

Interprofessional Action at Many Levels: Implications for Policy and Practice

By Victoria B. Costa, Helen P. Taylor, & Sid Gardner

In 1992, California Senate Bill 1422 called for the review of the requirements for earning and renewing Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials in the state. With this direction, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing engaged in a comprehensive, systematic look at the entire teacher certification structure, from teacher recruitment to preservice preparation (*California's Future*, 1997). An Advisory Panel of 24 appointees was selected for their distinguished records of accomplishments in education. They were charged with four major goals:

Victoria B. Costa is an associate professor, Helen P. Taylor is a professor, and Sid Gardner is director of the Center for Collaboration for Children, all with the Department of Secondary Education, California State University, Fullerton.

1. Improve teacher recruitment, selection, and access to the profession;
2. Establish clear standards for new teacher preparation programs;
3. Increase and improve professional accountability; and
4. Increase and improve professional collaboration and system evaluation.

The Panel's deliberations led to over 100 specific recommendations for reform in teacher credentialing in the State of California. These recommendations were outlined in *California's Future: Highly Quali-*

Interprofessional Action at Many Levels

fied Teachers for All Students. One recommendation of the SB1422 Advisory Panel was that issues of interprofessional development be included in the new standards for both preservice and induction programs for teacher candidates. This recommendation is outlined in General Policy Recommendations 7:

General Policy Recommendation #7: Require Teacher Preparation Programs to Address the Learning Needs of Children and Youth in California: Teachers must be well prepared to address the specific learning needs of California's diverse children and youth. To provide optimal conditions for children to learn, preparation for a teaching credential must include the following: (1) knowledge and understanding of the ability levels, languages, and cultures that children and youth bring to the learning process; (2) a broad base of knowledge and skill in pedagogy, curriculum design, student assessment, instructional planning, and classroom management; (3) effective practical preparation that is well integrated with principles for teaching the subjects authorized by the credential; (4) preparation for instruction in reading, critical thinking, and the classroom uses of technology; and (5) *preparation for the social and environmental conditions that are prevalent in California's K-12 schools.*

The Panel identified specific content areas for addressing the environmental and social contexts of teaching. These areas include "principles and effective methods for forming partnerships with parents and families, and for involving communities in schools; principles of student health, including effective methods for contributing to student health in general school programs; and principles and effective strategies for providing integrated social and educational services" (*California's Future*, 1997, p. 27).

In addition to the identification of specific content to be included, the Panel also specified when such content should be covered within the scope of teacher preparation. This issue is addressed in General Policy Recommendation #8:

General Policy Recommendation #8: Establish Levels of Standards that Ensure the Development of Teaching Competence Over Time: For teacher preparation, induction, and ongoing development to be coherent and effective, each phase must connect and articulate with the other phases. The Commission should adopt distinct standards for Level I and Level II preparation programs in conjunction with each other. Both sets of standards should address a curriculum of initial content and recursive content, supervision, formative assessment, individual support, and reflection on practice.

Specifically, the Panel recommended that interprofessional training and collaboration "should be introduced during professional preparation and re-emphasized during induction where the context of employment is a critical factor" (*California's Future*, 1997, p. 28).

The articles in this issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* explore the implications of these specific recommendations through a thoughtful discussion and analysis of the implications of interprofessional training and collaboration. Authors

represent a diversity of professions and geographical locations: University faculty in education, social work, and child development; public school personnel; and agency professionals from southern and northern California, Washington, Utah, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Voices of teachers, parents, students, and community members are heard throughout the articles. Issues are addressed from the perspectives of a diverse number of populations that are being impacted by the need for a new professional who can effectively collaborate across traditional disciplinary boundaries; new and veteran teachers; new and experienced health and social services professionals; K-12 students, their families, and communities; and university faculty members.

Articles in this issue are organized into three sections: Interprofessional Training and Higher Education, Interprofessional Collaboration in Schools and Communities, and Interprofessional Action and Accreditation Policies. Each article reflects specific competencies sought through interprofessional education and collaboration: (1) an orientation to working in teams, across traditional lines of programs, agencies, disciplines, professions, and communities; (2) an orientation to accountability for results: the outcomes approach; (3) an orientation to customers: students, families, and communities; (4) an orientation to understanding policy as the context for practice; (5) an orientation to recognizing the power of multicultural diversity; and (6) an orientation to changing the system.

Part I, Interprofessional Training and Higher Education, includes five articles on university-based course revisions and program development. In the first of these, Hal A. Lawson presents two frameworks for planning and evaluating school community relationships within the context of interprofessional training programs. Lawson sets the tone for this issue as he argues for a new generation of interprofessional leaders who will possess the moral courage, foresight, conviction, and abilities to effect transformations in real school, real university, and their surrounding communities. This article is followed by discussions of interprofessional education initiatives at four major universities. Michael Knapp, Kathy Barnard, Nathalie Gehrke, and Edward Teather describe the features of an interdepartmental program at the University of Washington and analyze design issues surrounding the creation of appropriate curricula. Patricia Karasoff provides an overview of the Integrated Services Specialist Program at San Francisco State University, demonstrating how the program fills the gap between the training received and skills necessary to work in collaborative service settings. Jacquelyn McCroskey and Peter J. Robertson explore both the challenges and benefits of interprofessional teamwork in "real life" inner city schools and agencies in their evaluation of the University of Southern California Interprofessional Initiative.

Whereas the last three articles focused on graduate education programs, Sylvia Alatorre Alva and Mikyong Kim-Goh review the philosophical framework used to organize a new general education course on the condition of children in Orange

Interprofessional Action at Many Levels

County (California) as part of a plan to prepare undergraduates for interprofessional practice.

The articles in Part II, *Interprofessional Collaboration in Schools and Communities*, focus on school- and community-based projects and issues. D. Jackson Maxwell begins with a discussion of how community partnerships can positively impact school libraries. Thomas J. Buttery and Patricia J. Anderson present a review of the literature on involving parents and families in schools on more than a perfunctory level. Carmen Zuniga Dunlap and Alva extend this discussion in their study of middle school teachers' attitudes towards a successful parent involvement initiative, ultimately raising questions about new teachers' professional socialization. Matt Oppenheim considers parent and community involvement from a different perspective in his ethnographic study of the evolution of the Vaughn Family Center, a parent-run family center. Finally, Katharine Briar-Lawson raises important questions about the impact of welfare reform on interprofessional collaboration efforts to improve educational, health, and family outcomes.

The articles in Part III, *Interprofessional Action and Accreditation Policies*, explore the impact of such programs on the accreditation process for social work and teacher preparation programs. The first reviews accreditation criteria related to interprofessional competencies in the field of social work and presents a case study on an accreditation visit at the University of Southern California. The second article reviews similar competencies in the field of teacher education and presents a case study on an accreditation visit at California State University, Fullerton. Both studies offer implications for policy and practice.

Reference

California's Future: Highly Qualified Teachers for All Students. (1997). The Final Report of the Advisory Panel on Teacher Education, Induction, and Certification for Twenty-First Century Schools (SB 1422). Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.