Developing a University–School District Partnership: Researcher–District Administrator Collaboration for a Special Education Initiative

Lily L. Dyson
university of victoria

This case study examined the development of a university–school district partnership designed to support a special education initiative with 156 students of middle socio-economic backgrounds in Grades 4 to 7 using critical-sampling, single-case, and documentation methods. It identified four essential elements of researcher–district administrator collaboration: a developmental process led by the partners' mutual goals and a gradual building of support for the project, a communication protocol dominated by professionalism and parity, a collaborative structure marked by complementary relationships and accountability between the partners, and outcomes benefitting all stakeholders (teachers, students, and researcher). The most important outcome was students' increased understanding of disabilities and empathy with persons with disabilities. The author proposes a conceptual framework for developing university-school partnerships and makes recommendations for future practice and research.

Cette étude porte sur l'élaboration d'un partenariat entre l'université et une circonscription scolaire en vue d'un projet d'éducation pour des enfants atteints de diverses déficiences. L'auteure identife certains éléments essentiels d'une collaboration entre le chercheur et l'administrateur de la circonscription, soit : (a) un processus d'élaboration axé sur les objectifs mutuels des partenaires et l'établissement progressif d'un appui au projet, (b) un protocole de communication accordant la priorité au professionnalisme et à la parité entre les partenaires, (c) une structure de collaboration caractérisée par des relations de complémentarité et une responsabilisation de tous les partenaires et (d) des résultats dont tous les intéressés puissent bénéficier. L'auteure propose un cadre conceptuel pour l'élaboration de partenariats entre l'université et l'école ainsi que des recommandations pour des expériences et recherches futures.

University-school partnerships and collaboration have been the most frequently recommended approaches to educational reform (R. W. Clark, 1988; Kersh & Masztal, 1998). One reason is that universities and schools provide each other with resources and benefits in research and practice (Stump, Lovitt, & Perry, 1993) and need each other to reach their common and respective goals (De Bevoise, 1986; Goodlad, 1988; Lasley, Matczynski, & Williams, 1992). There is, however, little information about how a university-school partnership is developed and how effective such a relationship is (Smith, 1992).

A university-school partnership represents a planned effort to establish a

formal, mutually beneficial, interinstitutional relationship (Goodlad, 1988). The purpose of the partnership is to create a process and an accompanying structure that allow partners to draw on one another's complementary strengths to advance their interests (Goodlad, 1988). According to Hord (1986), collaboration implies that "the parties involved share responsibilities and authority for basic policy decision making" (p. 22). In collaboration, decision making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs is shared (Hord, 1986). Collaboration thus serves to create and achieve partnership (Sirotnik, 1988). This raises an important question: How may universities and schools collaborate to achieve partnership?

De Bevoise (1986) suggests that "top-level institutional support and cooperation is essential for significant university-school personnel collaboration to occur" (p. 11). Collaboration at the administrative level is thus essential in developing university-school partnerships. Collectively, the literature suggests that a successful university-school partnership would result from a model of collaboration integrating at least the following elements: an effective developmental process led by mutual goals and gradual building of support for the project, efficient communication among the partners, a viable collaborative structure including accountability, and beneficial outcomes for the partners (Goodlad, 1988; Sirotnik, 1988). The developmental process refers to the activities undertaken in initiating the collaboration. Barnett (1990) wrote that "Studying the collaborative process may provide insights about critical features that may promote or impede the successful collaboration" (p. 155).

Because a university-school partnership takes place at the intersection of two cultures with differing aims and values (Brookhart & Loadman, 1992; Knight, Wiseman, & Smith, 1992), development of partnership is often difficult (Goodlad, 1993; McDaniel, 1988–1989). Thus, the process of developing a partnership should begin with the partners establishing mutual goals. Moreover, researchers should be prepared to encounter the uncertainty that occurs in school administration as a result of continuous cultural changes and politics in the school (De Bevoise, 1986; Oja & Pine, 1987). Developing a university-school partnership is also a gradual process of building a foundation and trust (Trubowitz, 1986) that requires approval from top-level administration (Goodlad, 1988). But with these supports in place, it is possible to formalize the partnership.

Efficient means for communicating and sharing information are also crucial to collaboration (Goodlad, 1988). De Bevoise (1986) notes that "a shared language helps break down traditional institutional barriers" (p. 11).

Sirotnik (1988) further suggests that structural considerations in a university-school collaboration include recognizable and viable structures for making decisions and organizational arrangements within the partnership. Although "there probably is no best way to organize school-university partnership," one structural arrangement is an orderly process of endorsing and encouraging activities undertaken in the partnership (Goodlad, 1988, p. 27). Such a structural arrangement

may involve each collaborator in complementing the other's responsibilities with his/her expertise and exercising accountability. Accountability is best acted on as a system of shared responsibilities among the partners in the educational leadership activity (Sirotnik, 1988).

The final element required in a university-school partnership is an outcome that benefits the partners. As a university-school partnership is motivated by the partners' self-interests (Goodlad, 1988), successful partnership must produce gains for each partner; these may include increased curriculum services for schools (R. W. Clark, 1988) and research potential for the university (Lieberman, 1986).

This model of collaboration, however, is yet to be developed and tested. In one study, incongruent goals caused an initial impasse in the researcher-teacher collaboration (Hattrup & Bickel, 1993). Another study found that the researchers' misinterpretation of the school's needs resulted in an unsuccessful university-school collaboration (Shulha & Wilson, 1993). In still another study, a lack of a collaborative structure resulted in ambiguous and undifferentiated roles being assumed by the collaborators, forcing an initially enthusiastic teacher to terminate a collaborative venture with a researcher (Cole & Knowles, 1993). Shulha and Wilson (1993) further attributed their failed school-university collaboration to the researchers' lack of accountability and the absence of benefits to the school as perceived by the teachers.

My research examined the development of a university–school district partnership in which a researcher and a district administrator collaborated in a special education project. In particular, I identified and tested these four essential elements of collaboration leading to partnership.

METHOD

I used critical sampling (Morse, 1994) to identify key incidents, the single case study method (Merriam, 1988) to describe and analyze the partnership as it unfolded over time, and the documentation method (T. A. Clark, 1988) to systematically monitor "appropriate components, processes, and interactions of program implementation" (p. 21). The documentation approach allows broad, continuous collection of documents such as proposals, reports, memoranda and other correspondence, meeting agendas and minutes, and accounts of related events (T. A. Clark, 1988). I was both researcher and participant, a practice applied successfully in educational research by Beck and Black (1991) and Crow, Levine, and Nager (1992).

Participants

The study took place in a mid-sized, western Canadian city. The primary study participants were a school district administrator and a university researcher (the

author). The collaboration was initiated to facilitate a project to promote the social integration in schools of children with disabilities. The project included 156 children from six classes, Grades 4 to 7, in two schools situated in primarily middle-socioeconomic neighbourhoods. Both the district administrator and the researcher possessed professional expertise and interest in special education. Prior to the collaboration, the administrator was an assistant student-service coordinator but after the project began he became the coordinator of Student Support Services. In that position, he provided administrative support to schools and teachers. I was teaching special education. To develop this partnership, the two participants collaborated for three years until the administrator left his district administrative position.

Data Sources

As researcher, I collected data and took field notes on researcher-administrator interaction, which took place in formal and informal meetings, letters, memoranda, and telephone discussions. Minutes of meetings, notes, letters, and memoranda thus became the major sources of data. I also collected learning logs from the children in the project. These logs showed what they had learned in the program and were used to evaluate the school outcome.

Data Analysis

In addition to numerous conference papers, I collected 41 documents pertinent to the researcher–district administrator interaction, with 2 of these documents (a field note and written correspondence) having been collected during a brief period prior to the collaboration. I read and reread the data to identify major elements current theory says are essential to university-school collaboration and extracted events from the data for each element, using the constant comparative method (Peck, Hayden, Wandschneider, Peterson, & Richarz, 1989; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). To validate the data and interpretation, the administrator reviewed activities and events related to him in the completed report. He made no corrections except to the specific title he held.

Similarly, using the constant comparative method, an assistant and I analyzed data from the children's learning logs with the computer program HyperQual Version 3.0 (Padilla, 1990). Main themes in the children's learning were derived and quantified following recommendations by Strauss and Corbin (1990) for a large set of qualitative data. To examine the reliability of our classification of the themes, we independently classified the children's responses in one randomly selected class of 26 children and compared our separate classifications theme by theme. Reliability was calculated by dividing the total number of agreements of

the two coders by the total number of agreements and disagreements and multiplying the result by 100. The average intercoder reliability was 96%.

RESULTS

The Developmental Process Towards Partnership

Critical activities took place as the researcher and the district administrator developed a university–school district partnership. Major activities included: establishing mutual goals, managing uncertainty, building support, and formalizing partnership.

Establishing Mutual Goals

This study began when a special education coordinator from a local public school requested help with her regular teachers' concern over the social isolation of children with disabilities. My faculty assigned me to provide that assistance because I had a professional research interest in the integration of children with disabilities in the regular class.

To assist the school's special education coordinator, an intervention plan to promote social integration of children with disabilities was designed. The plan called for developing and delivering a series of educational programs to raise nondisabled peers' awareness of disabilities. I then evaluated the programs' effect (Dyson, 1997). This intervention plan was chosen because research indicates that the negative attitudes of nondisabled children's towards those with disabilities results from their lack of understanding of their peers' disabilities (Graffi & Minnes, 1988). These negative attitudes lead to social isolation of children with disabilities. Negative attitudes towards people with disabilities have been improved through educational programs that raise awareness of disabilities (Donaldson, 1980; Florian & Kehat, 1987).

The intervention plan required collaboration between the researcher and teachers. Because interested teachers had to be released from regular duties to participate in the collaboration, I requested that the district provide such release. In granting one day's release time to be shared by the five teachers, the District Special Education Director gave the following reasons.

This plan goes along with our District's policy in integrating children with special needs. It would also help train new teachers. So often we have practicum students starting teaching who don't know much about mainstreaming. This project would help future teachers. When you bring back to your university classes ideas about how to integrate children with special needs, pre-service teachers will have some skills with mainstreaming when they come to our schools (for their practicum). (meeting notes: November 28, year prior to the collaboration)[1]

Although limited, the release time enabled the teachers and me to collaborate on the development of the social integration program. My assistants and I delivered the program to the teachers' classes. The program and the evaluation constituted a project called Friend-making.

Managing Uncertainty

The initial stages of the collaboration were marked by uncertainty about the project's future. This uncertainty began at the end of the first year, when I attempted to report the results and to seek continued support from the district for the next year. When I arrived at the District Special Education Office, I found a disordered office, with packing boxes scattered all over (field notes: June 15, year 1) and soon learned that the office and the position of the Director were being dissolved due to district re-organization and budget cutbacks. I was directed to a new administrator, the Coordinator of Student Support Services, who would be responsible for general support services for students in the new academic term. A brief meeting marked the beginning of the interaction between the researcher and the new district administrator. Despite uncertainty about future support for the project, I followed his instruction to contact him in the new academic year.

A similar setback occurred midway through the second year of the collaboration. At a scheduled meeting, the district administrator announced that further budgetary cuts and school re-structuring might eliminate his position. Pessimism thus coloured the meeting, despite his assurance that the district's support for the Friend-making project would continue for the rest of the year (meeting notes, field notes: May 31, year 2). I became concerned that the administrator might lose his position and about the uncertainty of future support for the project. Nonetheless, I accepted his advice that we should continue with the project and wait for the district to complete its re-organization before engaging in further discussion about the collaboration.

By exercising patience and following the administrator's direction during his district's transition, I, as the researcher, gave the administrator time to clarify his position and to re-organize his work. This approach proved effective when, in the new school term, the administrator affirmed the continuation of his position and specified continuing funding for the project (meeting notes: September 26, year 2).

Building Support

Beginning with the district's provision of limited release time for the teachers from one school to collaborate with me, the district's contribution gradually increased. After my first meeting with the new district administrator, the district granted additional release time for teachers from another school. There was a

small fund for videotaping the educational program but no funding for editing the videotape. In the second year of the project, the district granted 8 days of release time to be shared by the teachers from five schools but no funds for editing the videotape. In the third year, with increased provincial funding for special education programs, the district increased the release time for the teachers' collaboration to 10 days and provided funding to edit the videotape. A small amount was also designated for honoraria for people with disabilities to serve as guest speakers for the program. The district's support for the teachers' release time continued even after the administrator departed. I also generated funds at different stages to support the project, from minor research grants from my university and regional funding agencies to major federal funding. The funds from the school district and the research grants enabled the project to expand.

Formalizing Partnership

After two years of collaboration and with a major research grant to support the Friend-making project, the district administrator proposed that a partnership be formed between the university and the school district. Because creation of such a partnership required the approval and support of the Board of School Trustees, he proposed that he and I make a joint presentation to the Education Policy Committee of the Board. To prepare for the presentation, we held telephone discussions, exchanged memoranda, and, finally, met. At the meeting, he presented a typed outline of his intended presentation (undated document). And he suggested that a collaborating teacher also attend the Board meeting to provide support for the project. I invited two teachers to the meeting, one of them providing a proxy letter of support.

    At the meeting of the Education Policy Committee, the district administrator outlined the project's history and summarized its accomplishments, using documents and products that I, as researcher, had submitted. In turn, I explained the project described in the hand-outs (document: April 13, year 3) and the attending teacher provided his support for the project. The joint presentation resulted in a motion to recognize the researcher's work and to propose the project to the general Board meeting for approval as a partnership between the university and the school district (field notes: April 13, year 3). The partnership, formalized with the final approval by the Board of School Trustees, legitimized the project as a joint initiative between the two institutions. It also established a process for ongoing support and funding by the district to allow teachers to collaborate with the researcher (meeting notes: June 23, year 3).

Effective Communication

The district administrator and I engaged in an effective communication protocol marked by professionalism and parity. This protocol typified the collaboration at

our meetings, in which he responded to my prepared agenda with a summary of what had been agreed upon, what I was to deliver, and what action he was to take (e.g., meeting agenda, notes: September 10, year 1; December 9, year 2; September 26, year 3).

The pattern of professionalism and parity in communication was set in our first meeting when, with the departure of the Special Education Director, we needed to negotiate a new collaborative relationship. Prior to the meeting, I mailed the administrator a copy of the project proposal that requested ongoing support for the project and release time for the teachers' participation (documents: August 12 and September 21, year 1). At the meeting, I did not have to reiterate the content of the proposal because he had studied the materials. Further, with a clear agenda and sufficient details already in hand, the meeting was devoted to identifying new school participants and exploring funding resources.

Professionalism and parity were maintained to the end of each meeting, when he and I would exchange requests or assignments. For example, at one meeting, I presented written requests for release time for the teachers, funds to make a videotape, and the district's support for the project. In exchange, he requested that I provide an itemized budget to justify the requests (meeting notes: September 21, year 1).

In our communication, the foundation of collaboration was thus explicit to us both. Out of the professional exchange there also emerged parity in the control of the collaborative process. Yet, in exercising parity, each clearly acted to protect the interest he or she represented.

Collaborative Structure

Complementary Roles

Although the district administrator and I did not initially specify a collaborative structure, a structure evolved as the collaboration unfolded. In that structure, we assumed complementary roles. Initially, the administrator took over his predecessor's stance by supporting the project by providing release time for the teachers; gradually, his role became facilitative. Thus, when funds were not immediately available, he found "seed money" for things such as videotaping. He hoped, he said, that that "small amount will help you find other funds to finish the videotape" (meeting notes: October 10, year 1). He also helped identify community and provincial government funding possibilities. His efforts stimulated me to consider other sources of support, such as research grants, for the project.

The district administrator also facilitated the recruitment of schools by identifying potentially interested schools and by publicizing the project. A memorandum he distributed to schools (October 10, year 1; November 9, year 2) proved to be an unplanned but effective form of collaborative support. His screening and support of the project gave it credibility and reassured school staff. As one

school principal commented, "This project is supported by the district, I feel good about this, and so we will go along with it" (undated field note). The administrator's facilitation particularly increased my confidence in securing research participants and motivated me to apply for research funding to support the project.

As researcher, I assumed a different set of roles in the collaboration. I contacted schools in person and recruited teacher participants. I also designed the intervention program in collaboration with the teachers, directed the delivery of the program, and evaluated its effect. These roles were within a researcher's regular functions but were carried out with the district administrator's support. Thus, in the apparent absence of a clearly defined collaborative structure, he and I clearly assumed different responsibilities but worked towards the common goal of promoting the social integration of children with disabilities.

Accountability

Throughout the collaboration, each partner was accountable for specific tasks. The administrator identified my accountability for completing designated tasks and delivering specific products. For example, he requested that I submit a yearly proposal for teacher release time, justifying and specifying the amount required (meeting notes: September 10, year 1; September 16, year 2; September 22, year 3). He also requested that I provide details about the videotape and a written promise that the tape would be used only for educational purposes (meeting notes: September 26, year 3). Another example of his expectation for my accountability is a letter he wrote requesting specific information to clarify the ongoing support for the project (administrator's letter: September 23, year 2).

I responded to his requests for accountability with specific information such as budgets and completion dates for tasks (documents). When unable to meet a deadline, I arranged an alternative date. Moreover, I submitted yearly requests to continue the project with action plans and justifications for the budgets (documents). My response to his request for accountability is exemplified by a letter in which I confirmed the funding requested for completion of the videotape ($3,500), the content of the videotape, and that the videotape would be used only for educational purposes (researcher's letter to administrator: November 25, year 3).

To address accountability issues, I further provided the administrator with progress reports summarizing each year's results (e.g., document: September 22, year 3). Products such as booklets made of children's discussions were also compiled and copies sent to the administrator, as were copies of publications, conference papers, and other reports related to the project (documents).

Although less apparent, the district administrator exercised similar accountability in the collaboration. He released funds soon after receiving a report of the completion of the videotaping and the written guarantee requested (document:

June 8, year 2). The release time for the collaborating teachers was also provided as promised. Likewise, memoranda or letters of support for the project were promptly prepared to assist in the researcher's recruitment of participating schools or applications for research grants.

We thus developed a complementary collaborative structure with accountability. Each of us drew on our respective expertise and professional jurisdiction to contribute to the collaboration while each also remained accountable to the other. This collaborative structure proved effective when more schools joined the project. The collaborative structure also indirectly contributed to my success in securing research grants which, in turn, sustained the project and so benefitted the teachers and students. Meanwhile, the collaborative structure allowed me considerable freedom to pursue independent research and to collaborate with teachers in schools.

Outcomes of the Collaboration

The researcher–district administrator collaboration led to a number of outcomes, the most important being that it met the teachers' need for a program to promote the social integration of children with disabilities (Dyson, 1997). Other schools whose classes later joined the project benefitted, too. More schools may also have benefitted from the completed videotape about the method of promoting social integration of students with disabilities, which was publicized internationally and distributed locally (Dyson, 1996). Of further significance was the formation of a partnership between the university and the school district to continue to support a project for promoting social integration of students with disabilities.

The partnership and collaboration resulted in professional growth. As reported elsewhere (Dyson, 1997), I benefitted from my interaction with the collaborating teachers. Tangible scholarly gains took the form of international, national, and regional professional papers, two of which were presented with participating teachers (Dyson, Nanni, & Skolsky, 1994; Dyson, Rothnie, & Dryden, 1995). And the major research grants I received as a result of the collaboration further extended training opportunities for my university research assistants.

Children in the local schools especially benefitted from this researcher–district administrator collaboration. They received a series of four educational programs about disabilities, the types of disabilities typically being those found in their class or school — physical disability, learning disability, and sensory impairment. Each program contained information about a disability and methods of interacting with individuals with disabilities. Table 1 gives an example of the results, the major themes the children's logs record they learned from the program and their frequencies.

Table 1 shows that the children gained a new understanding of *learning disability,* accurately understood as a perceptual difficulty, not as a sensory

TABLE 1

*Themes and Frequencies of Children's Reports of What They Learned
About Learning Disabilities (*N = 156)

Theme	n	%
1. Content and meaning of learning disabilities (e.g., learning disability implies perceptual differences: "People with a [learning] disability see things differently [than other people]")	63	40
2. Empathetic understanding of difficulty (e.g., "[I learned] how difficult it is to have a learning disability")	43	28
3. Emotional references to learning disabilities (e.g., "I learned how it feels to have learning disability")	13	8
4. The ability and strength of individuals with learning disabilities (e.g., "People with learning disabilities must be pretty smart")	9	6
5. The way to interact with people with learning disabilities (e.g., "You have to go slow")	9	6
6. General learning (e.g., "I learned a lot of things")	5	3
7. Nothing	3	2
8. Not interpretable	11	7

impairment (e.g., "being deaf and blind is not a learning disability"). They also developed empathy for those with disabilities (e.g., "I learned mostly about how it feels to be different and the frustration in it") and an appreciation of the affective aspect of having such a disability (e.g., "it's hard for people with learning disabilities to get around"). Only 9% of the children reported no learning or did not specify their learning.

DISCUSSION

In this study, I examined the collaboration between a university researcher and a school district administrator in a special education project in order to study the development of a university–school district partnership. In contrast to reports of failure (Cole & Knowles, 1993; Shulha & Wilson, 1993), this study demonstrates a successful university–school district partnership. The benefits to the major participants (teachers, children, and researchers) confirm claims in the literature (R. W. Clark, 1988; Lieberman, 1986) that university–school district partnerships can generate instructional programs for schools and advance university research.

More importantly, the partnership increased social competence and cognition in the children involved.

A pivotal element in this partnership's success was the developmental process, a series of activities leading to the partnership. Key among these was establishing a match between the researcher's goal and the school district's policy. A shared goal of promoting social integration of children with disabilities allowed the school district to implement its policy for mainstreaming children with disabilities and was the major reason for the district's initial support. Clearly, in contradiction to concerns about the mismatch of goals of universities and schools that poses barriers to partnership (R. W. Clark, 1988), this study demonstrates that establishing mutual goals for researchers and school districts is not only possible but crucial to the development of partnership.

Our partnership's success also was due to the patient management of the uncertainty created by a changing district administration. In contrast, Cole and Knowles (1993) showed that a researcher's insensitive pressing for collaboration caused a teacher to withdraw from a potential collaboration. Our successful partnership was further built on financial support obtained by both the district administrator and the researcher. Perhaps crucial to formalizing this partnership was the Board of School Trustees' support, won through collaborative efforts by the district administrator and the researcher.

The partnership also was facilitated by an effective and efficient pattern of communication marked by professionalism and parity. Parity leads to successful collaboration (Crow et al., 1992). The communication protocol the district administrator and I used minimized the bureaucratic entanglement common in university-school collaboration (Sirotnik, 1988). Further contributing to the success was a collaborative structure in which we assumed complementary roles to achieve a common goal. Accountability grew out of such a harmonious structure. In particular, the presentation of the researcher's work to the Board of School Trustees suggests that the researcher's exercise of accountability was valuable in gaining support from the district administrator and the Board of School Trustees.

The development of this university–school district partnership is an accomplishment in view of the potential for tension and conflict involved in researcher-school collaboration (Brookhart & Loadman, 1992; Hattrup & Bickel, 1993; McDaniel, 1988–1989). However, this collaborative structure evolved gradually and was actively cultivated in a professional way by the collaborators.

CONCLUSION

The outcome of this study supports a conceptual model that university–school district partnerships are developed from elements including: an effective developmental process, efficient communication between the collaborators, a complementary role structure with accountability, and beneficial outcomes for all partners.

The developmental process involves identifying the partners' common goals, managing uncertainty in the school district, building support, and formalizing the partnership.

The fruitfulness of this partnership warrants further development and study of university-school partnering. Although partnership has to be based on the practical needs of teachers and school districts, other methods of developing partnership must be explored. Collective experiences involving university-school partnership would further validate the results of this case study. Finally, future research should examine the collaborative experiences of the administrators, as information about these is presently lacking.

NOTE

[1]   Based on the method of reporting in Scruggs and Mastropieri (1994), sources of data with dates are specified in parentheses with the year of the stage of the project (e.g., year 2 of the project).

REFERENCES

Barnett, B. G. (1990). School-university collaboration: A fad or the future of administrator preparation. *Planning and Changing, 21,* 146–157.

Beck, D., & Black, K. (1991). Redefining research relationships: Two heads are better than one. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 133–140.

Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1992). School-university collaboration: Across cultures. *Teaching Education, 4*(2), 53–68.

Clark, R. W. (1988). School-university relationships: An interpretive review. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 32–65). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, T. A. (1988). Documentation as evaluation: Capturing context, process, obstacles, and success. *Evaluation Practice, 9*(1), 21–31.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1993). Teacher development partnership research: A focus on methods and issues. *American Educational Research Journal, 30,* 473–495.

Crow, G. W., Levine, L., & Nager, N. (1992). Are three heads better than one? Reflections on doing collaborative interdisciplinary research. *American Educational Research Journal, 29,* 737–753.

De Bevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 9–12.

Donaldson, J. (1980). Changing attitudes toward handicapped persons: A review and analysis of research. *Exceptional Children, 46,* 504–514.

Dyson, L. (1996, July). *Promoting the social integration of elementary school children with disabilities: A program and effects.* Paper presented at the 10th World Congress of the International Association for the Scientific Study of Intellectual Disability, Helsinki.

Dyson, L. (1997). Toward successful researcher-teacher collaboration: Processes and benefits involved in developing a special education project. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 43,* 207–221.

Dyson, L., Nanni, M., & Skolsky, A. (1994). Inclusion as a shared responsibility: A program for facilitating social integration of elementary school children with special needs and researcher-teacher collaboration for implementation. In M. C. Pyryt (Ed.), *Congress '94: Challenging every child. Conference proceedings of the Alberta Federation of the Council for Exceptional Children and the Canadian Council for Exceptional Children, Calgary, Alberta* (pp. 25–30). Calgary: University of Calgary.

Dyson, L., Rothnie, R., & Dryden, R. (1995). The processes of researcher-teacher collaboration: Reflections of a researcher and two teachers in a project for promoting social integration of children with special needs. In C. Miller & M. Sakari (Eds.), *Connections '95* (pp. 53–62). Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Florian, V., & Kehat, D. (1987). Changing high school students' attitudes toward disabled people. *Health and Social Work, 12*(1), 57–63.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 3–31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1993). School-university partnerships and partner schools. *Educational Policy, 7*(1), 24–39.

Graffi, S., & Minnes, P. M. (1988). Attitudes of primary school children toward the physical appearance and labels associated with Down Syndrome. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93,* 28–35.

Hattrup, R. A., & Bickel, W. E. (1993). Teacher-researcher collaborations: Resolving the tensions. *Educational Leadership, 50*(6), 38–40.

Hord, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 22–26.

Kersh, M. E., & Masztal, N. B. (1998). An analysis of studies of collaboration between universities and K–12 schools. *Educational Forum, 62,* 218–225.

Knight, S. L., Wiseman, D., & Smith, C. W. (1992). The reflectivity-activity dilemma in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43,* 269–277.

Lasley, T. J., Matczynski, T. J., & Williams, J. A. (1992). Collaborative and noncollaborative partnership structures in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43,* 257–261.

Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 28–32.

McDaniel, E. (1988–1989). Collaboration for what? Sharpening the focus. *Action in Teacher Education, 10*(4), 1–8.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 220–235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Oja, S. N., & Pine, G. J. (1987). Collaborative action research: Teachers' stages of development and school contexts. *Peabody Journal of Education, 64*(2), 96–115.

Padilla, R. V. (1990). *HyperQual Version 3.0* [Computer Program]. Chandler, AZ: Author. (Available from the author at 3327 N. Dakota, Chandler, AZ 85224, U.S.A.)

Peck, C. A., Hayden, L., Wandschneider, M., Peterson., K., & Richarz, S. (1989). Development of

integrated preschools: A qualitative inquiry into sources of resistance among parents, administrators, and teachers. *Journal of Early Intervention, 13,* 353–364.

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1994). Successful mainstreaming in elementary science classes: A qualitative study of three reputation cases. *American Educational Research Journal, 31,* 785–811.

Shulha, L. M., & Wilson, R. J. (1993, June). *When teachers are the collaborators: The invitation to collaborative research.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Ottawa.

Sirotnik, K. A. (1988). The meaning and conduct of inquiry in school-university partnerships. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 169–190). New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, S. D. (1992). Professional partnerships and educational change: Effective collaboration over time. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43,* 243–256.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stump, C. S., Lovitt, T. C., & Perry, L. (1993). School-university collaboration: A year-long effort. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 28,* 151–158, 164.

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the development of school-college collaboration. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 18–21.

Lily L. Dyson is a professor in the Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, V8W 3N4.