Liaison during the 2002-2003 academic year made a significant impact on the functioning of the TF. The TF Liaison structure has created a conduit for information and knowledge. It has raised the visibility of the TF within member institutions as well as helped to focus efforts on the TF goals, particularly the development of partnerships. The TF Liaison structure has enhanced collaboration, empowered faculty, and ensured access for colleges and universities to the venue of K-12 decision-making.

Future Considerations

- As has been the case with the statewide meeting agenda, TF Liaisons should be used to help the decision-making process regarding future initiatives.
- Liaison input should be solicited for developing plans beyond the scope of the HESC contract.

- The efforts of Regional Liaisons may be showcased during the statewide meeting or during NYSATE/NYACTE and recognized for their contributions to the TF.
- Liaisons may become part of the renewal of Call for Commitments by the TF in the coming years.
- Liaisons may undertake more active parts in securing Statements of Agreement and negotiating SIG partnerships.
- A method of assuring smooth transitions from Liaison to Liaison in a region should be built into the task list to ensure continuity and allowing different members to lead regions.

Table 2.
Initiative #5: Regional Support and Task Force Liaison Grant Summary

Region	Liaison	Institution
New York City	Marilyn Bartlett	New York Institute of Technology
Hudson	Joan Black	Marymount at Fordham University
Long Island	Dolores Burton & Darra Pace	Hofstra University
Mid-State	Stephanie Leeds	Cazenovia College
Mid-West	Ann Monroe-Baillargeon	Nazareth College
East	Theresa Ward	The College of St.Rose
Western	Ida Jean Windell	Buffalo State College

Initiative #7: Co-Teaching Project Grants

Introduction

Among several initiatives offered through the HESC for the 2002-2003 funding cycle was Initiative #7: Co-Teaching Projects. The initiative's purpose was to support the development of capacity in teacher educators, their arts and science campus colleagues, and their colleagues in field settings, to better serve all learners. That includes coming to understand better their different teaching roles and experiences, and learning to appreciate each others' contribution to fully inclusive classrooms and schools. Co-teaching provides a venue in which professors and teachers can collaborate toward these ends, and can build inclusive teacher preparation courses, experiences, and programs. Projects could be undertaken at any level: early childhood, childhood, middle childhood, and/or adolescent levels.

Faculty at TF institutions chose to collaborate with colleagues from the same or a different department, division, or institution or to collaborate with a colleague from a high needs school either within the school or for a teacher preparation course. See Table 3. Twenty-seven (27) project proposals were received and considered; 23 were funded. Of the funded projects, 13 implemented co-teaching models between colleagues at the college level; 8 projects focused on co-teaching relationships between K-12 practitioners and college faculty; 2 projects enacted co-teaching models with local museums (one focused on science instruction, the other on art).

A total of \$109,414 was awarded to the 23 co-teaching projects. The average award was \$4,757. The awards were issued by subcontract only to institutions participating in the TF.

Overview of the Co-Teaching Projects

The experience of co-teaching proved to be overwhelmingly positive. Faculty reported significant impact on the delivery of course content, curricular changes at the college or university and K-12 levels, and largely impressive gains in attitude and confidence among their undergraduate and graduate students. Several reported changes in perspectives among other faculty and at institutions. All of them reported that their own teaching had been enriched by the experience of co-teaching with colleague from either a college or K-12 setting. Faculty who worked with K-12 practitioners reported the benefit of better understanding the perspectives of current in-service teachers.

Projects ran the gamut from co-teaching opportunities in gifted education and bi-lingual science education to literacy and inclusive math instruction. Practitioners focused on authentic assessment, cultural relevance, medical issues among students with special needs, classroom management strategies, and generating case studies in secondary inclusion and in rural schools. Faculty used co-teaching grants to advance inclusion as a priority in their own institutions and to solidify the placement of their student teachers in high needs schools. Student teachers in general education and in inclusive education settings were affected by the work as were children in elementary and middle public school programs.

Every project sought the goal of improving instruction for all learners. Sixteen (16) projects combined the talents and expertise of a special educator and general educator directly in the classroom. Eight (8) projects were implemented at the graduate level or in combination with graduate training; 15 were aimed solely at the undergraduate level. Two (2) projects specifically raised the profile of bi-lingual education and cultural awareness and efficacy.

The research interests of faculty at member institutions were advanced. Among other interests, faculty examined the dispositions necessary for effective co-teaching and the viability of various co-teaching arrangements. They also analyzed student teacher engagement in inclusive high needs settings, developed rubrics for successful co-teaching activities, and created several self assessments and teaching evaluations based on models of co-teaching. Several projects described presentations that had occurred or had been planned for at conferences for the National Education Association, the Northeastern Educational Association, the International Reading Association, and the New York State Reading Association among others. Several faculty members have manuscripts in process as a result of co-teaching projects.

On the level of institutional change, the co-teaching initiative advanced the necessity and practicability of inclusive schooling. Faculty either had instituted or sought new arrangements with institutions to create teaching loads that allowed for the exchange of talents and ideas in co-taught experiences. Faculty used the grants to advance their planning with colleagues, to revise syllabi, to develop course handbooks, to implement teaching modules to share with other faculty, and to justify and pilot innovative practice. Several projects integrated course content for greater organization and cohesion in future teaching experiences. At least two institutions have advanced co-teaching opportunities with their student teachers to the point of sending them into their field experiences in pairs. As a result of the co-teaching grant opportunities, the seeds for institutional change have been planted.

On the level of partnership with high needs schools, inroads were made. Of the eight projects that involved K-12 partnerships, five took place on-site at the public school; three involved a teacher co-teaching pre-service students with a professor at an institution. Also, one of the two grants supporting museum partnerships involved work directly with elementary school students. Co-taught topics included literacy and cultural literacy, classroom management, inclusive education strategies, and educational theory. The grants also supported the continued development by some institutions of professional development schools within schools.

The success of these co-teaching projects was measured using various means. Several projects measured student and teacher attitudes through pre and post testing techniques. Some projects, through journaling activities, engaged practitioners at deeply reflective levels. Students in high need schools who were tutored as part of co-teaching were pre and post tested and exhibited gains. Learning and satisfaction were documented through team meetings, interviews, surveys, and course evaluations.

General Observations

The majority of projects took place at the institutional level. As co-teaching was initiated, faculty frequently examined themselves as practitioners and their own teaching first. Many faculty members remarked about the value of modeling co-teaching for their students. Likewise, faculty modeled the process of life-long learning by professionally taking risks to advance their teaching and the intellectual life of their institutions. When partnered with a public school, institutional faculty found the experience powerful, informing their own practice while emphasizing practical applications in the college or professional development classroom. In all cases, the collaborative nature of co-teaching created new understandings and new connections.

Co-teaching methods were broad and varied. In every case, faculty participated in the experience themselves. Twelve projects continued the work begun under the “Seeds for Co-Teaching” grant in the 2002 academic year. Sixteen projects included expressed concrete plans to continue active co-teaching at their institutions or with their partners. Several have modified their original proposals and submitted requests for funding under the auspices of this or other initiatives offered by HESC. In particular, seven of the eight high needs school partnership projects will continue into the next academic year. One project mentioned extending the co-teaching effort to include school administration.

The “institutionalization” of co-teaching and, by extension, of inclusive educational practice, is an arduous process. The timing of the Task Force’s work as institutions prepared for and underwent processes of accreditation under

different agencies proved both blessing and curse. Experimenting with co-teaching provided important data for inclusive programming and launched discussions about collaboration and integrated study. Responsibilities for coordinating co-teaching experiences in addition to participating in accreditation were daunting. Among other considerations, the Task Force as it matures should focus on building capacity at institutions and through partnerships. Finally, the final reports were uneven because practitioners were still becoming skillful at using the web site and its reporting format.

Future Considerations

- TF member institutions should consider working together to better “institutionalize” inclusive practice by advocating for credit for faculty for service in partner schools for building capacity.
- TF member institutions should consider advocating for and developing institutional arrangements that encourage and promote time in schools and time with colleagues for planning and for building capacity.
- TF efforts should be extended to Schools of Leadership at participating institutions with specific initiatives aimed at administrators.
- TF efforts through the HESC should be targeted specifically at secondary and middle schools, which were thinly represented among the co-teaching projects.
- The HESC should consider continuing to support co-teaching initiatives at similar funding levels.
- The HESC should continue to increase the visibility of the co-teaching initiatives with deans and chair-people at schools and departments of education at TF member institutions.
- Upon phasing out the “Seeds for Co-Teaching” initiative, the HESC should consider incorporating additional financial support in the grant structure for planning.
- Follow-up support even of lesser magnitude should be considered for faculty continuing their co-teaching efforts.
- Although follow-up has been proposed in several cases, electronic connectivity between partners should be further explored and utilized.

Table 3.
Initiative #7: Co-Teaching Projects Summary

Lead Applicant	IHE	Partner Institution	Focus	1	2	3	4
Bromley	Binghamton University	Johnson City M.S.	Literacy			X	
Burke	St. Joseph's College	St. Joseph's College	4 th Grade Science		X		
Burton	New York Institute of Technology	Hofstra University	Mathematics		X		
Domaracki	SUNY Albany	SUNY Albany	Reading		X		
Foote	Niagara University	Niagara University	Management and Motivation		X		
Jarzab	Utica College	Utica College	Strategies and Related Service		X		
Knapp	Nyack College	Nyack College	Literacy		X		
Knapp	Nyack College	Mt. Vernon CSD	Giftedness and Diversity	X			
Lava	Long Island University-Queens	P.S. 372	Strategies	X			
Leeds	Cazenovia College	Belleview School, SCSD	Classroom Management			X	
Leeds	Cazenovia College	Belleview School, SCSD	Strategies			X	
Maheady	SUNY Fredonia	Dunkirk CSD	Contemporary Education	X			
McCarthy	Daemen College	Daemen College	Inclusive Methods		X		
Monroe-Baillargeon	Nazareth College	Arkport CSD	Inclusive Education in Rural Schools	X			
Monroe-Baillargeon	Nazareth College	Rochester Museum of Science	Science Education				X
Murray	SUNY Brockport	SUNY Brockport	Medical Issues in Special Education		X		
Raymond	SUNY Potsdam	SUNY Potsdam	Mathematics and Childhood Education		X		
Salmon	SUNY Geneseo	SUNY Geneseo	Integrated Education		X		
Schmidt	LeMoyne College	Elmwood Elementary, SCSD	Home-School Connections and Literacy			X	
Schwartz	Hofstra University	Queens Museum of Art/District 75	Art Education				X
Silliman	Cazenovia College	Cazenovia College	Education Theory		X		
Torres-Guzman	Columbia Teachers College	Columbia Teachers College	Bi-Lingual Science Education		X		
Whittaker	SUNY New Paltz	SUNY New Paltz	Secondary Education		X		

Key: 1. LEA partner to teach at the college 2. College faculty to co-teach 3. College faculty to teach in high needs school 4. Other

Initiative #8: Partnership Enactment Grants

Introduction

Among several initiatives offered through the HESC in the 2002-2003 funding cycle, was Initiative #8: Partnership Enactment Grants. The purpose of the initiative was to support new partnerships for inclusive practice between TF member institutions and high needs K-12 schools that were not participating in a NYS School Improvement Grant (SIG). Suggested options for developing partnerships included opportunities for partners to create field work classrooms within high needs schools, for implementing professional development for pre-service and practicing teachers, or for developing action research projects involving pre-service and practicing teachers.

The initiative provided funding of \$24,229 for five partnership projects. See Table 4. The average award was \$4,846. The awards were issued by subcontract only to institutions participating in the TF. The enacted partnerships materialized in several forms, ranging from the implementation of professional development schools within schools to creating connections at different grade levels between classroom teachers and university faculty. All the projects ended with plans for continuing the partnerships.

Overview of the Partnership Enactment Grant Projects

All five projects reported positive outcomes, remarking the excitement experienced by both faculty and K-12 teachers involved in the various activities. Importantly, each project effectively combined the needs of teacher preparation programs for advancing student teacher placements with K-12 needs for improving local student achievement. Two projects represented active attempts to establish Professional Development Schools (Leeds; Zoeckler) within urban school settings. Pre-service placement opportunities and continued learning were combined with in-service work among faculty at Bellevue School in the Syracuse City School District (Leeds). Students were connected with a tutoring effort at Donovan Middle School in the Utica City District (Zoeckler) and received their course training at the school while planning interventions alongside AIS staff in English and mathematics.

Two projects focused on the early implementation of inclusive practice in partner schools (Lawrence-Brown; Ward). In an action research project, St. Bonaventure University combined with Jamestown City District to survey, analyze, and consolidate efforts at inclusive practice at Ring Elementary School (Lawrence-Brown). Faculty and elementary teachers designed a survey

instrument together as well as analyzed the results, and discussed implications. Dr. Theresa Ward from the College of St. Rose led efforts in the East Region among three widely diverse school districts, Schenectady, Hudson, and Lansingburg to develop inclusive practice at the elementary and middle school levels. Trained in FUSE (Florida Uniting Students in Education), institutional and district educators were partnered for continual support and program development with a common vision and shared language of inclusive practice.

One project focused efforts at the Early Childhood level (Ensher) attempting to develop opportunities for graduate program special educators to be exposed to a range of student needs, home environments, and related service providers. Graduate students in the North Syracuse School District assessed pre-K individuals, developed reports, and participated in pre-school meetings with parents and other professional educators.

General Observations

The projects undertaken for Initiative #8: Partnership Enactment Grants represented a varied approach in establishing partnerships between colleges and universities and high needs schools. In particular, inroads developed with Professional Development Schools have proven successful. In each case, the sustainability of the partnership was critically important, and each project sought to establish a lasting presence in the school where the partnership was implemented. The long-term pairing of college and school district teachers, the collaborative process of action research, pre-service and in-service professional development delivered on-site, and the grounding of teaching experiences in active practice all served to begin to build capacity in the institutions and in school buildings. For each of these participants, the effort represented an initial foray into partnership activities, although two projects (Lawrence-Brown; Zoeckler) flourished as a result of Partnership Exploration Awards in 2002. Several projects remarked the need for on-going evaluation of their impact on student achievement and will be seeking funds to initiate the gathering of this and other data.

These partnerships exist now in precarious states. As much as the initial flush of excitement about partnership activities has carried practitioners a long way toward active and fruitful collaboration, the continued presence and perseverance of college personnel will make a difference for the sustainability of change. In at least one case (Lawrence-Brown with Jamestown) a second college has joined the collaboration and can work alongside the other practitioners already involved. In the case of another partnership (Leeds with Bellevue), the careful use of co-teaching awards from HESC and the development of teaching talent within the school building has assured a strong presence for the college in the partnership.

Future Considerations

- As is true with co-teaching awards, partnerships provide the opportunity for institutions to consider building capacity by advocating for credit for “service” among faculty at high needs schools.
- Partnership arrangements, professional development schools, and college-district collaboration should be recognized as equal to clinical practice in other professions for the purposes of merit and tenure.
- Reducing course load and creating alternative means of providing for faculty efforts engaging in partnerships should be considered.
- More collaborative models at the middle school and secondary levels should be explored, designed and developed.
- Follow-up support for continued implementation, for evaluation, and for dissemination of project results should be considered.
- Partnerships provide opportunities for higher visibility within institutions as well as in the media.
- Developing an electronic conduit via the HESC web site for partners to connect should be developed.

Table 4.
Initiative #8: Partnership Enactment Grants Summary

Applicant	Region	Institution	Partner	Focus
Ensher	Mid-State	Syracuse University	North Syracuse CPSE	Early Childhood Services
Lawrence-Brown	Western	St. Bonaventure University	Jamestown City SD	Research on Beginning Inclusion
Leeds	Mid-State	Cazenovia College	Bellevue Elementary, Syracuse City SD	Professional Development School
Ward	East	College of St. Rose	Schenectady City SD, Hudson CSD, Lansingburg CSD	Training for Inclusion
Zoeckler	Mid-State	Utica College	Utica City SD	Professional Development School