

Accreditation: A Plus or Minus for Interprofessional Education?

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

In order to staff the interprofessional service models now common in our public schools, universities have created interprofessional education programs for educators and health and social service professionals. Curriculum typically includes collaborative projects across professions as well as training in the new skills required within each profession. Some interprofessional education proponents, however, have argued that accreditation requirements limit curriculum and program revisions (Lawson, 1996). This paper examines how national and state accreditation requirements constrain and/or support the inclusion of interprofessional competencies in teacher education programs.

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.

The following case study begins with an explanation of the teacher education accreditation process in the state of California. It includes a historical perspective of an interprofessional program at a major state university, providing information regarding its governance, funding, and program features. It tracks the accreditation process for five departments comprising the Division of Education in the School of Human Development and Community Service at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), including document writing, planning and preparation, the visitation, and outcomes.

These elements and subsequent accreditation documents are then analyzed to determine what impact the accreditation had on the interprofessional education program at university, school, and department levels. Finally, reviewed are strategies for successful accreditation of teacher education programs that include interprofessional competencies. Implications for teacher education accreditation policy are also discussed.

The California Accreditation Process

Teacher education programs in the state of California are accredited in a five-year cycle by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). All teacher education programs are required to meet accreditation standards, including programs offering credentials for multiple subjects (certifying teachers of self-contained classrooms in grades K-12), single subject (certifying teachers of secondary classrooms [7-12] in specific subject matter areas), special education, reading specialists, and educational administration. At CSUF, these programs are housed in the four departments in the School of Human Development and Community Service: Elementary, Bilingual, and Reading Education; Secondary Education;¹ Special Education; and Educational Administration (combined, these departments make up the Division of Education).

Currently, teacher education programs in 72 California institutions are CTC-accredited. The accreditation process includes lengthy documentation of adherence to 32 standards in five categories: institutional resources and coordination, admission and student services, curriculum, field experiences, and candidates' competence and performance. In addition, schools must meet thirteen preconditions regarding university accreditation status, personnel practices, limitations on program length, and student enrollment. Additional materials are required for programs that offer Internship, Cross-Cultural Language Academic Development, and Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD)² certificates and credentials.

The accreditation process is similar across the state: A three-day visit to the university is scheduled six months in advance (November 4-8, 1995, for this particular visit). Accreditation team members are chosen by the Commission and names are forwarded to each program or department so that materials may be mailed for advanced review. During the three-day on-site visit, team members interview university, school, and department administrators, program staff, full- and part-time faculty, current students, alumni, and cooperating districts' faculty (master teachers) and administrators. The visit ends with a presentation of strengths and recommendations to program faculty, which are formally documented for future reference. As with any accreditation visit in this field, there are three possible outcomes: Each program may be fully approved, approved with conditions, or not approved.

In addition to state accreditation, California universities may also elect to

undergo accreditation by the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE is the sole accrediting agency for teacher education programs in states that do not offer their own accreditation agency. It also serves as a second accrediting agency for programs that have met their state requirements and want additional commendation.

The national accreditation process provides many benefits: It is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and endorsed by key education leaders. NCATE responds to the public's expectation that colleges of education be nationally accredited and meet rigorous standards. NCATE accreditation is an essential component in the profession's newly emerging quality assurance system. Accreditation by NCATE provides comparison to a national standard of excellence in teacher education and provides accredited institutions with access to a national public information network.

NCATE accreditation also allows teacher education programs additional visibility within the university. NCATE is committed to enhancing the quality of teacher education programs, holding them accountable for the essential elements of contemporary teacher preparation, including infusing the research and knowledge base for effective teaching into teacher education curricula, advancing technology in teacher preparation programs, promoting diversity in policies, practices, and programs, and emphasizing school district collaboration. Because of this emphasis, teacher education programs are able to leverage for additional support within the university.

In spite of these benefits, only thirteen of the 72 state-accredited teacher education programs in California (18 percent) were NCATE-accredited in 1996.³ Like the CTC process, this accreditation occurs in a five-year cycle (after initial accreditation). Required documents include a 25-page response to 20 standards in four categories: Design of professional education, candidates in professional education, professional education faculty, and the unit for professional education. Unlike the CTC accreditation, where each teacher education program is independently evaluated and accredited, NCATE evaluates all credentialed programs as a single unit. At CSUF, the professional unit is the School of Human Development and Community Service (HDCS).⁴

The NCATE Board of Examiners five-member team usually includes a team leader, three university teacher education faculty members, and a National Education Association (NEA) representative. These team members, as do the CTC team members, must undergo an extensive training process in order to qualify as reviewers. They may also serve as accreditation consultants for other universities. For the CSUF 1995 visit, all team members were from outside California. Additional NEA and American Federation of Teachers representatives and a CTC state consultant served as observers.

HDCS selected the option of concurrently scheduling the NCATE and CTC visits. Members from both teams jointly conducted interviews and attended site visits. Unlike CTC, however, the NCATE visit does not end with a presentation of

findings to faculty. Instead, an exit interview is scheduled with the Dean or head of the professional unit. Within 30 days, the professional unit receives an NCATE Board of Examiners Report, detailing findings for each category of standards. There are two possible outcomes of NCATE accreditation: continuing accreditation or accreditation with probation. The formal document identifies program "weaknesses" which must be addressed by the next accreditation visit. In addition, team members may also identify "exemplary practices" of the professional unit. In 1995, the School of HDCS received continuing accreditation.

The next section details the 1995 CTC and NCATE accreditation visits at CSUF. It focuses on elements related to the inclusion of interprofessional training in the secondary education teacher credential program, in particular, and across the school and university, in general. The section begins with a discussion of the antecedents of the Interprofessional Training Program, as well as its inception and implementation.

Historical Perspective on Interprofessional Education

HDCS has always emphasized addressing the needs of children, youth, and families. The departments and programs of child development, human services, nursing, counseling, elementary education, secondary education, special education, educational administration, kinesiology, and reading have trained professionals in the helping professions for over 50 years. In 1991, the school strengthened this mission by establishing a Center for Collaboration for Children. The Center was designed to strength the ability of professionals to design and implement a more holistic approach to serving children and adolescents. The major premise underlying the work of Center staff is that health and social services in the state may be positively affected by improving the ways in which the university system educates more than 10,000 professionals who graduate each year and begin their work with children and families.

The Center is staffed by a full-time director, Sid Gardner, and an administrative assistant, as well as university faculty who serve as Center "Fellows." The Center supports interprofessional activities across the university as well as system-wide. For example, the Center has supported several statewide conferences on interprofessional education, both within the California State University system, as well as across all universities.

One product of Center faculty collaboration is the undergraduate "Collaborative Services" seminar offered to students across departments in HDCS and the Division of Political Science and Criminal Justice. As part of their discipline-specific course requirements, students in the fields of nursing, education, human services, child development, and criminal justice meet monthly to learn about each others' roles. They engage in collaborative projects, including the design of a community-based, integrated services model. A newly approved masters degree in

Interdisciplinary Studies with an emphasis in Integrated Services has also been instituted. Interested graduate students may complete two courses in the design, implementation, and evaluation of integrated services models. To date, 36 graduate students have completed these courses.

In the last two years, Center fellows have become active in Orange County Healthy Start Initiatives. A 16-hour institute during the summer of 1995 provided specialized training in project design and implementation to districts with Healthy Start planning and operational grants. For the past two years, the Center has also offered an early proposal review to Orange County Healthy Start applicants. A summer 1996 Institute emphasized the development and implementation of program outcomes and included community, city, and state agency personnel.

The Interprofessional Training Program

In the Summer of 1993, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dean of HDCS, Coordinator of Secondary Education, and Superintendent of Anaheim Union High School District attended a Teach America Conference (sponsored by the American Association for State Colleges and Universities) and outlined a plan to establish a "second generation" professional development center. They envisioned a model similar to that of the Secondary Education Professional Development Centers, which focus on four major goals: preparing prospective teachers, providing professional growth opportunities for secondary school educators and university faculty, and enhancing secondary student learning. The Interprofessional Training Program (ITP) would accomplish three additional goals: prepare secondary teachers (both preservice and practicing) to work in schools with integrated services; provide a school-based field experiences for health and social services interns from the programs of nursing, human services, criminal justice, child development, counseling, and public administration; and improve the delivery of services to secondary students. In 1993, the Department of Secondary Education recruited a new faculty member who became the Director of the Anaheim Professional Development Center. This PDC is a collaboration with the Anaheim Union High School District (AUHSD) and one of three teacher training centers in the Secondary Education program). It was decided to house the ITP in this PDC because of Anaheim's commitment to interprofessional collaboration.

Governance and Funding

The ITP is jointly coordinated by university faculty members in the Department of Secondary Education and the AUHSD superintendent. A broad-based Advisory Council of university faculty and administrators (including the President of the University and the Director of the Center for Collaboration for Children), district teachers, administrators, specialists, agency representatives, and community members model collaboration and oversee the program. Funding for graduate

Accreditation

student assistants, faculty release time, and travel for program dissemination has been both external and internal, with support coming from the Center, the Dean's Office, the Department of Secondary Education, and university intramural programs.

Program Features

The ITP has two major components: (1) a school-based field experience for health and social services preprofessionals and (2) revisions in the prerequisite and first semester coursework of the teacher education program designed to increase candidates' interprofessional skills and understanding.

Preparing Health and Social Services Preprofessionals. The ITP provides intern experiences for undergraduate and graduate students pursuing careers in the fields of human development and community services. Intern placements are offered at both the junior high and high school levels. Selected interns serve as counseling assistants; subject matter, English, and reading tutors; nursing interns; and school or district administrative assistants. Placements are coordinated by the director, school principals, and, as necessary, a supervisor who is appropriately credentialed (i.e., a school nurse or counselor). Faculty also meet with students in discipline-specific seminars. Internships begin with two weeks of guided observations of classroom instruction and school offices, attendance at Student Intervention Team meetings, and review of student cumulative file reviews. At the end of this two-week period, interns are given specific responsibilities to complete their 60- or 120-hour internship. The school-based field experience allows interns to develop and implement interventions, practice collaboration with classroom teachers, and document their experiences.

Preparing Preservice Teachers. To facilitate preservice teachers' increased awareness of services available to students, the means through which teachers might access them, and strategies for the identification of and intervention with at-risk students, a new emphasis was added in our prerequisite undergraduate course entitled Adolescence. Coursework now focuses on at-risk students and their families. One major paper assignment requires visits to and the analysis of three community agencies (including a visit to the county child protection agency,⁵ which is structured as a class field trip). Students analyze these agencies in light of four major context of adolescent lives (family, peers, school, and work) and psychosocial problems adolescents may encounter.

Also instituted were 14 hours of seminar during the first week of the first semester of our field-based program and additional field observation requirements that focus on issues of interprofessional collaboration and at-risk student populations. During the first ten weeks of the semester, students receive specialized instruction on how to identify, refer, support, and follow up on students at risk for not achieving academic success. They meet with district and community specialists and explore topics including drug use, prevention, and intervention; gang involvement prevention and intervention; building resiliency in students; how to make

student referrals to Student Intervention Teams; characteristics of district students; and what academic, medical, and social services are available to students and their families. Traditional teacher education topics, including learning objectives, classroom management, lesson and unit planning, cooperative learning, effective lectures and use of media, student evaluation and assessment, and developing a teaching portfolio, are also covered in detail. Program revisions built upon a major strength of the Professional Development Center model in place in the district since 1972: making use of mentor teachers and district specialists to make presentations on these issues so as to model the real world. As a result, the main text for the course is the real world of students and their classrooms, schools, and communities.

The Accreditation Visit

Planning for the accreditation visit occurred under the direction of the Associate Dean of Accreditation and Review of the HDCS. Preparation was extensive, involving the development of over 1,000 pages of responses (including both self-studies and delineation of features for each individual program) as well as eight file drawers of program materials and evaluation data. An Accreditation Committee, including representatives from each program, met monthly throughout the year preceding the visit, then weekly as the visit neared.

Accreditation Documents and Files

Preparation began 18 months in advance with the writing of the accreditation documents. Faculty members in each program were given the task of organizing necessary documentation and writing the response to CTC standards, which were organized in notebooks by program (Multiple Subjects, Single Subject, Special Education, Reading, and Educational Administration). A full professor in the Division of Education was assigned the composing of the 25-page NCATE response. To assist her in compiling this extensive information, each department was asked to submit individual program responses, which were then blended into one major document. Three division-wide retreats provided time for faculty to review and discuss accreditation issues and program materials.

In the Department of Secondary Education,⁶ both the CTC document and the NCATE program response were written by an assistant professor who also happened to be the director of the ITP. The completed documents were based on the *1994-1995 Single Subject Credential Handbook*, course syllabi, and previous accreditation documents. Department faculty discussed the standards and responses in bimonthly department meetings.

Surprisingly, however, neither document emphasized the ITP. The NCATE document referred only to the Center's newly-developed graduate courses on interprofessional collaboration. The CTC Secondary Education document included no reference to interprofessional training at all. Although this seems a glaring

Accreditation

omission, it reflected department politics. Some faculty rejected an emphasis on interprofessional competencies, voicing strongly that only traditional teacher education components be included in our curriculum. As a result, the Anaheim PDC emphasis on addressing student diversity through interprofessional collaboration was downplayed in both documents.

Information on the ITP was, however, included in the Secondary Education appended materials. General information was provided in a file for the Anaheim PDC under Category IV, Field Experiences. A notebook of advisory council minutes, memoranda, program brochures and handouts, and dissemination materials was also available in the Document Room, as was a large display on program features.

Scheduling and Conducting the Accreditation Visit

To prepare for her leadership role, the Associate Dean attended a 40-hour NCATE training session in Washington, D.C., in November 1994 (one year prior to the visit). Presenters at this training seminar emphasized showcasing the "best programs" and "exemplary practices" of the university. The ITP came immediately to mind of the Associate Dean:

At that time, I had no doubt in my mind that the foremost innovative practice of the Division of Education was the Interprofessional Training Program. ITP had established interdisciplinary collaboration between secondary education and human services disciplines, contributed to collaboration that called attention to the needs of students and families at risk, and developed in student teachers an increased sensitivity of needs of at-risk students as well as strengthened their ability to assist such students in becoming successful learners. (Associate Dean of Accreditation and Review)

To showcase ITP, the Associate Dean scheduled opportunities for accreditation team members to learn about the Center for Collaboration and interprofessional education efforts. A meeting with the Director of the Center and involved education faculty was scheduled with team members, and a large display on ITP (along with other externally-funded secondary education programs) and ITP brochures allowed team members not able to visit the Anaheim PDC to review the program in the documents room.

In addition to these efforts, a visit to the Anaheim PDC included interviews of district faculty involved in the interprofessional training component. Team members traveled by car to visit the Anaheim PDC, housed in the district offices. Driven by the PDC Coordinator, two NCATE team members and one CTC team member arrived at the district early in the morning. During the visit, team members met with the District Resident Instructor (the district staff member who facilitates student teacher placements and assists with the seminar) and interviewed district and site administrators, including the Superintendent and the founding principal, who housed the health and social service interns for two years, master teachers, general pedagogy and ITP seminar presenters, including the district social worker and Gang

Enforcement Unit Coordinator, and CSUF graduates now teaching in the district.

Accreditation Results

Results of the accreditation visits were impressive, both in general and with respect to interprofessional training. NCATE identified the ITP as an "exemplary practice." Such a recognition is reserved for those practices that are

...so outstanding that other institutions may wish to emulate them; they are those activities which may be viewed as progressive, innovative, implemented in an exceptional fashion, and/or outcomes that are much better than at other sites. They substantially exceed the expectations of the NCATE standards in implementation and/or outcomes. (*Board of Examiners Training Manual*, 1996, p. 5)

Team members are directed to explain why the practice cited is outstanding. The citation explained that:

The Anaheim Professional Development Center successfully brings together unit faculty, academic department faculty, the Center for Collaboration for Children and others in an integrated services model, providing learning opportunities for entering professionals from multiple fields. (NCATE Report on CSUF, 1995, p. 14)

When asked how the team arrived at the decision to cite ITP as an exemplary practice, the Team Chair commented:

I recall the team's positive discussions and our unanimous vote to identify the ITP as an exemplary practice. This decision represents a very serious national honor since teams are instructed to only report as "exemplary" those practices, which may serve as national models.

ITP was also identified as a "strength" by the CTC. Program "strengths" are identified by CTC as features that "fortify programs beyond those standards identified in state requirements" (CTC Document, 1996). The Interprofessional Training Program was recognized for:

...provid[ing] a highly commendable model for teacher preparation in integrated services. (CTC Report on CSUF, 1995, p. 4)

Reflecting on the Accreditation

The recognition by NCATE and CTC accreditation teams of the interprofessional efforts and success was due largely to the Associate Dean, Center Director, and ITP Director. Effective planning and scheduling by these three individuals ensured that accreditation team members were informed of interprofessional education and collaboration efforts. The face-to-face meetings with the Director of the Center for Collaboration for Children and district school personnel allowed team members to see the commitment to interprofessional collaboration; materials allowed team members to review program features; and interviews of student participants allowed for candid feedback about the program. In addition to these

activities, four other strategies are important for insuring a positive accreditation visit with respect to interprofessional education:

1. *Include Interprofessional Education and Collaboration Activities in Accreditation Documents.* Accreditation could have been made even more positive by carefully integrating the components of interprofessional education in to the yearly AACTE/NCATE Reports, the NCATE accreditation document, and the CTC Standards Report. Although neither the 1995 NCATE or CTC guidelines specifically requested information on interprofessional education, many CTC standards contain elements that relate to interprofessional competencies. For example, interprofessional competencies should have been included under CTC Standard 14 (Orientation to Human Development and Equity). This standard requires teacher candidates "to be oriented to common traits and individual differences that characterize adolescents during several periods of development." Better knowledge of and skills in interprofessional practice would allow teachers to assist adolescents and families in need of health and social services. This standard also requires that teacher candidates "examine principles of educational equity and analyze the implementation of those principles in curriculum content and instructional practices." The ability to identify, refer, support, and follow up on students at risk for academic success is an interprofessional skill that promotes educational equity in that it may give all students the opportunity to be successful in school.

Other CTC Standards under which interprofessional skills and knowledge should be included are Standards 1 (Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination), 8 (Admission of Candidates: Preprofessional Qualifications), 13 (Development of Professional Perspectives), 15 (Preparation for Multicultural Education), 25 (Student Motivation, Involvement, and Conduct), 27 (Student Diagnosis, Achievement, and Evaluation), and 30 (Capacity to Teach Diverse Students).⁷

NCATE Standards also include elements that are related to interprofessional practice and collaboration. Most specifically, Standard I.D (Professional and Pedagogical Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation) would be an excellent standard under which to highlight interprofessional competencies. This standard requires the program "to ensure that teacher candidates acquire and learn to apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to become competent *with all students*." Other NCATE standards under which interprofessional skills and knowledge could have been documented are Standard I.A: Conceptual Framework(s), Standard I.F: Advanced Professional Studies (where the two graduate courses on the design, implementation, and evaluation of integrated services models were outlined), Standard I.H: Quality of Field Experiences, Standard I.I: Professional Community, Standard III.D: Professional Development of Faculty.⁸

2. *Provide Accreditation Team Members with Information.* Schedule ample opportunity for team members to talk with all involved parties—including university faculty and administrators, district and community agency personnel, student participants, and if possible, even the clients (students and their families) served.

Arrange an on-site visit. Provide visual information on the program, including program brochures, literature and displays. Make sure this information is available to all team members during the entire visit.

Make sure that accreditation team members meet your strongest collaborators. AUHSD made an unbelievable commitment to the success of our accreditation. They shifted teacher and administrator schedules and provided period substitutes to allow for driving time, as all interviews were scheduled at the district office. At one time, we had one principal and three teachers from the same high school! Their commitment to the preparation of new teachers, in general, and our credential program, in particular, is truly outstanding.

Not only do accreditation team members benefit from face-to-face interactions. District specialists were made aware of their important contributions during interviews with accreditation team members. In a follow-up survey, four groups of accreditation participants (secondary education faculty, school faculty, AUHSD participants, and accreditation team members) were invited to reflect on the outcomes of the accreditation. "I valued being [part of] the interview. I responded in a very positive manner as to the professionalism and level of cooperation," said one respondent to the survey sent to all AUHSD accreditation participants. "The process was very positive," said another. AUHSD specialists and faculty involved in ITP felt the CTC/NCATE commendation to be a very important recognition. "I was glad that the work being done is being more adequately recognized by other significant groups," commented one seminar presenter. "We need to have more publication of this information [the designation as an exemplary practice]." "This is a very important program to continue," commented another. "The collaboration between the university, district, and community needs to continue to increase."

3. Keep the University and Community Informed. All respondents to the survey indicated that the recognitions of CTC and NCATE validate the existence of the ITP. They remarked that such recognitions were "important" because they "convince faculty and administrators of the worth of the program." Teacher candidates involved in the accreditation visit felt proud of their accomplishments and were able to show evidence of their new skills in a special section of their teaching portfolios. University faculty involved in the program were recognized by the department, school, and university as accreditation results were made public.

The department, school, university, and community needs also to be made aware of interprofessional efforts. Over the course of three years, faculty have presented on ITP to the city's League of Women Voters, the university-wide Education Leadership Group, and at one of the school-wide Faculty Affairs Brown Bag Lunch Seminars. With the national recognition as a "Best Practice in Integrated Services in Education" by AACTE (one of the parent organizations of NCATE), the program has also received publicity in the HDCS newsletter, university *Compendium*, and the *Fullerton Observer*. This dissemination has allowed program administrators the opportunity to reflect on program features and make revisions as

appropriate. However, continued dissemination is needed to keep the program growing and supported by the university and community.

4. Capitalize on Your Results. Use your accreditation report to gain stronger commitment from the department and Dean. Less than 50 percent of the university faculty we surveyed were even aware that we received special recognition from these two commissions (this number increased dramatically with the newspaper articles and HDCS Faculty Affairs presentation). This statistic is even more reflective of our lack of dissemination because we only surveyed those who would be most likely to care about the outcome of the accreditation visits—i.e., who played an active role in either the accreditation visit or in the development and implementation of the ITP. Several who returned surveys commented that we needed to be more effective in publicizing the results. One hundred percent of respondents were supportive of continuing the program, with most suggesting ideas for expansion. Suggestions included increasing the number of university interns, creating an emphasis in a second Secondary Professional Development Center, expanding the emphasis into the multiple subjects credential program, and adding additional Anaheim schools.

Impact on the Department, School, and University

Accreditation findings were unequivocally positive. The feedback confirmed to university and district personnel that issues of interprofessional collaboration and education are important and valued at both the national and state levels. Independent of the accreditation, the university has since shown an increased interest in service learning, and ITP is included in these opportunities.

However, there remains no secondary education program-wide emphasis on interprofessional training (and even less emphasis at the elementary level), limited dissemination of the program and its successes at the community levels (in part due to the political conservatism of local elected school boards within the county resulting in decreased visibility of school-linked services), and a still-tight budget climate.

Independent of these minor negatives, the accreditation reports and program evaluation document that ITP addresses an important need of both secondary students and education, health, and social services preprofessionals. Through the Interprofessional Training Program, 27 college student interns have compiled a total of over 3000 service hours. Student interns have served as counseling assistants, providing group and individual counseling, conducting college and career forums, and tracking attendance-related school failures; in school nurse capacities, counseling pregnant teens, presenting in Health Education classes, and referring students to low-cost dental and medical care; taught in Special Education classes; performed administrative and research tasks, including analyzing data on chemical and tobacco use prevention programs, gang intervention programs, and district-wide social services; assisted in school events, including Friday Night Live,

school dances, athletic events, and Associated Student Body activities; and aided in English as a Second Language classes. In addition, over 130 secondary teacher candidates have received training in interprofessional education and integrated services. At least 75 of these are now practicing teachers.

Lawson (1996) identifies three needs that accompany interprofessional education programs: (1) preservice and practicing teachers need evidence of their special preparation; (2) program designers, most specifically university faculty, need rewards and recognition for the new work they are performing; and (3) employers in school-community collaborations need assurances that the individuals they hire are qualified for interprofessional practice. The successful accreditation of our Single Subject Credential Program addressed all three needs by validating the worth of the interprofessional training provided.

Findings indicate that ITP has been effective in meeting objectives in each of the three major program goals. The program is now better preparing preservice secondary teachers to work within schools utilizing integrated services models; providing health and social service preprofessionals with meaningful internship experiences in secondary schools; and demonstrating success in the improvement of secondary school-based, integrated services.

Through their visits to community agencies, graduate students in the single subject teacher education program have become more aware of and how to access services available to adolescents and families. Their At-Risk Student assignment allowed them to practice the identification, referral, and follow-up on a student in need of such services. Finally, documenting their new knowledge and skills in their Teaching Portfolio allowed them to reflect on these experiences.

Students in the fields of health and social services have increased their understanding of the political, institutional, and educational contexts of school life. Through their school-based field experience, they were able to revise intervention strategies that were appropriate in a school setting. Because most worked with school administrators, they increased their understanding of issues of confidentiality, communicating with parents, and how to access students during the school day. They also gained a greater appreciation for the differences and similarities of their goals and the goals of school personnel. Many were able to document their experiences in a Professional Portfolio, allowing them to reflect on their experiences.

Three national and state recognitions further document the success of the Secondary Education ITP: As noted earlier, in February, 1997, The Interprofessional Training Program and the Center for Collaboration for Children were honored as a "Best Practice in Integrated Services in Education" by AACTE. This recognition was a direct result of the accreditation visit, as AACTE was made aware of these efforts through a review of NCATE-identified "Exemplary Practices."

AACTE Best Practice Awards recognize innovations in teacher-training programs. "Our intent is to ferret out examples of best practices in teacher preparation among our member institutions and to hold them up as models,"

Accreditation

explained AACTE representative Susan Cimburek, as quoted in the *Orange County Register*. The newspaper went on to say that AACTE hopes the program will be "duplicated across the nation."

In addition, the Anaheim PDC received the California Council on the Education of Teachers Quality of Education Award for Fall, 1994. The Center was honored for over 20 years of collaboration in the preparation of teachers. The ITP was also showcased in *Changing Course: Teacher Education Reform at State Colleges and Universities*, a publication of the Association of Teacher Education at State Colleges and Universities.

The ITP has provided rich opportunities for collaborative projects between practicing professionals. Structured articulation and joint problem solving between practicing teachers and administrators, youth and family service providers, and university faculty and administrators has yielded benefits not only to students. Personal and professional growth have occurred as we collaborate on project planning and developmental activities including the development and revision of field materials; the development and implementation of assessment tools; the composition of case studies and other instructional materials for preservice and inservice programs; the development and presentation of joint student teacher and health and social service seminars and orientations; the inservicing of district teachers and service providers; the development and revision of project materials for dissemination; conference presentations; and program evaluation and revision.

Conclusion

Accreditation criteria and processes in teacher education are established to safeguard quality. As such, they identify specific requirements that must be met. Not one of the CTC or NCATE standards prevent the infusion of interprofessional competencies. On the other hand, neither do any standards specify interprofessional collaboration as required. Without specific criteria, recognition as a CTC "strength" or an NCATE "exemplary practice," is somewhat meaningless and remains dependent on current educational fads. Further, in the absence of explicit endorsement, recognition depends on whether the accreditation team members are even looking for interprofessional education (and thus, whether institutions make such competencies visible).

Even the explicit inclusion of interprofessional competencies in teacher education accreditation standards, however, is at best a partial answer. Without the involvement of health and social service pre- and practicing professionals, such revisions are merely "tinkering with minor reforms" (Lawson, 1996, p. 11). Although it will be a daunting and complex task, teacher education standards must not be revised in a vacuum—the accreditation of all programs must be interlinked. Within the state of California, this process has already begun. In 1997, the California SB1422 Advisory Panel (charged with the development of new teacher

education standards) recommended to the CTC that issues of interprofessional development be included in the new standards for both preservice and induction programs for teacher candidates. The newly revised Administrative Credentials Standards already include such a standard.

Within the university, factors that impede the implementation of inter-professional education are related to tradition and turf, not to accreditation and licensure issues. Many university faculty members, for example, feel that traditional teacher education topics (lesson planning, classroom management, teaching strategies) remain the best curriculum. They do not understand how interprofessional skills can result in a more effectively managed classroom or lead to more innovative instruction. Practicing teachers, on their part, are not currently aware of or how to access services available to students with special needs, and often feel frustrated when preservice teachers bring new expectations of the teaching role. In addition, structures for service providers and pre-professionals to work in school settings are not always in place and often must be developed and instituted. Further, many of the ITP health and social service interns felt that their goals for students were incompatible with the goals of teachers and school administrators. As all increase their understanding of and appreciation for each others' roles, however, effective collaboration can lead to increased success for K-12 students and their families.

Notes

1. Although administered through the Department of Secondary Education, the Secondary Education Cooperative Teacher Education Program (SECTEP) includes course offerings in eight additional departments across the university: English, Theater, Art, Music, Foreign Language, Science Education, Mathematics, and Physical Education.
2. Cross-Cultural Language Acquisition Development credentials and certificates require 12 units of coursework on multicultural education, second language acquisition, and strategies for teaching specially designed academic instruction in English and six units of a foreign language. Bilingual CLAD certificates require that the candidate be fluent in a second language.
3. Of these 13, all but one are California State universities; the one private institute is University of the Pacific. The 12 NCATE-accredited state universities issued 64 percent (or 7916) of the 12,326 multiple and single subject teaching credentials issued in the CSU system in 1996. Of the total credentials in the state of California (21,257), the CSU system issued fifty-eight percent, the University of California system 5 percent, and private universities 37 percent. The one private NCATE-accredited institution issued 2 percent of the private school percentage.
4. HDCS includes the Division of Education as well as the Divisions of Kinesiology and Children, Family, and Community Services, which are not formally part of the accreditation visit. Beginning with the Year 2000 visit, three programs outside the School will also be part of the professional unit: the Master of Arts in Teaching Science (MATS), the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Masters Program, and the Communicative Disorders Credential (in Speech Communications).

5. Orangewood serves as the county's children's shelter, for children (age birth to 18 years) who have been removed from their homes.
6. In this case study, particular attention is given to the Department of Secondary Education because it houses the Interprofessional Training Program. As noted earlier, each department underwent separate accreditation by the CTC (although the process is similar in each department) and joint accreditation by NCATE.
7. For detailed information on the CTC Standards for individual programs, see Taylor, H., Costa, V., & Gardner, S. (1997a), *Analysis of California Credential Standards for Interprofessional Education Language*. Unpublished document. California State University, Fullerton.
8. For detailed information on the NCATE Standards for the Teaching Profession, see Taylor, H., Costa, V., & Gardner, S. (1997b), *Analysis of NCATE Standards for Interprofessional Education Language*. Unpublished document. California State University, Fullerton.

References

- Alder L. & Gardner, S. (Eds.) 1994. *The politics of education yearbook: The politics of linking schools and social services*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Asayesh, G., Blank, M., & Melaville, A. (1993). *Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.
- Gardner, S. (1992). Key issues in developing school-linked integrated services. *The Future of Children*, 2(1), 85-94.
- Gardner, S. (1989). Failure by fragmentation. *California Perspectives*, 4, 18-25.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's school: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Knapp, M., Barnard, K., Brandon, R., Gehrke, N., Smith, A., & Teather, E. (1993). University-based preparation for collaborative interprofessional practice. *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*.
- Lawson, H. (1996). Accreditation, certification and licensing issues accompanying interprofessional education and community collaboration.
- Lawson, H. (1994). Toward healthy learners, schools, and communities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45, 62-70.
- Lee, L. (1983). The social worker in the political environment of a school system. *Social Work*, 28(7), 302-307.
- Lux, D. (Ed.) (1987). *Theory into practice: Interprofessional education*. Columbus, OH: College of Education, The Ohio State University.
- Second to none: A vision of the new California high school*. (1992). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- Taylor, H., Costa, V., & Gardner, S. (1997a). Analysis of California Credential Standards for Interprofessional Education Language. Unpublished document. California State University, Fullerton.
- Taylor, H., Costa, V., & Gardner, S. (1997b). Analysis of NCATE Standards for Interprofessional Education Language. Unpublished document. California State University, Fullerton.
- Uphold, C. (1993). Schools as centers for collaborative services for families: A vision for change. *Nursing Outlook*, 41, 204-209.