

REIMAGINING TEACHER EDUCATION'S RESPONSE TO DISABILITY:
FROM SUMMER COURSES IN AUXILIARY EDUCATION TO DISABILITY STUDIES

TERI RUBINOFF

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN EDUCATION
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

April 2017

© Teri Rubinoff, 2017

Abstract

Teacher education programs have a responsibility to prepare teachers to support the diverse learning needs of students. However, this rarely includes critical examination of constructions of disability and how these constructions may create barriers to the establishment of inclusive classrooms. This dissertation examines the intersecting histories of special education and teacher education in Ontario in order to understand how current practices developed and to consider the impact that factors like compulsory schooling, immigration, eugenics, intelligence testing, and models of disability had on this development.

This dissertation explores the influence of changes in special education and attitudes towards disability on teacher education programs in Ontario, beginning with an examination of the establishment of two special education classes (called Auxiliary classes at the time) in Ontario in 1910. I have identified critical shifts in the education of students with disabilities and whether or not there were corresponding shifts in teacher education.

Historical and archival research methods were used to collect data within the framework of a case study approach. Teacher education in Ontario began with the establishment of normal schools that were subsequently renamed teachers' colleges and ultimately merged with universities to become faculties of education. This dissertation focuses on the teacher education programs at the University of Toronto, University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario¹, and Nipissing University. These four were chosen because their histories can be traced back to normal schools thus providing historical depth.

While vestiges of the past are still apparent in current approaches to teacher education, there is some evidence that teacher education programs utilizing a disability studies approach can provide a starting place for engaging teacher candidates in developing the critical

¹ The University of Western Ontario changed its name to Western University in 2012, however, its legal name remains the University of Western Ontario (Rogers, 2012).

consciousness necessary to create inclusive classrooms. Although a disability studies approach has the potential to positively influence teacher practice, it is also important to recognize that teacher education programs should prepare teacher candidates to navigate the cognitive dissonance that they may experience when working in schools that are firmly entrenched in traditional special education practices. The critical analysis provided in this dissertation could provoke new ways of thinking about disability in teacher education.

Acknowledgements

I was very fortunate to have a village supporting me in the writing of this dissertation. My family, friends and colleagues have cheered me on throughout this process. Special thanks to my supervisor, Connie Mayer, for your guidance, wisdom, and constant reassurance. I will be forever grateful for your ability to keep me moving towards the finish line by helping me put things in perspective. Thank you to my supervisory committee members for your thoughtful feedback and insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Situating the Research	1
Current Special Education Practices in Ontario	6
Research Questions.....	12
Data Collection.....	16
Data Analysis	17
Ethical Considerations.....	18
Outline of the Dissertation	22
Chapter 2: Historical Framework.....	24
The Changing Face of Special Education in Ontario	26
Institutions	26
Auxiliary classes	27
Expansion of special education in Ontario	29
The Evolution of Teacher Preparation	33
Normal schools.....	33
Teachers' colleges.....	36
Faculties of education.....	36
Balancing theory and practice.....	38
Where Special Education and Teacher Preparation Intersect.....	39
Looking Back to Move Ahead.....	41
Chapter 3: Contributing Factors	42
Compulsory Schooling	42
Industrialization and Immigration	43
Eugenics	44
Eugenics in Canada.....	44
Eugenics and the advent of auxiliary education	45
Intelligence Tests	49
IQ testing in Ontario.....	52
The Rise of the Professional	53
Impact of the rise of professionals on families.....	54
Models of Disability	55
The Search for Origins	57
Chapter 4: Disability in the Curriculum: Normal Schools, Teachers' Colleges, and Faculties of Education.....	58
Normal Schools: Oversight.....	59
Normal Schools: Pre-Service Programs	60
Normal Schools: In-Service Programs.....	62

Teachers' Colleges: Oversight	64
Teachers' Colleges: Pre-Service Programs	64
Teachers' Colleges: In-Service Programs	65
Faculties of Education: Oversight	65
Faculties of Education: Pre-Service Programs	68
OISE/UT	68
University of Ottawa.....	71
University of Western Ontario	72
Nipissing University	73
Faculties of Education: In-Service Programs	75
The Impact of the Past on Current Practice	76
Chapter 5: Remnants of the Past in the Present	77
Medical Model.....	77
Critiques of the medical model.....	77
Social Model	78
The Medical Model and The Social Model in Teacher Education	79
From 'disability is abnormal' to 'disability as difference'	79
From 'disability residing in the individual' to 'disability arising from interactions between the individual and society'	81
From 'accessibility is the job of experts' to 'accessibility is the job of educators'	83
From 'segregated settings' to 'inclusive classrooms'	85
The Medical Model and The Social Model in the Ontario Ministry of Education	86
The Medical Model and The Social Model in In-Service Programs	89
Special Education Part I.....	89
Special Education Part II.....	92
Special Education Part III.....	93
Barriers to Inclusion.....	95
Chapter 6: Reimagining Teacher Education.....	97
Critical Disability Studies (CDS)	98
Disability Studies in Education (DSE)	100
Benefits of Disability Studies in Education (DSE)	101
Human Rights Approach.....	102
Teacher Beliefs and Attitudes	103
Reconceptualizing students	103
Interdisciplinarity	104
Intersectionality of identity.....	105
Lived Experience of Disability	106
Courses in Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and Their Impact.....	108
Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and School and Classroom Realities	114
New Possibilities	115
Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	116
History from Below and Lived Experience	116
Moving Towards Inclusion	118
Pedagogical Practices	118
Teacher Education.....	121
Impact of Disability Studies in Education	123
Cognitive dissonance.....	123
Collaboration	125

Passionate teachers	128
Final Thoughts	129
References	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: New Classification System from the Stanford-Binet I.Q. Test53

Chapter 1: Introduction

Special education in Ontario schools is indicative of particular beliefs about disability that tend to go unchallenged. New teachers, both in the regular and special education classroom, become absorbed into a system that requires them to navigate an extensive maze of bureaucracy. As a result, there is very little time left for questioning the system itself. Critical pedagogy provides a framework for beginning to think differently about special education and to consider disability as a category of oppression. Ira Shor (2009), defines critical pedagogy as,

Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse. (p. 129)

Critical pedagogy has traditionally focused on issues relating to class, race and gender, but as Ware (2009) points out, “disability is a long overdue conversation among critical theorists, pedagogues, and educationalists who fail to recognize disability as a cultural signifier; nor do they include disability as a meaningful category of oppression” (p. 403). Thinking about this ‘long overdue conversation’ prompts me to wonder if teacher preparation programs in Ontario are encouraging teacher candidates to think otherwise about disability by creating opportunities for them to engage in the conversation to which Ware (2009) refers.

Situating the Research

Simon (2004) tells us that, “...we must pose questions to ourselves about our questions, interrogating why the information and explanations we seek are important and necessary to us” (p. 195). I have come to realize that my desire to understand societal attitudes towards disability stems from a desire not only to think differently about the work that I do but also to understand my attitudes towards disability. As I move about and encounter people with visible disabilities, I

find myself almost hyper aware of the disability and I begin to wonder if I am behaving differently as a result. I wonder how much of this reaction is due to the lack of contact I had with children with visible disabilities while going through school. It seems to me that if I had had more interaction as a child, I would be more comfortable as an adult.

As my awareness of invisible disabilities (e.g., cognitive differences) has grown, I find myself reflecting on some of my experiences as a student. I am particularly reminded of my time in junior high school. The school I attended was one in which students were streamed based on ability. In grade seven the classes were identified as 7A through 7F. At the time my classmates and I were in the habit of referring to 7A as the 'stupid' or 'dumb' class. I recall how comical we thought it was that the administration had decided to put these students in a class referred to as 7A in what we assumed was an attempt to fool us into thinking that it was the 'smart' class. I realize now how little awareness I had about disability and how much I would have grown and benefitted had I been provided with opportunities to challenge my thinking as I went through school. I believe that these experiences highlight the importance of creating a school system that sees disability as a natural part of the human condition and makes space for it.

I will attempt to search my "psychic archive" (Derrida, 1995, p. 19) to explore the origin of my interest in the education of students identified as disabled. A few years into my teaching career I decided to leave the school where I was teaching. Since I had yet to procure another position, I decided to register for an additional qualifications (AQ) course. I thought it would help me develop my skills and, probably more important to me at the time, to provide myself with some structure while I looked for another job. As I surveyed the catalogue of offerings I came across the three part series of AQ courses for special education. Upon reading the description for part one; it occurred to me that the students it described had characteristics that were similar

to those of the students I was already teaching so it seemed that it could only benefit me to take the course. That decision ultimately led to my first position as a special education teacher².

As I gained practical experience as a special education teacher, I also continued to take courses. I completed my specialist in special education and then went on to complete a master's degree. Through all of this I began to think more deeply about the ways in which children are identified³ as having a disability within the school system and how we then go about educating them. By the time I started working towards a Ph.D., I had begun to think more broadly about societal constructs of disability and how these constructs are influenced by, and/or influence, our system of education. From there, I began to think about its origins. How did our system of education in Ontario develop? What were the factors that influenced its development? In the forward to Henri-Jaques Stiker's, *A History of Disability*, Sayers points out that Stiker (1999), "argues for a continuum of effects in which one epoch's beliefs continue to inform the practices of succeeding generations" (p. vii). Considering the impact of earlier generations' beliefs on our understandings in the present and the future leads us to historical consciousness (Seixas, 2004). Historical consciousness examines, "individual and collective understandings of the past, the cognitive and cultural factors which shape those understandings, as well as the relations of historical understandings to those of the present and the future" (Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness, n.d.).

Over time, different models of disability have developed to reflect different ways of understanding disability. These models include religious/moral, tragedy/charity, medical, social,

² Bennett, Dworet and Weber (2008) report that 81% of exceptional students in Ontario are educated in regular classrooms. Given that the majority of students with disabilities spend at least part of their school day in a regular classroom, the reality is that all teachers are teachers of students with special needs. However, teachers who complete the additional qualifications courses in special education are eligible for teaching positions that are classified as special education teaching roles (The actual title of the position varies by school board).

³ Disabilities are diagnosed by either a medical doctor or a psychologist. School boards set up Identification, Placement and Review Committees (IPRCs) to review this information and determine whether or not to identify a student as exceptional. It is also possible for the IPRC to identify a student as exceptional without a diagnosis as long as there is other assessment data to support the identification. This data may come from other professionals (e.g., speech-language pathologists, audiologists). Please see pp. 6-7 for more information about this process.

and rights-based. Although there is a chronology to the development of these models, newer constructs do not necessarily replace those that came before. The model that has had the greatest influence on the development of special education is the medical model. The medical model focuses on the biological nature of disability and views disability as flaws inherent in individual bodies that are in need of fixing. This construction of disability absolves society of any responsibility for the barriers impacting the lived experiences of people with disabilities (Lalvani & Polvere, 2013). If we are going to challenge our beliefs about disability we must begin by interrogating the medical model and the way in which the medicalization of disability became normalized within education.

Special education as a notion appeared in Ontario at the beginning of the twentieth century. At that time the eugenics movement was at the height of its popularity. It grew out of the work of Frances Galton in England and was a primary driver of decisions made by Dr. Helen MacMurchy. She was a medical doctor who was responsible for establishing the first two special education classes (then called auxiliary classes) in Ontario in 1910. Her perspective was that students with disabilities, or 'feeble-minded' students as they were referred to then, were a drain not only on the school system, but on society in general. She believed that, "unless when they are under permanent care in a suitable institution, the mentally-defective are never self-supporting; they are always dependent, usually, indeed, far worse" (MacMurchy, 1915, p. 2). MacMurchy, along with Charles Kirk Clarke, a noted psychiatrist, and Clarence M. Hincks, a physician, were among a number of Canadian eugenicists who shared this belief and were involved in identifying feeble-mindedness in children (and adults) and referring them to institutions. Clarke and Hincks established the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene (CNCMH) and MacMurchy and Peter Sandiford, a professor of education at the University of Toronto, were among its original members. Among other things, the CNCMH focused on identifying and segregating 'mentally defective' children (Milewski, 2010).

While the eugenics movement was becoming increasingly prominent, intelligence testing⁴ was being developed by psychologist Alfred Binet in France and then revised by psychologist Louis Terman at Stanford University. Although intelligence testing was initially resisted by MacMurchy, Sandiford was one of its foremost proponents in Ontario. He believed that intelligence testing aligned with the goals of the eugenic movement (Milewski, 2010).

I believe that remnants of eugenic thinking are still visible in the special education structures and discourses entrenched in our schools today. I also contend that shedding a light on these historical remnants is necessary in order to prompt educators to think differently about disability and move us from a system based on special education to a system that is truly inclusive.

For this to happen, teachers need to be engaged in the pursuit of critical consciousness. In a paper written for a Critical Pedagogy course, I referenced McLaren (2009) who asks, “How have certain pedagogical practices become so habitual or natural in school settings that teachers accept them as normal, unproblematic, and expected” (p. 71)? I maintain that this is still the primary question when it comes to thinking about disability in our schools. As a special education consultant with a large public board of education, I have had the opportunity to have many conversations with current special education teachers. Among other things, my role includes providing workshops for special education teachers, as well as working individually with teachers to provide guidance as they work to support particular students. I have found that in both the workshops and the one on one situations, the focus tends to be on the *how* of special education (i.e. how to write an Individual Education Plan; how to fill out Identification, Placement and Review committee paperwork; how to facilitate an in-school team meeting, etc.) and not the *why*.

⁴ Eugenics and intelligence testing will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

This focus on the *how* over the *why* leads me to Freire (2009). In my first year of the Ph.D. program I was introduced to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and as I read it, I was particularly struck by the notion of praxis; the need for both action and reflection in order to effect change. While I believe that practicing teachers would benefit from opportunities for reflection as well, my current focus is on providing these opportunities to teacher candidates in our teacher preparation programs because, “teacher preparation is the decisive factor in developing efficacious teachers who are confident in their ability to teach all students; willing participants in the inclusive movement; and prepared to be engaged in education reform towards inclusion” (as cited in Forlin, 2010, p. 6). Borrowing from Freire (2009), in order for these programs to provide opportunities for teacher candidates to develop critical consciousness about issues related to disability, engagement in a problem-posing approach is a key component. This approach, “strives for the *emergence* of consciousness and *critical intervention* in reality” (p. 81).

Current Special Education Practices in Ontario

Arguing for an approach to teacher preparation that challenges candidates to think differently about disability presupposes a need to think differently. As Ware (2009) points out, there has been, “a general ignorance about issues of disability as a category of educational and social oppression” (p.404). At this point, I think it would be prudent to provide a brief overview of some aspects of special education in Ontario as it currently functions.

The Ministry of Education oversees education in Ontario. Currently, students with special needs are identified through an Identification, Placement, and Review Committee (IPRC) process (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2001). The *Education Act* defines an exceptional pupil as “a pupil whose behavioural, communicational, intellectual, physical or multiple exceptionalities are such that he or she is considered to need placement in a special education program...” (as cited in Ontario Ministry of Education, 2001, p. A3). Students are identified

according to the categories and definitions of exceptionalities provided by the Ministry of Education. Based on a variety of assessment data, the IPRC determines if a student is exceptional and under which category of exceptionality the student falls. In addition to determining a student's exceptionality, the IPRC committee also determines the most appropriate placement. In making this determination the committee must consider whether placement in a regular class with appropriate special education support will meet the student's needs and be consistent with parental preferences. The committee may, however, determine that a student requires an alternative placement for all or part of his/her day. If this is the case then the committee must state the reasons for that decision on the written Statement of Decision. An Individual Education Plan (IEP) must be developed for the student within thirty days of placement in a particular special education program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2001).

The description of the IPRC process provided above may appear quite straightforward at first glance, however, in my experience, the situation is not as clear-cut as it may initially seem. Although placement decisions are intended to be made based on the needs of the student involved, it seems that these decisions are often made based on the needs of the teachers. Classroom teachers may not have, or may not believe themselves to have, the necessary skill set to support the needs of diverse learners. These same teachers also tend to assume that if a student is struggling in the classroom then, by virtue of the existence of a range of placement options outside of the regular classroom, one of these options must be better able to meet the needs of the struggling student. I think that this attitude stems from the fact that regular classroom teachers feel that since the teachers in these alternative settings have special education qualifications (through the completion of AQ courses), they must therefore be in possession of the knowledge and skills to support these students that regular classroom teachers do not have. This, however, is not supported by the research. Stanovich & Jordan (as

cited in Jordan, Schwartz and McGhie-Richmond, 2009) have found that, “specialized skills for such students may not be crucial for effective inclusion. Teachers who are effective overall with all their students are more likely to be skilled in inclusive practices” (p. 536). For me this brings to mind the description that Brown (2010) provides of the nanny who looks after his son who has very complex needs,

She had no special qualifications to look after a boy as complex as Walker – beyond endless patience, and imagination, an eccentric sense of humour, cast-iron reliability, a love of the cellphone and a massive heart that did not distinguish between the needs of one person and the next. (p.14)

While teaching students with identified disabilities in the regular classroom requires more than just the right attitude, a willingness to try and the belief that there is a way to successfully include all students is a necessary starting place. Florian, Young and Rouse (2010) include it in their list of three challenges related to initial teacher preparation program reform,

- (1) How teacher education might take difference into account from the outset (knowing);
 - (2) How teachers might be convinced that they are qualified to teach children with ‘additional needs’ (believing); and
 - (3) How teachers might learn new strategies for working with and through others (doing).
- (pp. 713-714)

Florian et al. (2010) have beliefs listed second, but I would argue that beliefs should be listed first since, to me, it is the foundation upon which an inclusive school system can be developed. To that end, a 36-hour Inclusive Education course has been instituted in the Faculty of Education at York University in Toronto based on the belief that, “the foundation of positive, equitable and inclusive attitudes towards the education of students with disabilities can be laid in preservice-teacher-preparation programmes” (Killoran, Woronko, & Zaretsky, 2013, p. 2).

In my role as a special education consultant I am often asked to observe students who have been referred to full-time special education classes (often in schools other than the student's home school). As a consequence, I had the opportunity to visit a regular kindergarten classroom to observe a student with autism whose teacher had referred her for placement in a special education classroom for students with autism at another school. The conversation that I had with the teacher led me to believe that she was making the referral because the other class existed, and by virtue of its existence she just assumed it would be a better option. She had not considered that the student might benefit from continued inclusion in a regular classroom at her neighbourhood school with her same age peers. She had also assumed that the teacher in the special education classroom would be better equipped to meet the student's needs. I cannot help but wonder how her thinking might be changed by her participation in a course in inclusive education such as the one offered at York University⁵ (Killoran, Woronko, & Zaretsky, 2013).

In addition to examining the process by which students are placed in special classes, there is also a need to consider the programs that are offered to these students within special class placements. Recognizing that there are some differences in the way each public school board implements the Ministry of Education's requirements for special education programming, I would like to share my experiences in one particular school board with two types of programs offered.

Some identified students are withdrawn from their regular classroom for part of their school day. This is usually for language, math or both. These students are primarily those with an identification of learning disability, mild intellectual disability, language impairment, or behaviour. In the special education classroom these students are offered either a replacement program (generally based on Ministry of Education curriculum expectations from a different grade level) or support with grade level work brought from their regular class. While this may

⁵ This course is described in greater detail in chapter 6.

sound reasonable, what tends to happen (due to limited resources) is that in the support classroom you will find students of various ages working on programs at a number of different grade levels. There may be students who are working on language while other students are working on math. In theory, these programs are designed to meet the individual needs of students, but in reality the range of needs in these support programs can be far greater than the variation one would expect to find in the regular class.

The second program I would like to discuss is the self-contained classroom. These programs often require students to be bussed to schools other than the one in their immediate neighbourhood. The students in these classrooms generally have more complex needs. Among other things, they may be identified as having a developmental disability, multiple exceptionalities, or autism. Determining placement in either of these programs is not based solely on identification, but also on the severity of the disability. Self-contained programs exist in regular schools; however, often the students in these programs are quite isolated from the rest of the students. There are also concerns about the level of academic programming offered to these students.

I feel that at this point I must offer something of a disclaimer. I have worked with many dedicated, hardworking teachers in both regular and special education programs. I believe that they generally have the best interests of students at heart. What they have not had is the opportunity to consider how things might be otherwise. It is also important to consider the structures within which these teachers work and how these structures influence their thinking about disability. In addition, employing a critical pedagogy approach within teacher preparation programs might enable teachers to develop ways to use these structures differently in an effort to meet the needs of students. One such structure that comes to mind is the referral process.

The referral process, whereby a student is referred to a school-based team, is used by teachers when they have concerns about a student's progress. According to the Ontario Ministry of Education (2001),

Many school boards have school-based "teams" that suggest teaching strategies to classroom teachers who have students with special needs and that recommend formal and informal assessments. School teams play a significant role in helping classroom teachers address difficulties that a student may be experiencing in the classroom prior to, and after, formal assessment and identification. (p. C6)

The school board in which I work has in-school teams where the core membership is usually the referring teacher, the special education teacher and the principal or vice-principal. Other teachers (e.g., Reading Recovery, English as a Second Language, etc.) as well as board support personnel (e.g. psychologist, speech-language pathologist, physical or occupational therapist, etc.) may be included as necessary. These meetings are designed to provide the classroom teacher with an opportunity to share concerns about a student and brainstorm additional strategies that he/she can then implement in the classroom. Ideally, once these additional strategies are in place, the student experiences greater success in the classroom. If not, an additional in-school team meeting may be held to either develop additional strategies, determine whether the student would benefit from additional assessments (formal or informal) that may lead to an Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC) meeting in which a student, as discussed earlier, would be identified as having special needs and a placement would be determined.

The in-school team meeting is a great opportunity for classroom teachers to develop their repertoire of strategies by brainstorming with colleagues. Unfortunately some teachers come to an initial team meeting thinking that this will be an opportunity for them to convince the team that the student needs formal assessments done so that he/she can be identified and then

placed in a program outside of the regular classroom for at least part of the day. What needs to be determined is why teachers come to that first meeting with a specific end goal in mind. If there were no options for removing a student from the homeroom class, would teachers be more likely to use the in-school team process to build their own skills at meeting the needs of diverse learners? If teacher candidates were given the opportunity to develop their understanding of constructs of disability and how they have changed over time, would they think differently about their motivations for making referrals to in-school team meetings?

Focusing on historical consciousness would bring our individual and collective understanding of disability history to the surface and allow us to ask how this understanding can be used to help us think otherwise about disability in our system of education. Before a full argument can be made for the need to expose teacher candidates to the history of special education in Ontario and the factors that contributed to its development, an exploration of this history is needed. This exploration consists of determining what this history is and where it might be found.

Research Questions

My research interest began with my belief that there is a need to trouble the way teachers currently think about disability. Disability studies in education offers a framework for encouraging teacher candidates to begin to think differently about disability prior to beginning their teaching careers. Advocating for a disability studies approach to teacher education requires that I have an understanding of, not only what is currently in place in teacher education, but also the way in which it came to be so. The following research questions developed from this thinking:

1. How has special education evolved from its inception as auxiliary classes in 1910?
2. How has teacher education evolved in that same time period?

3. How can the history of special education and teacher education help identify barriers to moving forward with a disabilities studies approach to initial teacher preparation?
4. How can the intersecting histories of special education and teacher education be utilized as a component of a disabilities studies approach to initial teacher preparation?

To address these questions I have employed historical and archival research methods to explore the intersecting histories of special education and teacher preparation in Ontario.

Historical and documentary research methods are intended to provide access to, and facilitate insights into, three related areas of knowledge about human social activity. The first of these is the past, whether that of modern history over the past two centuries or of earlier times. The second is that of processes of change and continuity over time, including contestation and negotiation that is involved in these and the broader social, political, economic and other forms of context within which they take place. The third relates to the origins of the present that explains current structures, relationships and behaviours in the context of recent and longer term trends. (McCulloch, 2011, p. 248)

Before delving into the three areas of knowledge outlined above, I found it necessary to reflect upon the concept of the archive and its complexity. In their discussions of archives, Derrida (1995) and Steedman (2002) focus on the institutional whereas Benjamin (in Marx, Schwarz, Schwarz & Wizisla, 2007) focuses on the incidental; things that may not have been traditionally included in institutional archives. Whereas the institutional archives are repositories of official documents, Benjamin's archives, "consist of images, texts, signs, things that one can see and touch" (in Marx et al., 2007, p. 2). Derrida equates the archive with state power. The archon, the superior magistrate, kept the archives in his home and held the power of organizing and interpreting the archives. In contrast, Benjamin's archives were scattered among friends in various countries.

Derrida (1995) highlights the importance of deconstructing the notion of archive beginning with the origin of the word itself. He claims that, “a science of the archive must include the theory of this institutionalization, that is to say, the theory both of the law which begins by inscribing itself there and of the right which authorizes it” (p. 4). Steedman (2002) points out that in *Archive Fever*, Derrida emphasizes, “the Western obsession with finding beginnings, starting places, and origins” (p. 5). Derrida (1995) refers to this as archive fever,

It is to burn with a passion. It is never to rest, interminably, from searching for the archive right where it slips away. It is to run after the archive, even if there’s too much of it, right where something in it anarchives itself. It is to have a compulsive, repetitive, and nostalgic desire for the archive, an irrepressible desire to return to the origin, a homesickness, a nostalgia for the return to the most archaic place of absolute commencement. (p. 91)

However, Steedman (2002) claims that the, “search for the historian’s nostalgia for origins and original referents cannot be performed, because there is actually *nothing there*: she is not looking for anything: only silence, the space shaped by what once was; and now is no more” (p. 154).

In the preface of *Walter Benjamin’s Archive*, Wizisla says that, “order, efficiency, completeness, and objectivity are the principles of archival work (in Marx, Schwarz, Schwarz, & Wizisla, 2007, p. 2) and that Benjamin’s collection varies from those of official archives in its subjectivity. However, Steedman (2002) points out that, “no one historian’s archive is ever like another’s” (p. 9). These differing views highlight a change in approaches to historical work more broadly from a positivist view which posits that historians should be held to the standards of natural science because, “to demand anything less would disqualify history from the ranks of empirically based, scientific disciplines and relegate it to the status of pseudoscience” (Gilderhus, 2003, p. 84) to a more relativist view that the notion of objectivity in history will

always diverge from that in the natural sciences (Gilderhus, 2003). As Newman (2005) points out, “the practice of reading holograph manuscripts is a process that involves the scholar as an interpreter of textual material, and, as such, she or he is intimately implicated in the construction of meaning and knowledge (p. 52).

This dichotomy between institutional archives as representative of state power, and items representative of personal collections is reconciled somewhat through the development of the concept of ‘total archives’. This concept has developed over more than 150 years of Canadian archival history. It is understood to mean,

...that publicly funded archival institutions – such as national archives, provincial archives, and city archives – would acquire, preserve, and make available for public use both government and private sector records in all media, including paper documents and visual and cartographic images, sound recordings, and in more recent years, magnetic and digital media. (Millar, 1998, p. 104)

The evolution of an archival system in Canada was based on concern for the collection of historical information from all sources and not the protection of original government records. Official and personal documents and materials were included. According to the Public Archives Act of 1912 (as cited in Millar, 1998)

The Public Archive shall consist of all such public records, documents and other historical material of every kind, nature and description as, under this act, or under the authority of any order in council made by virtue thereof, are placed under the care, custody and control of the Dominion Archivist. (p. 110)

Put another way, “all records, from all sources, for all people” (Millar, 1998, p.117).

Although the concept of ‘total archives’ merges the personal with the institutional, it is still critical to consider whose voices are represented in the archives and whose are not. We can learn, not only from what we find in the archive, but also from what we do not find. As Steedman

(2002) asserts, “historians read for what is not there: the silences and absences of the documents always speak to us” (p. 151).

Throughout my research, I have considered both what I found and what I did not find in the archive. I have also kept in mind Ann Stoler’s contention (as cited in Arondekar, 2005) that there is a need “for scholars to move ‘from archive-as-source-to archive-as-subject,’ to pay attention to the process of archiving, not just to the archive as a repository of facts and objects” (p. 15).

Data Collection

My research begins with an exploration of the origins of special education and teacher education in Ontario and the circumstances which led to their development. After providing the broad context, data was collected within the framework of a case study approach in order to provide an in-depth study of the changes in teacher education in response to evolving special education practices. Although there are currently sixteen faculties of education in Ontario, I focused my research on the teacher preparation programs at the University of Toronto (which ultimately became part of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education [OISE/UT]), University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario and Nipissing University. These are the four faculties of education in the province with histories tracing back to Normal Schools. I examined the development of their programs as they transformed from Normal Schools to Teachers’ Colleges and then became integrated into the universities to become faculties of education.

Both primary and secondary sources were gathered for the purposes of this research. These documents included those related to educational policy and administration; those of individual educational institutions; as well as the personal papers of teachers, educational reformers and others whose work has related specifically to education (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000). I began by reading secondary sources about educational history in Canada and then more specifically in Ontario (for example, Axelrod, 1997; Curtis, 1988; Fleming, 1971;

Gidney 1999). As I read through these sources I was able to generate a list of people, organizations, and documents to use as a starting place for archival research. I began my search for primary sources at the Archives of Ontario. I was also able to access primary sources through online archives (e.g., www.archive.org). As I reviewed primary sources, and continued to access secondary sources, I became aware of additional primary sources which resulted in an organic, iterative process.

Archival records related to teacher preparation in Ontario include, but are not limited to, the content of courses in Normal Schools, Teachers' Colleges and later in the Faculties of Education as well as specific courses related to special education that were offered to Ontario's teacher candidates in other jurisdictions (e.g., Vineland Training School in New Jersey; Massachusetts Institute for the Feeble-minded⁶).

Policy documents from the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (including their preceding agencies) related to teacher preparation and special education were also accessed. Additionally, I examined policy documents from the Ontario College of Teachers. Available documents were accessed from the agencies themselves and older documents were accessed through the Archives of Ontario. In one instance, I contacted a Program Officer from the Ontario College of Teachers directly for additional information.

In an attempt to determine the development of programs of teacher education in the faculties of education in Ontario, course calendars and course outlines were reviewed. They were accessed either from the faculties themselves, the university libraries or the registrars' offices.

Data Analysis

Documentary analysis was undertaken with consideration given to the four components outlined by McCulloch (2011). These components include: authenticity, meaning, context, and

⁶ For references to these and other training opportunities for Ontario teachers of auxiliary classes please see MacMurchy, 1915.

theorization. Authenticity asks the researcher to verify authorship, place and date of production of the document. The credibility of the document must also be taken into account as well as the degree to which the document is representative of the topic. Meaning involves understanding the content as well as the position from which the author writes and the arguments he/she develops.

The context in which the document was produced is also an important area of investigation. Context comprises the broad educational, social, political and economic milieu of the time. Context also takes into account the audience for whom the document was created as well as the influence the document may have had on the issues of the time in which it was created. As it relates to disability, context will allow for the examination of, “policies and practices that have a direct impact on the material reality of living with disability [but] are rarely examined by society” (Ware, 2009, p. 397).

Lastly, McCulloch (2011) recognizes three general theoretical traditions in documentary analysis: positivist, interpretive and critical. I adopted a primarily critical approach in my analysis. I considered this work as an opportunity to explore the, “unexamined assumption about the taken-for-granted category of disability in educational discourse – one shaped by ideologies, history, medicine, and social and political assumptions whose central binary is ability – disability” (Ware, 2009, p. 403).

Ethical Considerations

Delving into the area of ethics in historical research took me on an interesting journey. When I turned to qualitative research texts I found information relating to ethical considerations for research involving human participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Kirby, Greaves & Reid, 2010; Patton, 2002) but very little, if anything at all, about ethical considerations for historical and documentary research. One exception was *Research Methods in Education* (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011) which included a chapter on *Historical and Documentary Research in*

Education (McCulloch, 2011) containing a section on *Ethical and Legal Issues*. McCulloch and Richardson, in their book *Historical Research in Educational Settings* (2000), provide some insight into the dearth of information about historical research in qualitative research texts.

The discipline of history and the field of education have developed separately and with different perspectives. Educationists, defined by McCulloch and Richardson (2000) as, “those concerned to understand and improve education” (p. 131), want to utilize historical studies in education to address contemporary problems and controversies whereas academic historians value educational history for its own sake. However, “the present situation is one in which the history of education is more open than ever before to a creative relationship between the traditional strengths of history and the empirical social sciences” (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000, p. 49). McCulloch and Richardson (2000) stipulate that, in addition to being well versed in the research methods of social sciences, researchers interested in the history of education should also be familiar with the, “concerns and methods of research in history” (p. 49). So it is to the discipline of history I turn to investigate areas of ethical consideration that might impact on my work.

I came across an issue of the journal *History and Theory* (“Historians and Ethics”, 2004) that was devoted to the topic of ethics in historical research. The questions that contributors were asked to consider were outlined in the introduction to the issue,

Do historians *as historians* have an ethical responsibility, and if so to whom? Are there ethical commitments that historians have whether they like it or not? Are there ways that historians can either insulate themselves from ethical commitments (insofar as these commitments infect historical research and render it unable to function as it should), or re-conceive these commitments so as to practice history better and to understand the nature of their endeavor more accurately? (Fay, 2004, p. 1)

As I read through the responses I found certain themes emerging. They included notions of objectivity/subjectivity, the role of moral and value judgments and to a lesser extent, the historians' obligations to his/her readers and to the dead about whom he/she writes. The impact of postmodernism on these issues was also addressed.

In the modern era of history writing objectivity was revered and, more importantly, thought to be possible. Postmodernism has challenged historians to recognize the artificiality of traditional historical methods. Ermarth (2004) points out that the primary liability of historical method is its exclusions. She goes on to say that "history suppresses what it cannot encompass, for whatever reason of cultural or individual limitation, and thus the objectivity that it formally claims is unearned" (p. 71). The shift from modernity to postmodernity also involves a shift in ethics. In modernity, ethics involved, "value-based prescriptive rules governing what we *should* do ... but postmodernity erases the authority of *should*" (p. 75). She goes on to argue that in postmodernity ethics takes on the meaning of *code*. As a result, ethical practice in the writing of history involves explicit acknowledgment of methods, purposes and position (Ermarth, 2004).

Recognizing the subjectivity of writing history also involves recognizing when judgments are being made. The call for this type of acknowledgment has met with resistance from historians because, "to admit that in one way or another moral values inform, even pervade our histories would be to deny their fully academic (read, scientific) character and thereby inflict on our work, in the academy's eyes, a proportional loss of authority, credibility, and respect" (Gorman, p. 38, 2004). Even if the historian is willing to acknowledge that judgments are being made, one of the challenges of identifying when the historian is making these judgments stems from the difficulty inherent in separating the subject (the historian) from the object (the past itself) (Ankersmit, 2004). Despite this challenge, historians must carefully differentiate between

facts and values in their research because there is, “no complete escape from involvement in moral and value judgments” (Carcraft, 2004, p 33).

Gorman (2004) purports that historians *as historians* have an ethical responsibility to provide their readers with historical truth. He goes on to say that, “being a historian is essentially a matter of searching for historical knowledge as part of an obligation voluntarily undertaken to give truth to those who have a right to it” (p. 115). He includes the dead among those who have a right to historical truth. De Baets (2004) also explores the idea of the historian’s ethical obligations to the dead whom he refers to as, “former human beings” (p. 134). He contends that, “concern for the dignity of the subjects of historical study constitutes the most important of several classes of responsibilities of historians” and argues for the institution of a code of ethics which should include a statement regarding the obligations of historians to both the living and the dead. He suggests the following wording:

Aware of the universal rights of the living and the universal responsibilities of the living toward the dead, historians shall respect the dignity of the living and the dead they study. They shall use a test when handling or publishing sensitive personal information: when privacy and reputation interests of subjects of study conflict with the responsibility to search honestly for historical truth, private and public interests shall be fairly assessed. (De Baets, 2004, p. 159)

Reflecting on the ethical obligations of historians highlights the importance of revealing my position as a researcher and recognizing some of the challenges inherent in this kind of work. While my intention is to search for historical truth, I will keep in mind that history is constructed from fragments and told from the perspective of the individual researcher. As I proceed, I will also consider the responsibilities I have to be respectful of the individuals (living or dead) whose experiences will become part of my work.

Outline of the Dissertation

The overall purpose of this dissertation is to reimagine teacher education programs as environments in which prospective educators are challenged to think about their conceptions of disability and how those conceptions impact their practice in the classroom. Ultimately my hope is that this reimagined approach to teacher education will lead to inclusive schools that improve the experiences of all students.

To provide a context for this reimagining I will investigate current teacher education practices against the backdrop of the intersecting histories of special education and teacher preparation. To that end, in Chapter Two I provide an overview of the history of special education in Ontario from the schoolrooms of Orillia's *Ontario Asylum for Idiots* established in 1876 and the auxiliary classes that opened in two Toronto public schools in 1910 to our current practices across the province. From this history I go on to explore the evolution of teacher education in the province from the establishment of the Toronto Normal School in 1847 to the Teachers' Colleges that normal schools evolved into in 1953 and then the relocation of teacher education to universities where they became faculties of education in the 1960s and 70s. The chapter ends with an examination of the intersections of these two histories and the implications for the preparation of teachers who work with students with disabilities.

Chapter Three provides an analysis of the factors that influenced the development of the intersecting histories of special education and teacher preparation. The factors identified and explored in this chapter are compulsory schooling, industrialization/immigration, eugenics, intelligence testing, the rise of the professional, and models of disability.

Chapter Four contains descriptions of the teacher education programs at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario, and Nipissing University. Before delving into their contemporary programs I trace their histories back to their

normal school beginnings. Throughout the descriptions I have highlighted courses that have a special education component or focus.

In Chapter Five I offer an analysis of the four current teacher education programs described in chapter four that looks for remnants of the past that continue to, often unknowingly, influence current practices. This analysis is organized around characteristics of medical model and social model constructions of disability. I then go on to explore Ministry of Education regulations in relation to these two models.

Chapter Six moves beyond the past and the present to reimagine the future of teacher education from a disability studies in education lens. I describe the development of disability studies in education as an outcropping of critical disability studies. I go on to explicate the characteristics of disability studies in education and the benefits of embedding this approach into teacher education programs while at the same time recognizing some of the challenges.

Chapter Seven highlights the benefits of disability studies in education for our schools and communities. I acknowledge some of the challenges that may arise as teachers with a disability studies in education perspective begin their work in schools and offer possible responses. I conclude the discussion by advocating for the adoption of this approach despite its challenges so that ultimately we can create schools that are inclusive of all our students.

Chapter 2: Historical Framework

Historical research can, “illuminate the structures and the taken for granted assumptions of our contemporary world, by demonstrating that these have developed historically, that they were established for particular purposes that were often social, economic and political in nature, and that in many cases they are comparatively recent in their origin” (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000, pp. 5-6). The lack of emphasis on history in the field of education can be linked to the persistent struggle to find a balance between theory and practice. While the traditional discipline of history has a long-standing place in the academy, the field of education is a relative newcomer. From their inception, programs in teacher education tended to focus on the practical whereas academic history did not. Students in teacher education programs prefer a practical approach and tend to view studies in the history of education as irrelevant to their classroom practice (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000).

What these education students do not realize is that,

By focusing only on the current situation, on the current attempts to restructure curriculum and teaching, we lose a sense of what these attempts grew out of. Very importantly, we can also miss some of the major political dynamics that are embodied within such attempts. In so doing, the efficacy of real groups of people who successfully acted against such earlier periods of rationalisation are lost. (Apple, 1986, p. 10, as cited in McCulloch & Richardson, 2000)

The way in which history is presented to teacher candidates is also something that should be considered. In order to trouble our thinking about disability in education, disability history should be critically examined and explored. This approach would challenge teacher candidates to question their current understandings of disability, and how those understandings developed.

With an eye to first positioning this discussion in terms of the historical practice in the field, this chapter will begin with a brief chronological overview of education for children with disabilities starting from segregation in institutions and the opening of auxiliary classes in public schools. In order to understand the corresponding preparation of teachers to work in these classes, I will also provide a broad overview of the development of teacher education and then go on to discuss the intersections between practice in special education and teacher education. Giroux and McLaren (1986) point out that, chronological history typically, “saw its object as somehow unalterably ‘there,’ given, waiting only to be discovered”. They argue that this approach should be, “supplanted by a focus on how specific educational practices can be understood as historical constructions related to the economic, social, and political events of a particular time and place” (p. 231). To that end, the chapter that follows will examine factors that influenced the development of these two histories with a particular focus on compulsory schooling, industrialization/immigration, eugenics, intelligence testing, the rise of the professional, and models of disability.

My intention in examining the historical context in this way is twofold. It provides a starting place for considering the incorporation of disability history into teacher education and how it could be used to engage teacher candidates in praxis. “Through their continuing praxis, men and women simultaneously create history and become historical-social beings...people can tri-dimensionalize time into the past, the present, and the future, their history, in function of their own creations, develops as a constant process of transformation” (Freire, 2009, p. 101).

Examining this history also provides a backdrop for the analysis of current teacher education practices related to preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities. Exploring these histories will allow me to identify their remnants in our current practices and the ways in which these unexamined remnants keep us tethered to old notions of disability as ‘other’.

The Changing Face of Special Education in Ontario

The education of children with disabilities has changed over time. Initially, if these children were educated at all, it was in segregated settings.

Institutions. Children who, at the beginning of the twentieth century, would have been classified as ‘mentally-defective’ were thought to need permanent care in an institution because, as MacMurchy, the Inspector of Auxiliary classes at the time explained, “investigators who have traced back the history of the ne’er-do-weel [*sic*], the loafer, the tramp, the pauper, the drunkard, the incendiary, the vicious, and the criminal, have often found that in the elementary schools they were recognized as mentally-defective children” (1915, p. 2). These students were institutionalized to prevent, “the degradation and deterioration of the national character” (MacMurchy, 1915, p. 2).

The Ontario Government opened its first institution in 1876. Originally called the *Ontario Asylum for Idiots*, it was built outside of Orillia on the shores of Lake Simcoe. Although consigning children to institutions became less likely over time, by 1960, the Ontario government operated 16 institutions for people with developmental disabilities. More than 6,000 children and adults lived in these institutions (Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, 2012). Ontario’s last three institutions to close were the *Huron Regional Centre* in Orillia, originally called the *Orillia Asylum for Idiots* and then the *Ontario Hospital School* (1876-2009); the *Rideau Regional Centre* in Smith Falls, originally called the *Ontario Hospital School* (1951-2009); and the Southwestern Regional Centre in Chatham Kent, originally called the *Ontario Hospital School for Retarded Children* at Cedar Springs (1961-2008) (Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, 2013).

These institutions were intended to provide academic and vocational training in addition to custodial care, however, this was often not the case. Only those children deemed ‘educable’ had the opportunity to go to the schoolrooms for any sort of formal education. Robbie and

Edgar, residents of the institution in Orillia in the 1930s, describe the schoolrooms and how they compared with their previous school,

The schoolrooms were at the back. It was different from St. Mary's, which was a proper school with its own yard, classrooms, and the head-teacher's office where Sister St. Gabriel lived. Here they were in a large airy room with large grimy windows and a lead fireplace. Different groups sat together: Lower Academic at one end, and Upper Academic at the other end. Smaller groups for little children, imbeciles, and idiots, were in the basement doing bead work and tin foil sorting and such... (Wheatley, 2013, pp. 252-253)

The vocational training was often little more than an excuse to make up for understaffing and included shoveling coal, farming, laundry, kitchen tasks and other forms of manual labour (Rossiter & Clarkson, 2013). And, as Rossiter and Clarkson (2013) point out, "from their inception, life within Canadian institutions was unrelentingly oppressive; however, many years of financial strain, provincial neglect, chronic overcrowding and prevailing cultural attitudes of fear, abjection and the need for social isolation left people with ID [intellectual disabilities] vulnerable to widespread abuse" (p. 12).

Auxiliary classes. These classes were initially designed by Helen MacMurphy as clearing houses used to determine which children belonged in institutions and which children were allowed to stay at home and attend a segregated class in public school. These classes were the precursors to what would ultimately become known as special education.

Classes for children with intellectual disabilities. Not all feeble-minded students were immediately relegated to residential institutions. In 1910, two special classes called Auxiliary classes were set up in two different schools in Toronto for students who were experiencing difficulty in the regular classroom. Helen MacMurphy (1915) explained that some students may only appear to be mentally defective as a result of a physical defect and these

students may find their way back to the regular class after having some remediation in the auxiliary classroom. Other students may only have a slight mental defect and as a result, may be successful in the auxiliary classroom. However, she goes on to point out that,

Where special classes have been tried, and they have been established now for many years in Great Britain, on the continent and in the United States, it is found that more than two-thirds of the children who are in them are and always will be dependents. From the special [day] schools, then, as a rule, they should go very soon to special boarding schools as their permanent home, a place where they can be taught to be useful and are happy, and thus save, instead of squandering, the people's money. (MacMurchy as cited in Marshall, 1990, pp. 22-23)

Classes for children with physical disabilities. In addition to addressing the education of children with cognitive disabilities, another aspect of the development of special education was centered on the needs of students with physical differences. When auxiliary classes for students with physical disabilities were first being developed, MacMurchy (1915) delineated that they were required for children who fell into three categories:

(1) Children who are physically disabled as the result of congenital defects, disease or illness; (2) children who are blind or semi-blind from high myopia and other causes; (3) children who are deaf or semi-deaf. (p. 51)

It was considered appropriate to provide 'training' to children who fell into these categories so, "that they may become capable of self-support and of discharging the duties of citizenship" (MacMurchy, 1915, p. 51).

MacMurchy (1915) advocated for the provision of transportation to get to school, appropriate equipment (i.e., adjustable desks and seats; blackboards and dustless chalk instead of pen, pencil, ink or paper) and open-air schools for children with illnesses such as anemia or tuberculosis. She also recognized the need for students to have their vision and hearing

appropriately assessed. Although MacMurchy stressed the importance of school for students with physical disabilities, for many of these students the goal was suitable employment in occupations considered appropriate to their situation. The list provided in *Organization and Management of Auxiliary Classes* (MacMurchy, 1915) includes, “art embroidery, bookbinding, dressmaking, jewellery work, photography, tailoring and wood-carving” (p. 54). Ironically, many of the occupations recommended for students with physical disabilities are actually physically demanding and unfortunately they do not necessarily take into consideration students’ intellectual capabilities.

Expansion of special education in Ontario. With the ascendance of the doctor and the authority of science came the medicalization of pedagogy. MacMurchy’s tenure as Inspector of Auxiliary classes coincided with what Milewski (2010) refers to as the scientisation of schooling. After MacMurchy resigned in 1920 this scientisation continued with the appointment of psychologist Dr. S. B. Sinclair as her replacement. Auxiliary classes continued to expand and by 1928 there were 207 in the province. When Sinclair retired in 1929 he was followed by H. E. Amoss who continued the work of his predecessor until 1939 and the number of auxiliary classes continued to grow.

In 1945 a Royal Commission (the Hope Commission) was set up to investigate changes that should be made to the education system to accommodate post-war increases in immigration, the baby boom and industrial development. The commission released its findings in 1950 (Marshall, 1990). In the chapter entitled *Exceptional Children*, the commission provided an overview of the provision of special education services from their inception including institutions, day schools, and auxiliary classes. The report explained that children referred to as ‘atypical’ required support beyond that available in a regular classroom. They go on to explain that, “a markedly atypical child is one who, by reason of physical, mental, or social deviation from the average, is unable to make reasonably satisfactory progress in the work of the regular

grades of the school. Included are not only those who deviate mentally or physically, but also those who show deviations in attitudes and behaviour...” (Ontario & Hope, pp. 364-365). The commission generally concluded that the approach currently in place to support ‘atypical’ children continued to be suitable, however, it required substantial expansion to meet the growing needs of the children in the province.

In addition to expanding the provision of special education services, the commission recommended a change in the terminology used to refer to these services. It was determined, “that the name “Special” be substituted for “Auxiliary” in the Acts and regulations of the Department of Education relating to special education” (Ontario & Hope, 1950, p. 382). It was felt that this would provide greater consistency with terminology used in other provinces and countries. Special education continued to be a preoccupation into the 1960s as the civil rights movement took hold.

The civil rights movement gave voice to people with disabilities and allowed for challenges to an education system that segregated students with disabilities. These challenges brought about a movement for integration. In Ontario, the Hall-Dennis Report, *Living and Learning: The Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario* was released in 1968. Gidney (2002), describes this report as, “very much the child of its age” (p. 72). It is grounded in educational progressivism that stresses the importance of ‘child-centred’ schools. These schools focus on the interests, needs, and abilities of students and provide them with opportunities to make decisions about the learning experiences in which they would like to participate (Gidney, 2002).

The report itself argues that, “...if primary emphasis is placed on the learning and progressive development of each child as an individual, it becomes easier - as well as imperative - to take in a far greater number of children with a variety of personal strengths and weaknesses under the umbrella of the regular school program” (Ontario, 1968, p. 101). The

report goes on to question the value of diagnostic categories. These labels can become self-fulfilling prophecies because; “dividing children into categories has the effect of labelling the child and of making him think that he fits the label as one who is in some respect deficient” (p. 106). Despite the categorical distinctions made, the classrooms that are set up based on these categories tend to use remarkably similar teaching methods. The authors of the report suggest that it would be more useful to focus on providing a learning profile that moves beyond diagnostic categories and instead provides an outline of a student’s strengths and weaknesses which can then be used to design and implement a positive program of learning tailored to individual needs. Emphasis should be shifted from special classes that are set up for students based on diagnostic categories to a system within which children with disabilities becoming part of the regular class and spend part of their day in a special classroom focusing on areas of difficulty. This approach also recognizes the importance of social interaction with same age peers (Ontario, 1968).

Recommendations from the Hall-Dennis Report (Ontario, 1968) suggest that improving the development and organization of special education requires acknowledging that, “the provision of special educational services to meet the needs of all children is a mandatory responsibility of school boards” and the development of special education is, “an integral part of the total school program” (p. 187). Although the report supports the right of every child to have access to the best educational program possible and suggests that, “special education should not be set up as something separate from the ordinary school program”, it still recommends maintaining a small number of residential schools throughout the province, “for those whose handicaps are so serious as to require such services” (p. 188).

Despite recommending the maintenance of a number of residential schools, the Hall-Dennis Report (Ontario, 1968) led to greater integration of students with special needs into local schools. It also ultimately led to the development of the Education Amendment Act commonly

referred to by its working title: Bill 82 that was enacted on December 12, 1980. Prior to Bill 82, boards of education were allowed to provide special education if they so chose but after the enactment of Bill 82 they were required to do so (Bennett, Dworet, & Weber, 2008). Although greater numbers of students with disabilities were now being educated in their neighbourhood schools, integration still falls under the umbrella of special education, and students with disabilities tend to be separated from their peers for all or some part of their school day. Integration tended to focus more on placement than program. The assumption was that if students with disabilities were placed in classrooms at their local schools that teaching practice in the classroom would change accordingly (Vislie, 2003). It was possible, however, for a student to be technically integrated while at the same time spending the entire day isolated from his/her peers (Farrell, 2000).

In the 1990s, a body of inclusive education literature emerged. It grew out of the struggle against the pervasiveness of deficit-based discourses that privilege the labeling and categorizing of students into segregated education (Goodley, 2011). Inclusion moves beyond placement to describe the quality of education received by students with special needs (Farrell, 2000). It is typified by the challenge of expressing the full range of human variation in school cultures that are mediated through curriculum, pedagogy and school reorganization (Slee, 1997, 2008). Sapon-Shevin (2007), defines inclusion as,

...a model that begins with the right of every child to be in the mainstream of education. Students do not have to “earn” their way into the classroom with their behavior or skills. They are assumed to be full members nonetheless. Rather than saying, “This is my classroom – let’s see if you can fit in,” inclusion asks teachers to think about all aspects of their classroom – pedagogy, curriculum and classroom climate – in order to make the environment educative and welcoming for all students. It is a mutual process of adaptation and accommodations, with the goal being full inclusion with supports. (p. 6)

Although Sapon-Shevin (2007) does not include the need for systemic reorganization in her definition, I believe that her explanation of inclusion highlights the need for individual classroom teachers to consider their beliefs about disability and how those beliefs impact upon the instructional decisions they make every day. Slee (1997), tells us that, “special education proceeds from a theoretical position – from a particular way of seeing the world and the place of schooling and those who are seen to be disabled within that world” (p. 410). He goes on to cite the observation of Clark, Dyson, Millward and Skidmore, “that theory often remains unexplicated and therefore there is a tacit acceptance of the disinterested professional going about an unquestionably necessary set of tasks” (in Slee, 1997, p. 410). In order to explicate the theory behind special education, I will argue that a deeper understanding of the historical shifts in thinking about special education will provide new understanding of both theory and practice in special education today.

The Evolution of Teacher Preparation

Having briefly explored the history of special education and the role that this history might have in inspiring teacher candidates to think differently about disability leads me to question why examining this history has not traditionally been part of teacher preparation programs. Just as the workshops provided to practicing teachers focus on the *how* over the *why*, it seems that teacher preparation programs tend towards this same kind of emphasis. An exploration of the development of teacher preparation in Ontario may provide some insight into why this is so.

Normal schools. Formal teacher preparation in Ontario began when Egerton Ryerson opened the Toronto Normal School for teacher training in 1847. The opening of this school was predicated on the contention made by provincial education officials that consistent teacher certification would raise the quality of school teaching and enhance the status of teachers. These schools stressed standardized teaching norms, and as described by Ryerson were

schools, “in which the principles and practices of teaching according to rule are taught and exemplified” (as cited in Axelrod, 1997, p. 40). As the 19th Century progressed, additional normal schools were opened in the province. Normal school students were expected, “to acquire the habits, skills and the character structure appropriate to the morally forceful teacher” (Axelrod, 1997, p. 46). To ensure that students were good moral examples there was strict enforcement of the many rules that were in place. Students were subjected to a rigorous schedule of lectures, had a strict nine p.m. curfew and were expected to attend church services every week (Curtis, 1988).

In contrast to the harsh conditions that students of the Normal School experienced in learning to become teachers, Ryerson advocated for a gentler approach to educating children in elementary schools. He was a proponent of the Prussian system that was based on Pestalozzianism. This approach replaced memorization and rote recitation with deeper understanding and also encouraged teachers to make learning a joyful experience for students (Curtis, 1988; Phillips, 1957). In his *Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada* (1847), Ryerson advocates for this approach by quoting James Porter (Local Superintendent of the Public Schools of the city of Toronto),

Ought we to attach more value to an Education which, though it only teaches a child to read, has, in doing so, taught him also to think, than we should to one which, though it may have bestowed on him the husks and the shells of half a dozen sciences, has never taught him to use with pleasure and effect his reflective faculties. He who can think, and loves to think, will become, if he has a few good books, a wise man. He who knows not how to think, or who hates the toil of doing it, will remain imbecile, though his mind be crowded with the contents of a library. (p. 58)

Although Ryerson supported this approach, there were difficulties putting it into practice. Often this was due to large class sizes, and the problems teachers experienced with classroom

management (Curtis, 1988; Houston & Prentice, 1988). In his *Report on the State of Education, County of Northumberland, 1855-6*, Edward Scarlett, Superintendent of Schools, observed that teachers in his county routinely adopted the practice of,

...pressing children in a hurried superficial manner from book to book without reference to age capacity or the future wellbeing of the pupils... Words are learned without meaning sentences are stammered over without knowing the ideas the[y] contain rules are committed without understanding them. (as cited in Curtis, 1988, p. 285)

Despite the difficulties with implementation, by 1877, “most of Ryerson’s enlightened ideas on teaching methods and pupil-teacher relations were widely accepted” (Johnson, 1971, p. 176).

Before potential teachers could learn about Pestalozzian methods, they had to meet the Normal school entrance requirements. The entrance requirements were, “a Normal School Entrance or higher academic certificate, a certificate of moral character, and a physician’s certificate. Candidates had to be at least eighteen years of age and, if successful, had to teach in Ontario for at least one year” (Fleming, 1971, p. 4). Despite the increase in opportunities for formal teacher training, aspiring teachers were not required to attend normal schools in order to be qualified to teach. It must also be recognized that the length of the initial normal school teacher training was only five months and, given that many of the teacher candidates had limited secondary school education, the normal school curriculum tended to focus on academic work with a little bit of additional professional training in preparation for work in the classroom. As access to secondary education expanded, more applicants had attended secondary school. As a result the content of the normal school training moved from academic content to a focus on teaching methods (Ontario & Hope, 1950). To support this focus on teaching methods, manuals pertaining to the teaching of each subject were introduced in 1916. They continued to be in use until 1937 when the elementary school program became much less prescriptive and teacher preparation shifted its focus as a result (Ontario, 1966).

Teachers' colleges. Normal schools were renamed teachers' colleges in 1953. Smyth (2006), explains that the change in name indicated a change in focus. "No longer was the goal of the teacher education program to instruct students in the craft of 'teaching to the norm'. Instead, their goal was the professional education of teachers through academic and pedagogical studies" (p. 82). The Hope Commission (Ontario & Hope, 1950) recommended that the teachers' college training program include:

- (1) An extension of general education through a study of English and a limited number of other subjects of the programme of the third year of junior college.
- (2) A study of professional subjects such as methodology, school management and administration, educational psychology, and professional ethics.
- (3) Special attention to oral and written English (including speech training and production), library methods, methods of teaching religious education, and audio-visual teaching aids.
- (4) In addition to training in methods in physical and health education, a school health programme including utilization of health services for teachers in training. (p. 582)

As teachers continued to be trained in the province's teachers' colleges, debates about the initial preparation of teachers continued to flourish. Teachers' colleges were owned, operated and financed by the Ministry of Education and regulated by the Ministry of Education's Teacher Education Branch. As a result, a key question in the debates centered on the issue of control. Some of the discussion began to focus on the possibility of placing teacher education within the universities. In 1964 a Ministerial Committee, chaired by C.R. MacLeod, was established to examine and report on the preparation of elementary school teachers.

Faculties of education. The MacLeod Report (Ontario, 1966) outlined key concerns about teacher preparation and recommendations for its improvement. The committee recognized that Teachers' Colleges had been doing a competent job preparing teachers within

their current structures, however, given the short duration of the program and its focus on teaching methods, new teachers were graduating without the maturity and knowledge of child psychology and philosophy of education required for their work. The members of the committee agreed that the new program of teacher education should include four main components:

1. a liberal or academic education;
2. foundations of education such as psychology, philosophy, and sociology;
3. curriculum and instruction;
4. practice teaching. (p. 17)

The report provides additional recommendations regarding the content of each of the foundations of education components. Educational psychology should concentrate on the learning process and child development to enable teachers to provide children with opportunities that are appropriate to their intellectual, social, and emotional growth. A focus on educational philosophy would allow student teachers to critically assess the way they were taught and to develop their own philosophies of teaching, and an awareness of sociology would increase student teachers' awareness of the socio-cultural context within which schools are situated (Ontario, 1966).

The MacLeod Report recommended the relocation of teacher education to university settings. The report went on to say that the program should be four years long and admission would now be based on grades and not open to anyone who applied. The program would consist of, "academic/liberal education; foundations of education; curriculum and instruction; practice teaching" (Smyth, 2006, p. 87). On March 29, 1966, William Davis, the Minister of Education welcomed the MacLeod Report's recommendations. Despite the enthusiastic response from the Ministry of Education, the universities were more tentative. It took eight years until all of Ontario's teachers' colleges were integrated with the universities in the province to become faculties of education (Smyth, 2006). Additional faculties of education have since been

established.

Balancing theory and practice. From its inception, teacher training in Ontario focused on providing teacher candidates with some of the content knowledge typically found in secondary school courses as well as providing information about teaching methods. The focus on methods corresponds to the *how* of teaching mentioned earlier. When teacher preparation was absorbed into the universities the amount of time devoted to the foundation areas of history, philosophy and sociology of education as opposed to the applied areas of curriculum and instruction was a constant source of dispute. Adding to the challenge of emphasizing the foundation areas, which represent the *why* of teaching, is the recognition that, “students clearly placed higher value on those curriculum and instruction courses that they perceived as providing them with the tools to instruct and manage their classrooms” (Smyth, 2006, p. 92).

The MacLeod Report (Ontario, 1966) recognized the tensions that can arise between the foundations of education and the curriculum and instruction components of teacher education programs by acknowledging that, “some teachers object to the meaningless repetition to which they believe they are subjected in methodology courses, and some teachers comment on the overemphasis on teaching patterns and techniques insufficiently related to the foundations of education” (p. 25). The report goes on to recommend that instructors in each of these areas work cooperatively to, “emphasize the relationship and integration of educational aims, psychological principles, course content, and instructional procedures” (p. 25).

Despite this recommendation, this focus on methods remains dominant among many teachers today. I have presented workshops in which the prevailing feeling displayed by the participants is one of ‘just tell me what to do’. Teaching is fast-paced and demanding but as a teacher, I think that we do ourselves, and our students, a disservice if we do not take the time to ask ourselves why we do what we do. Exploring the history of teacher preparation in Ontario provides insight into how things got to be the way they are, which leads us to consider how

things might be otherwise. Bartolome (2009) reminds us that,

Educators need to reject the present methods fetish so as to create learning environments informed by both action and reflection. In freeing themselves from the blind adoption of so-called effective (and sometimes “teacher-proof”) strategies, teachers can begin the reflective process, which allows them to recreate and reinvent teaching methods and limit or expand the possibilities to humanize education. (p. 340)

Where Special Education and Teacher Preparation Intersect

As the education of children with disabilities moved from segregation to integration and then towards inclusion, governmental commissions and their subsequent reports began to acknowledge the need for teacher education programs to prepare teachers to work with an increasingly diverse population of learners. However, these reports also clearly continued the practice of additional, separate teacher education for those who were interested in working primarily with children with disabilities.

Helen MacMurchy also outlined the qualifications and training required for the teachers of these classes. She determined that, “it is of essential importance to secure some one for this work who will be a saviour to these children” (MacMurchy, 1915, p. 103). The teachers who taught the students in these classes were also expected to take additional courses. These courses were initially offered at the Vineland Training School in New Jersey, and the Massachusetts Institute for Feeble-Minded at Waverly as well as a number of other American Universities. Classes in the New York University Summer School, run by Dr. H. H. Goddard of the Vineland Training School, included: The Psychology of Defectives; The Pedagogy of Defectives; Tests of Intelligence; Abnormal Psychology; and Criminal Psychology (Macmurchy, 1915).

As thinking about children with disabilities became more supportive of diversity, the nature of these additional courses for teachers who worked with them changed but ultimately

remained separate from initial teacher education. In 1950 the Hope Commission reviewed the existing auxiliary class provision and recommended additional training for teachers of handicapped children. It was felt that it would be unfeasible to provide the special courses at the usual teacher training institutions. It was also felt that teaching experience was necessary before teachers could be admitted into programs that would prepare them for teaching in auxiliary classes. The Hope Commission recommended that special professional preparation for schools and classes for handicapped children should continue to be offered through summer courses (Ontario & Hope, 1950).

The MacLeod Report came out in 1966 as the disability rights movement was gaining momentum. It advocated for a comprehensive overhaul of teacher education that takes into account, "the need to deal with all children with all their abilities and disabilities" (Ontario, 1966, p. 12). According to the report, most 'exceptional' children remain in the ordinary classroom and are taught by a regular teacher who should have some knowledge and understanding of working with children with "special abilities or disabilities" (p. 20). However, the report goes on to recognize that two or three percent of the school population require placement in special classes and the teachers of these classes require a "fuller program of preparation than that which is now provided" (p. 20).

The committee outlines a plan for these teachers that includes a basic degree and professional preparation followed by specialist preparation. They suggest that the general professional program include some options in special education to provide a general background for all teachers and to spark interest in the specialist option for further study. Elaborating on the importance of the foundations of education, the report explains that educational psychology courses should focus on stages of development. This coursework should also provide opportunities for all student teachers to observe and work with children, "selected from those who are normal, slow-learners, gifted, emotionally disturbed or culturally

deprived” (Ontario, 1966, p. 25). These opportunities would allow candidates to make connections between theory and practice. However, the specialist option would still be required for teachers of special classes within the schools as well as for teachers of students in special schools (i.e., schools for the deaf) and institutions (i.e., for the emotionally and mentally disturbed).

Although over time teacher education has acknowledged a greater need to prepare all teachers to work with students with a broad range of abilities, special education qualifications still require interested teachers to complete additional qualifications beyond completion of their initial teacher preparation program.

Looking Back to Move Ahead

In addition to the continued practice of separate and additional courses for teachers interested in special education qualifications, the majority of teacher education institutions continue to prepare teachers within the traditional special education paradigm. Although some institutions have begun to claim an inclusive approach to disability, “difference is often reinscribed rather than interrogated” (Rice, 2006, p. 20). Examining the history of teacher education and the factors that influenced its development may help identify the obstacles to moving forward with a disability studies approach. This look back is necessary because, as Smyth (2008/2009) points out, “institutes of teacher education are among the least studied of the professional schools” (p. 2) and Borsay identifies history as, “the missing piece of the jigsaw in disability studies” (as cited in Armstrong, 2007, p. 560).

The next chapter explores the social and cultural context in which teacher education and special education developed. This exploration begins at the end of the nineteenth century.

Chapter 3: Contributing Factors

In the late nineteenth century a 'perfect storm' was brewing that set the stage for the development of what would become known as special education. Although the educational decisions that were being made would ultimately impact the school experience of children throughout the province, they were being made by government officials in Toronto who were heavily influenced by the changing social situation around them. Compulsory schooling had been put in place and industrialization and immigration were changing the population of the city and by extension the school population as well. Not all children were successful at school and when they were not, the policies that were put in place to deal with this perceived threat to the social fabric of society were grounded in eugenic thinking that was further supported by the development of intelligence tests. These tests provided additional ammunition for the sifting and sorting of children that was foundational to the eugenic approach in place at the time.

Compulsory Schooling

In the mid-nineteenth century various politicians and public officials supported the expansion of public education. Prominent 'rebels' like William Lyon Mackenzie in Upper Canada and Louis-Joseph Papineau of Lower Canada believed that ordinary citizens had the right to be educated in order to be better prepared to act in their own political interests. Colonial politicians such as Egerton Ryerson, superintendent of Ontario schools, alleged that public schooling could, "cultivate students' sense of citizenship, loyalty, respect for property, and deference to authority" (Axelrod, 1997, p. 25). Increasing numbers of children began to attend school and in 1871, Ontario became the first province to legislate compulsory attendance beginning with the requirement that children between the ages of seven and ten attend school at least four months per year (Axelrod, 1997).

When compulsory school was put in place an assumption was made that all children were of equal intelligence (Clarke, 1923), however,

Compulsory education not only reveals cases of retardation but effectively creates them by subjecting many children to completely new and frightening demands for systematic intellectual functioning. But such apparent retardation often disappears once the individual is freed of the restraints of the institution and allowed to pursue his or her interests. (McLaren, 1990, p. 92)

Be that as it may, at the beginning of the twentieth century this notion of being “schooling disabled” (Sousa, 2007, p. 4) had yet to enter into the conversation. Consideration also had yet to be given to the impact of industrialization and immigration on children’s ability to be successful at school.

Industrialization and Immigration

The first decades of the twentieth century brought with them a swift rate of industrial growth that completely altered what had once been a primarily rural-agricultural society. In addition to the changes brought about by industrialization, an influx of new immigrants resulted in rapid population growth (Piva, 1979). Industrialization and immigration were bringing larger numbers of children to the cities, and a policy of compulsory education required that they attend school.

Children who may have been considered ‘slow’ in rural settings may still have gradually learned to follow the routines of the farm. However, they had a much more difficult time navigating the requirements of formal education (Sutherland, 2000). In addition to the challenges faced by children who were new to urban living, there was a great deal of concern about the educational struggles of immigrant children. These struggles were attributed to feeble-mindedness and resulted in calls for stricter immigration policies to limit the number of mental defectives entering the country (MacMurchy, 1915). As Clarke pointed out in 1923, “Our immigration must be closely watched, and in the future Canada must not be made the dumping ground for undesirable types from other countries” (p. 133).

Eugenics

Eugenics is a term that Francis Galton determined would be sufficient to express, ...the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which, especially in the case of man, takes cognisance of all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give to the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had. (Galton, 1907, p. 17)

This 'science of improving stock' is an idea that Galton first expounded upon in his 1865 article, *Hereditary Talent and Character*. In it, Galton expresses his belief in the hereditary nature of intellectual capacity. He advocates for the betterment of the human race through selective breeding. According to Galton (1865), "What an extraordinary effect might be produced on our race, if its object was to unite in marriage those who possessed the finest and most suitable natures, mental, moral, and physical!" (p. 165). This is necessary in order to enable, "commanders, statesmen, thinkers, inventors, and artists" (p. 166) to navigate the increasing challenges of the times.

Galton was heavily influenced by the work of his cousin, Charles Darwin, whose seminal work, *The Origin of the Species* was published in 1859. This tome inspired Galton to investigate issues of heredity and the possible improvement of the human race (Sandall, 2008) ultimately leading to the publication of Galton's (1869) book, *Hereditary Genius*. It is important to recognize that this work was published at a time when scientism was affording science unprecedented levels of authority (Gokyigit, 1994). Gokyigit (1994) points out that *Hereditary Genius* was seen, "as part of the new scientific faith initiated by Darwin, his predecessors, and his followers, and it was judged largely by its role in this scientific movement" (p. 238).

Eugenics in Canada. Concerns about the impact of industrialization and immigration in the late 1800s sowed the seeds from which eugenics in Canada was able to grow. Canadians

preoccupied with 'racial degeneration' at the beginning of the 20th century saw reproduction of the unfit and immigration of the unfit as the two primary concerns. Eugenacists saw themselves as members of an international movement grounded in science. This approach provided new scientific justifications for old racist and classist assumptions (McLaren, 1990). This eugenic thinking is what ultimately led to the development of auxiliary classes in Ontario schools.

Eugenics and the advent of auxiliary education. Helen MacMurchy was integral to both the eugenics movement and the development of auxiliary classes. She was a medical doctor who began her career in private practice, but shortly thereafter moved into public service in a variety of roles. She worked for the Ontario government from 1906 to 1919 and then for the federal Department of Health from 1920 to 1934. She served briefly as the medical inspector for Toronto schools from 1910 to 1911 and from 1905 to 1916 she was Ontario's Inspector of the Feeble-minded. Once auxiliary classes were established in the province she became the first Inspector of Auxiliary Classes in 1914. She was appointed as the first Chief of the Division of Maternal and Child Welfare in the Department of Health when it was established in 1920 and she remained in that position until her retirement in 1934 (McLaren, 1990).

Much of MacMurchy's thinking was influenced by her belief in eugenics. Although MacMurchy was not alone in turning to eugenics to explain the source of many of the public health problems plaguing Canada in the first third of the twentieth century, she was, however, "the one person most responsible for winning for hereditarian concerns a central place on the agenda of the public health movement" (McLaren, 1990, p. 44). The three areas in which she had a significant influence were infant mortality, maternal mortality, and feeble-mindedness. Her work in each of these areas was motivated more by her concern about the threat disease posed to the 'race' than by empathy for the individual. Although she indicated some awareness of the impact of environment on physical and mental health, ultimately she felt that individual deficiency was at the heart of the primary threats to public health (McLaren, 1990).

Asylums for the mentally ill had been built during the nineteenth century, however, very little had been done for those considered feeble-minded. When compulsory education was put in place, teachers began to 'discover' children who were deemed to fall into that category. These newly 'discovered' children were initially identified based on arbitrary norms of intellectual achievement. Once identified, these children were recognized as a threat to society so institutionalization seemed a logical solution to this problem. In the various positions MacMurphy held between 1907 and 1918 she provided annual reports on feeble-mindedness, impressing upon medical leaders the extent of mental deficiency and supporting the need for institutionalization (McLaren, 1990).

MacMurphy pushed for the establishment of auxiliary classes and in 1911 the *Act Respecting Special Classes for the Mentally Defective* was passed. This gave the Toronto Board of Education legal authority and financial support for the establishment of half-day classes in Grace and George Street Schools. These classes would provide a place where children could be further sorted to distinguish the truly 'mentally defective' requiring institutionalization from those who were merely backward and deemed to be 'educable' (Wheatley, 2013).

MacMurphy also made the general public aware of the problems posed to society by the subnormal with her 1920 popular account, *The Almosts: A Study of the Feeble-Minded*. She argued that institutionalization would be beneficial because it would prevent the feeble-minded from causing problems for society and it would also prevent them from reproducing. MacMurphy was certain that mental deficiency was an inherited trait and that 80% of feeble-mindedness could be eliminated within a generation by segregation, and even more so with sterilization (McLaren, 1990).

MacMurphy's impact is clearly articulated in a 1915 presentation made by Mary Blackwell to her teacher colleagues after spending the summer participating in a course for

teachers of auxiliary classes. Blackwell expresses what she acknowledges that teachers already know about the backward child, “he is an incubus to the class” (p. 622). She goes on to highlight the hereditary nature of mental defectives and the inability to provide a cure or even improve their situation because, “there is something lacking in his brain substance which must always be lacking because no power can supply it” (p. 623). Blackwell advocates for the creation of additional auxiliary classes and then ends her talk by stressing the important role that MacMurchy plays in this work. She describes MacMurchy as, “our path-finder, our lodestar, and if we follow the gleam, we shall help, at least a little, to better the condition of the country which is so dear to the heart of every true Canadian” (p. 626).

Dr. H. L. Brittain, Director of the Toronto Bureau of Municipal Research, (1916) points out that there were dissenting voices when it came to the removal of children from the regular classroom,

One influential school inspector is reliably reported to have pleaded within the last year for the retention of feeble-minded children in the ordinary school classes on account of the moral advantages which would result. He holds that lessons of kindness, sympathy and service will be developed among normal children by the presence of feeble-minded children in their midst and that such again would outweigh any loss of time which might result from the admixture of normal and subnormal children in the same classes. (p. 495)

However, Brittain highlights this only as an example of naive ‘feeble-minded idealism’ that runs contrary to the experiences of classroom teachers.

Sandiford (1916) agrees with the argument that feeble-minded children interfere with the education of, “their more fortunate companions” (p. 497). He goes on to raise the question of teacher attitudes towards feeble-minded students and then responds,

The teacher is a servant of the state, and if the state decrees that the teacher must endeavor to teach every child sent to him, the teacher faithfully and somewhat patiently

does his duty. But the teacher is also a citizen, and as such, he urges, nay demands, that steps be taken to segregate all feeble-minded children so that they may properly be cared for throughout their lives. He does this, not only to ease his somewhat heavy burden in school, but also in order that society at large may be protected. (p. 497)

Ultimately, Blackwell (1915), Brittain (1916), and Sandiford (1916) paint a picture of a school system supportive of the eugenic thinking prevalent at the time. Although there may have been some dissenting voices, they were generally drowned out by the eugenic concerns espoused by its proponents.

This approach continued, and in the 1930s Madge Thurlow Macklin emerged as the country's pre-eminent human geneticist and the most important scientific defender of eugenics. In an address to the 1934 Ontario Education Association, she warned that, "the public school system was also being undermined by the presence of defectives" (as cited in McLaren, 1990, p. 140). She felt that the average level of intelligence was declining in schools because of the increasing number of unfit in schools. She told the delegates that this class's "lack of enterprise, intelligence, and ambition had kept them living in the slums and hovels" (as cited in McLaren, 1990, p. 140). They were flooding into the schools where they were coddled by teachers who were deluded into thinking that intelligence could be developed. She believed that this distracted teachers from their primary responsibility of educating the brightest students (McLaren, 1990).

In 1937, at a presentation to the Canadian Public Health Association in Toronto entitled, *The Problem of the Subnormal in the Community*, B. T. McGhie, then the Deputy Minister of Health for Ontario, pointed out that although, "subnormality of intelligence exists at birth and remains unchanged throughout life" (p. 106) not all feeble-mindedness is the result of heredity. He argues that, "there is no grounds for sensational alarm concerning the salvation of the race in respect to the subnormal" (p. 107). Although McGhie was a member of the Eugenic Society of Canada, in his opinion, "registration was futile, segregation expensive, and sterilization - except

in a few rare cases - pointless” (McLaren, 1990, p. 157). McGhie goes on to advocate for the social education of the subnormal because he feels that it is a lack of social training that has led to the ill repute of mental defectives. It should be noted, however,

...that McGhie’s views on deinstitutionalization and community integration for mentally retarded people were expressed at a time when many people, including some of the major figures in the field still held to some version of the menace of the feeble-minded idea. (Simmons, 1982, p. 122)

Intelligence Tests

In the first decade of the twentieth century, and in keeping with the eugenic thinking prevalent at the time, anthropomorphic measurement by medical professionals was the means used to identify feeble-mindedness. Doctors looked for stigmata such as those identified by Lombroso as indicators of criminal minds. They included, “greater skull thickness, simplicity of cranial sutures, large jaws, preeminence of the face over the cranium, relatively long arms, precocious wrinkles, low and narrow forehead, large ears, absence of baldness, darker skin, greater visual acuity, diminished sensitivity to pain, and absence of vascular reaction (blushing)” (Gould, 1981, p. 159). Ultimately this approach to identifying feeble-mindedness was replaced by the I.Q. test developed by psychologists Binet and Simon in 1905.

Alfred Binet, working in France, was commissioned by the minister of public education to develop a method to determine which students would benefit from regular schooling and which would be better served in special classes (Gould, 1981). It is important to recognize that Binet did not intend his tests to be predictive of future academic success or failure but rather an accurate reading of a student’s intellectual functioning at a particular point in time, “...we do not attempt to establish or prepare a prognosis and we leave unanswered the question of whether this retardation is curable, or even improvable. We shall limit ourselves to ascertaining the truth in regard to his present mental state” (Binet & Simon, 1980, p. 37). Binet did not regard the

results of his tests as indicative of inborn intelligence. As Gould (1981) points out, the purpose of Binet's test was, "...to identify in order to help and improve, not to label in order to limit" (p.152). Binet asserted that even the intelligence of a feeble-minded child could improve with appropriate teaching and that one's environment affected performance. His ideas openly challenged Galton's claims that intelligence was biologically predetermined. Binet even called Galton a "brutal pessimist" (Wheatley, 2013, p. 185).

Testing itself is not necessarily to blame for the misuses that followed. According to Gould (1981), as intelligence testing continued to be developed in the English speaking world two fallacies were embraced by those who wanted to use the tests to maintain the social order of the day. These two fallacies are reification and hereditarianism. Reification is the belief that the abstract notion of intelligence can be considered a concrete thing (i.e., a test score) and hereditarianism is the belief that intelligence is inherited and therefore fixed.

Henry H. Goddard, a staunch eugenicist and Director of the new research laboratory at the Vineland Training School for Feeble-Minded Boys and Girls in New Jersey, brought Binet's test to the United States and translated it into English (Wheatley, 2013). Lewis Terman, a Stanford psychologist, revised the test that then became known as the Stanford-Binet. He advocated for widespread testing in order to appropriately determine a, "...gradation of innate ability" (Gould, 1981). Terman (1916) viewed intelligence as innate and fixed. He felt that the more we learn about children whose mental development he believed would stop somewhere between the 7-year and 12-year level of intelligence,

...the clearer it becomes that they must be looked upon as real defectives....They may master a certain amount of rote learning, such as that involved in reading and in the manipulation of number combinations, but they cannot be taught to meet new conditions effectively or to think, reason, and judge as normal persons do. (p.6)

He felt that determining a person's degree of "feeble-mindedness" was critical because it would allow for a future where,

...intelligence tests will bring thousands of these high-grade defectives under the surveillance and protection of society. This will ultimately result in curtailing the reproduction of feeble-mindedness and in the elimination of an enormous amount of crime, pauperism, and industrial inefficiency. It is hardly necessary to emphasize that the high-grade cases, of the type now so frequently overlooked, are precisely the ones whose guardianship it is most important for the state to assume. (Terman, 1916, pp. 6-7)

Terman's thinking about the heritability of intelligence aligned with Francis Galton's work in eugenics. With the publication of Galton's (1869) book *Hereditary Genius*, individual differences became a systematic field of study (Walberg & Haertal, 1992) and Galton went on to develop psychometrics and differential psychology. His work has had a profound effect on the way in which students are classified and sorted based on intellectual ability as determined by intelligence tests.

There was deemed to be a need for these new scientific measures to respond to the growing crisis of feeble-minded students. Administrators called for a more scientific and progressive approach to identifying and measuring retardation so that individual difference could be addressed (Ryan & Stoskopf, 2008). It was determined that students should be assessed and then placed in an educational track that was commensurate with their level of intelligence. Intelligence tests promised to eliminate costly and frustrating student "retardation" by pointing to the actual intellectual capabilities of each individual student. High scorers would do well in an academic track, while low scorers would avoid discouragement and failure by participating in "opportunity classes" or the vocational program (Trone, 1999).

Binet's tests were used with "subnormal" students and the results determined diagnosis and treatment. However Terman went further, adapting Binet's tests for wider use. IQ tests were

introduced to American schools on a massive scale after World War I. The tests provided a means to help sort and differentiate among a variety of learners. The students were then placed in what was deemed to be the appropriate educational track (Ryan & Stoskopf, 2008). Group intelligence testing symbolized for many the most advanced educational thinking of the postwar period. One standard intelligence test could be administered to a classroom full of students at the same time, often in an hour or less and reveal a standard score that would, according to the thinking at the time, largely remain fixed (Trone, 1999).

IQ testing in Ontario. Helen MacMurphy had gone to New Jersey in 1911 to learn how to administer the test under the direction of Goddard himself and Dr. Walter Cornell, Chief Medical Inspector for Philadelphia's Public Schools. She was hesitant about endorsing this new intelligence test because she still believed in anthropomorphy as the gold standard for identifying feeble-mindedness. She also viewed the intelligence test as an attempt to replace physicians with psychiatrists and psychologists. As a result, the governance of the feeble-minded remained the purview of the Ministry of Health, and not the Ministry of Education, until the 1970s (Wheatley, 2013).

Despite MacMurphy's reticence, the I.Q. test gained in popularity, and even she acknowledged that its precision was a powerful tool for identifying delinquents. In 1916 Lewis Terman's revision, the Stanford-Binet, became the standard and MacMurphy conceded and recognized its value. Dr. Hincks, however, was the first to apply it in the Toronto Public Schools to address concerns about the 'supra-normals'. He stressed the importance of identifying and supporting gifted students (Wheatley, 2013).

Table 1

New Classification System from the Stanford-Binet I.Q. Test

Term	I.Q.
Idiot	Below 20 or 25
Imbecile	20-25
Moron	50-70 or 75
Dull Normal	80-90

Note. From “And Neither Have I Wings to Fly’: Labelled and locked up in Canada’s oldest institutions,” by T. Wheatley, 2013, p. 187.

The new classification system shown in Table 1 allowed for the identification of those who presented without any stigmata, but were nonetheless feeble-minded. Since Canadian law only allowed for idiots and imbeciles to be institutionalized, MacMurphy, like her American colleague Dr. Goddard, advocated for the creation of a ‘farm colony’ to detain these newly identified high-grade feeble-minded indefinitely (Wheatley, 2013).

Intelligence testing continued to gain in popularity. Sandiford was among its foremost supporters in Canada. In a 1927 article he stated that, “intelligence is a trait that is passed on by heredity” (as cited in McLaren, 1990, p. 61) and he claimed that intelligence testing was turning psychology into a “true experimental science” (as cited in McLaren, 1990, p. 62).

The Rise of the Professional

This approach to classifying students allowed for the creation of new kinds of institutions and experts (i.e., auxiliary classes, vocational schools, school inspectors, auxiliary class teachers) (Milweski, 2010). To support this medicalization of education, political positions responsible for overseeing education were turned over to medical professionals. Prior to 1905 the Liberal Party governed Ontario, and men with longstanding experience in the school system held the position of Minister of Education. In 1905, when the Conservatives took office, physician and surgeon Robert Allan Pyne was appointed to this role. In addition, physician Helen MacMurphy became the first Inspector of the Feeble-minded (Milweski, 2010).

McLaren (1990) suggests that MacMurchy, “probably did more than any other doctor of her time to try to convince the Canadian public that a host of social problems were in fact medical issues that only physicians could competently deal with.” (p. 44). This idea aligned with the eugenic thinking that many psychologists, social workers and teachers were drawn to, in part because embracing what they took to be a scientific approach to social problems allowed them to enhance their professional standing (McLaren, 1990).

In 1920 the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene (CNCMH), with its successful campaign to alert the public to the dangers of inherited mental deficiency, served as a launching pad for the psychiatric and psychology professions in Canada. Each achieved increased social status by showing the public the social importance of their respective sciences through CNCMH activities. The members of these helping professions supported eugenics because, if nothing else, eugenics supported them by enhancing their status as experts through the popularization of concepts of biological determinism (McLaren, 1990).

Impact of the rise of professionals on families. Although the rise of the professional allowed for greater administrative efficiency through the development of a system for classifying students and sorting them into the appropriate classes, this approach ran the risk of stirring up resistance from families (Milewski, 2010). Recognizing this risk, steps were taken to ensure that families would support these new practices. This was clearly indicated by Dr. Eric Kent Clarke when he addressed the Ontario Education Association in 1920,

If diplomacy and tact are used when the [industrial] class is organized there is no trouble, and no stigma is placed on the child. It is a privilege to be allowed in such a class. Such names as “The nut class” and “Dunce class” must be assiduously avoided. The call for specially trained teachers along these lines is growing all the time. (p. 205)

Although parents may want to be viewed as equal partners in their children’s education, the prevalence of the child development discourse makes that goal quite difficult to attain.

Griffith and Smith (2005) explain that this discourse, “originates and coordinates the work of professionals - child psychologists and psychiatrists, social workers and educators...through the work of these professionals, the child development discourse normatively structures the limits and possibilities of our knowledge about children’s maturation” (p. 36). The child development discourse privileges the work of professionals and subordinates the role of families. It disadvantages parents since professionals have a preference for their own perspectives. Families are led to believe that professional judgment is better and more accurate than their own. Inherent in this discourse is the assumption that families receive information and professionals provide it (Griffith & Smith, 2005).

While this approach disadvantages all families, it is felt even more acutely by working class and poor families (Lareau, 2011). This is illustrated by the experiences of the Hewitt family living in the slums of 1920s Toronto. By 1929, Florrie and Henry had eight children although Florrie was not yet thirty years old. The social worker assigned to the family arranged an appointment for the whole family to be assessed by a psychiatrist at the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. I.Q. testing revealed that the parents and the children were either ‘morons’ or ‘imbeciles’, except for the toddler Georgie. As a result, the ‘professionals’ determined that it would not be appropriate for the Hewitt family to keep Georgie and they arranged for him to be adopted by a more suitable family. Florrie sobbed, “But is my babby [sic]!” (Wheatley, 2013, p. 128) and Henry was also inconsolable. Despite Henry and Florrie’s protestations, they were convinced by the social worker and the psychiatrist to sign an agreement that allowed Georgie to be adopted by a ‘good Catholic family’ in Hamilton (Wheatley, 2013).

Models of Disability

The rise of the professional at the beginning of the twentieth century led to the medicalization of disability and what is now known as the medical model of disability. Throughout history there have been various paradigms of disability, and as Stiker points out,

“we illuminate a question better by following its development through time than by trying to fix it in a false eternal moment” (Stiker, 1999, p. 13). To put this medical model into a historical context it is worthwhile to briefly consider the paradigms that preceded it.

Histories of disability tend to start in ancient Greece where body shape and fitness were idealized and infanticide was accepted for those born with physical impairments (Barnes & Mercer, 2003). In the Middle Ages people with disabilities who were rejected by their families relied on the arbitrary distribution of Catholic charity for their survival. By the 17th century people with severe impairments were generally determined to be part of the ‘deserving poor’ and were included in what Foucault (2009) referred to as the Great Confinement. Confinement was enacted to manage poverty and indigence (Foucault, 2009). During the Great Confinement, various categories of poor people (mad, disabled, criminal) were thrown together in order to protect the general population from the dangers they represented. By the late 18th century the hospitals of the Great Confinement were replaced by asylums that were well organized and specialized (Stiker, 1999).

The creation of asylums encouraged the development of an orthodox medical profession that replaced pluralism in healing practices. The establishment of these specialized sites created distance between the professional experts and their patients. Medicalization began to emerge as a key aspect in the social control of people with disabilities. Groups with perceived impairments were identified as social problems and were more likely to be incarcerated. By allying these institutions with the medical profession the general population was reassured that something positive was being done for the ‘deserving poor’ (Barnes & Mercer, 2003).

With the emergence of eugenics, the increased authority of physicians and psychologists, and the development of intelligence tests, the medical model became entrenched as the paradigm of disability. In a medical model disability is understood as an individual deficit based on medical and psychological discourses. The diagnosis of a disability is made by

seemingly objective professional activity combining clinical judgment with scientifically validated psychometric measures (Danforth, 2008). Medical models endorse the use of categories and labels to delineate types of disabilities and their severity in order to ensure that appropriate interventions are put in place (Terzi, 2005).

Lalvani and Polvere (2013) point out that, “to a large extent, conditions that become medicalized are influenced by, and in turn influence, prevailing beliefs and values in society” (“Medicalization of Disability”, para. 1). This was clearly the case at the beginning of the twentieth century when eugenics, immigration, industrialization, intelligence testing and the rise of the professional influenced each other, as well as the decisions that were made about those deemed to be feeble-minded and a threat to society. Ultimately, medical and mental health professionals were able to legitimize restricting the rights of others to prevent the perceived threat to society by what Blackwell (1915) refers to as the backward child who grows up to be the backward man, “backward in everything that makes for good citizenship, but forward, alas, in the qualities which tend to the lowering of social standards (p. 624).

The Search for Origins

Steedman (2002) claims that the, “search for the historian’s nostalgia for origins and original referents cannot be performed, because there is actually nothing there: she is not looking for anything: only silence, the space shaped by what once was; and now is no more” (p. 154). While this may be the case, I have attempted to provide some insight into the social, political, and economic factors that influenced the development of what we now call special education. This historical information will be used to interrogate current practices in teacher education with the goal of uncovering traces of this history still having an impact. Revealing these traces may lead us down new paths that will ultimately benefit all learners. Before looking for these traces, in Chapter Four I provide an overview of teacher education in the four faculties of education in Ontario that can trace their histories back to normal schools.

Chapter 4: Disability in the Curriculum: Normal Schools, Teachers' Colleges, and Faculties of Education

There are four faculties of education in Ontario with histories tracing back to normal schools. These programs at the University of Toronto, University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario and Nipissing University will be the focus of a deeper exploration of the changes in teacher education since its inception in 1847. I will examine the development of their programs as they transformed from normal schools to teachers' colleges and then became integrated into the universities to become faculties of education. Understanding this development provokes a deeper consciousness of how current teacher education practices came to be thereby leading us, "to apprehend that situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation" (Freire, 2009, p.85).

The normal schools in Toronto, Ottawa, London, and North Bay had all been established prior to the opening of auxiliary classes in the province in 1910. Preparation for teachers of auxiliary classes was done through additional summer courses. Initially these courses were only offered in American settings, but by 1920 courses for teachers of auxiliary classes were offered in Ontario as well. As the number of auxiliary classes grew, there was increased demand for teachers with this training. Courses for working with children with disabilities continued to be seen as an adjunct to teacher training, necessary only for teachers working in special classes. Although some courses in special education made their way into initial teacher preparation programs, what began as summer courses for teachers of auxiliary classes were still mainly offered in the form of additional qualifications courses in special education.

In this chapter I provide a summary of pre-service and in-service programs provided at four representative normal schools, teachers' colleges and faculties of education in Ontario. As outlined in chapter 1 the information included in the summary was collected using primary and secondary sources. The primary sources were accessed through physical and online archives

and from the faculty of education webpages on each university's website. To provide a sense of the current program of initial teacher preparation as well as the recent past, I have included an overview of the program requirements for the most recent school year and one or two other years since 2000. To draw attention to the special education courses that are part of these programs they have been underlined in the text below.

Normal Schools: Oversight

In 1846 Egerton Ryerson drafted the Common School Act. It defined the duties of the Superintendent of Schools and Ryerson became the chief executive officer of the Government in all school issues. The Act also established the first General Board of Education. It consisted of the Superintendent of Education and six other members appointed by the Governor-General. Among its duties was the management of the Normal School (Putman, 1912). With the passing of the *Act for the Better Establishment and Maintenance of Common Schools in Upper Canada 1850*, the General Board of Education was increased to nine members and renamed the Council of Public Instruction. The Chief Superintendent of Education continued to be a member of the Council. The Council was abolished in 1876 and replaced by the Ontario Department of Education. At the same time the position of Chief Superintendent was abolished and the new department was presided over by the Minister of Education (Archives of Ontario, 2012-2015a).

Although The Department of Education managed the Normal School, certification could be granted by County Boards. This led to concerns about the consistency of requirements for certification. To alleviate these concerns, in 1871 Ryerson arranged for the implementation of a provincial system wherein licensing of teachers was under departmental control (Putman, 1912).

Ryerson then went on to expand the normal school structure to other areas of the province. He advocated for the establishment of normal schools in Ottawa, London, and Kingston. At the same time, he felt that all the normal schools should be overseen by the

Department of Education to ensure uniformity in both the quality of teachers produced and the system in which they were instructed. In 1875, a normal school opened in Ottawa, but the plan to open schools in Kingston and London was abandoned (Putman, 1912). Ultimately a normal school opened in London in 1900 followed by schools in Hamilton, Peterborough, and Stratford in 1908 and North Bay in 1909 (Ontario, 1966).

The Department of Education equipped and maintained the normal schools, appointed and paid for the personnel, prescribed the curriculum, authorized the textbooks, set and evaluated the examinations, granted certificates to the graduates, and inspected the schools through its own officer, the Director of Professional Training. To ensure that the criteria was applied consistently at all the schools, the Department of Education also determined the eligibility of the candidates for admission (Dupuis, 1952).

Normal Schools: Pre-Service Programs

In 1847 the first normal school opened in Toronto on the premises of Old Government House. The school temporarily moved to Temperance Hall two years later and remained there for three years before moving to its new location at St. James Square (Toronto Normal School 1847-1947). In 1851, at the ceremony of the laying of the corner stone of the new Normal School building, Ryerson explained the inspiration behind the creation of the Normal School and its approach to teacher education, suggesting that:

The system of Normal School training of teachers, and the principles and modes of teaching which were found to exist in Germany, and which have been largely introduced into other countries, were incomparably the best - the system which makes school-teaching a profession, which, at every stage, and in every branch of knowledge, teaches things and not merely words, which unfolds and illustrates the principles of rules, rather than assuming and resting upon their verbal authority, which develops all the mental faculties instead of only cultivating and loading the memory - a system which is solid

rather than showy, practical rather than ostentatious, which prompts to independent thinking and action rather than servile imitation. (Ryerson, 1851, p. 6)

The Normal School was established at a time when there were very few secondary schools, so initially the curriculum focused on academic subjects with some additional professional courses to prepare graduates for their roles as teachers. The initial term of training was also only five months long (Ontario & Hope, 1950). The Normal School curriculum itself was copied from the State Normal School in Albany, New York and included academic courses in grammar, orthography, composition, logic, geography, history, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, physics, physiology, astronomy, and chemistry as well as courses in teaching methods (Dupuis, 1952).

The Hope Commission Report (Ontario & Hope, 1950) explains that by 1870 additional secondary schools had been established and, as a result, teacher candidates were better prepared academically when they arrived at the Normal School. The report goes on to say that the Normal School program could now focus greater attention on teaching methods. However, in the Annual School Report of 1871 Ryerson quoted Dr. John Herbert Sangster, Mathematical and Science Master in the Normal School, who argued that,

To teach well one must be possessed of adequate knowledge; in a word, must be well-informed; and as more than nine-tenths of those who apply for admission to Normal School do not possess anything like the amount of information and general knowledge which the advancing spirit of the age very properly demands of those who would become Educators of youth, the Normal School Masters are compelled to Supplement, by Lectures on the different Branches of Study embraced in an ordinary English education, the early training or want of training, of those who enter its walls. (Toronto Normal School 1847-1947, p. 27)

The second normal school opened in Ottawa in 1875, the London Normal School was established in 1900 and the North Bay Normal School was launched in 1909. As this expansion was taking place the focus of the teacher education programs began to shift from academic work to professional study. During this period, courses were primarily taught through lectures to large groups of students. This resulted in a lack of inspirational teaching (Toronto Normal School 1847-1947). As manual training and household science gained prominence they were embedded into the Normal School program. At the same time lecturing to large classes came to an end. In the Minister's Report of 1915 Dr. Merchant, Inspector of Normal Schools, explained that, "the theory now is that every Normal School master's lesson should be a model of method in presentation as well as a type of the proper selection of subject matter" (as cited in Toronto Normal School 1947-1947, p. 38). Instead of the previous focus on rigid procedures, more emphasis, "was placed upon the discussion of principles and their application to concrete educational problems" (Toronto Normal School 1947-1947, p. 38).

Normal Schools: In-Service Programs

As early as 1888 summer courses for teachers were established to enable continued specialization. Beginning in the summer of 1902 courses in agriculture, drawing, and music were instituted in Toronto. The following summer these courses were offered in the London and Ottawa Normal Schools as well (Dupuis, 1952, p. 72). Although the summer school structure was already in place when the first two Auxiliary classes were opened in 1910, courses for Auxiliary class teachers were not initially included in the offerings. Special training was, however, identified as being, "of greatest importance" (MacMurchy, 1915, p. 110) so teachers were sent to the *Massachusetts Institute for Feeble-minded at Waverly* or the *Vineland Training School* in New Jersey. MacMurchy (1915) felt that,

the best place to train teachers for Auxiliary Classes and to study mentally-defective children is in an institution where these children are cared for under the best

conditions....In order to know what, and how, we can teach the children, we must know what they can learn, and how they can learn it best. In the outside world, where the mentally-defective child is really a 'foreign body,' we have little or no chance to understand him. He needs a place of his own where the environment is suited to him. (p. 111)

There were also summer courses in Auxiliary education provided by a number of American universities. In addition to the courses taught at the New York University Summer School outlined in Chapter 2, there was also a program at the University of Pittsburgh which included courses entitled: Clinical Psychology and the Study of Mentally Exceptional Children; The Care and Education of Backward and Feeble-minded Children; Psycho-Educational Pathology; Educational Therapeutics; Social Investigation; Industrial and Manumental work; Child Study; Educational Psychology; Principles of Education; Biological Aspects of Education; Experimental Pedagogy; Play; and Industrial Arts (MacMurchy, 1915). By 1919, special summer courses in auxiliary education were being provided in Toronto under the direction of Helen MacMurchy (The Globe, 1919).

In 1920 continuing education courses were accredited by the Ministry of Education. A special certificate in auxiliary education (and other specialty areas as well) could be acquired after the completion of summer school courses in this area. In 1925 Dr. Sinclair, Inspector of Auxiliary Classes after Helen MacMurchy, explained that in these courses, "half of the time is devoted to theory - the science of education, intelligence testing, comparison of normal and subnormal children, and methods of treatment. The afternoons are devoted entirely to manual work - woodcraft, basketry, sewing, chair-caning and other useful occupations in which the pupils may develop as they become more skilled" (The Globe, 1925). For the most part, a one-summer course lead to an elementary certificate; a two-summer course to an intermediate certificate; and a three- or four- summer course to a specialist or supervisor's certificate. It was

also possible to obtain a special certificate as Teacher of the Blind or Teacher of the Deaf through completion of a second-year normal school course either at the School for the Blind in Brantford or at the School for the Deaf in Belleville. Admission to these courses required at least two years of successful teaching experience and the recommendation of an inspector (Ontario & Hope, 1950).

Teachers' Colleges: Oversight

In 1953 normal schools were renamed teachers' colleges. At the time of the name change, teacher education was the purview of the Professional Training Branch of the Department of Education. Shortly thereafter, in 1956, the Professional Training Branch became the Teacher Education Branch. The Teacher Education Branch approved and reviewed programs of both pre-service and in-service teacher education offered by teachers' colleges (Archives of Ontario, 2012-2015b).

Teachers' Colleges: Pre-Service Programs

The pre-service programs in the newly named teachers' colleges reflected the increasing emphasis on child study and educational psychology. These new teachers' colleges included the Toronto Teachers' College, the Ottawa Teachers' College, the London Teachers' College and the North Bay Teachers' College. The curriculum was consistent throughout the colleges because as Alan Johnson, North Bay's acting principal pointed out, "professional subjects such as teaching...tend to be universal in content". He then went on to say that, "we're giving people a certificate that's valid in Windsor as well as Moosonee" (The Globe and Mail, 1970). The programs at these renamed institutions also included an increase in the amount of time spent practice teaching in school.

The teachers' college period of teacher education did not last long. By the 1960s there was increasing concern about teaching standards and in 1962 Minister of Education William Davis established the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers.

The committee recommended that elementary teachers possess a university degree and that teacher education should take place within the university setting (Ontario, 1966).

Teachers' Colleges: In-Service Programs

In the report from the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, the committee outlined the summer courses that would continue to be offered during this period. The courses available included: art; audio-visual work; auxiliary education; guidance; industrial arts; library science; mathematics; music; physical and health education; and primary education. There were also courses in teaching English as a second language, teaching French as a second language, and teaching students who were identified as 'trainable retarded' (Ontario, 1966).

Faculties of Education: Oversight

Teacher education was still under the purview of the Teacher Education Branch of the Department of Education when Teachers' Colleges were first amalgamated with universities to become Faculties of Education. In 1972 the Department of Education became the Ministry of Education and the Teacher Education Branch went through a number of administrative changes until, in 1992, it became the Ministry of Education's Centre for Teacher Education (Archives of Ontario, 2012-2015b).

In 1996 the Ontario College of Teachers Act was passed and the Ontario College of Teachers opened its doors the following year. The College's mandate included licensing teachers and accrediting teacher education programs (History of the Ontario College of Teachers, 2016). The Ontario College of Teachers Act includes regulation 347/02 outlining the requirements for the accreditation of teacher education programs in the province. This covers both programs of professional education and programs of additional qualifications.

Prior to a 2013 amendment outlining increasingly specific program requirements for professional education, regulation 347/02 provided a broad overview of the necessary program components. The following paragraphs of subsection 9 (1) delineate some of these elements:

4. The program curriculum is current, references the Ontario curriculum, includes the application of current research in teacher education and represents a wide knowledge base in the divisions and components of the program.

5. The course content of the program includes theory, method and foundation courses and makes appropriate provision for the application of theory in practice.

11. The teaching theory and foundation courses in the program include courses on human development and learning and on legislation and government policies relating to education. (Ontario Regulation 347/02, May 20, 2010 to October 24, 2013)

As outlined in subsection 10(3) of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, when submitting an application for accreditation the program provider must include, “a description of the conceptual framework for the program, including any mission statement, a history of the program and a description of the goals for the program and the means for achieving those goals” (para. 3), as well as, “course descriptions for the program” (para. 4).

Prior to the 2013 amendment there were no specific accreditation requirements related to special education. According to F. Duval, Bilingual Program Officer, Accreditation, Ontario College of Teachers, despite this,

All teacher education programs address this content area. For example, our faculties often reference their special education content as evidence that the following accreditation requirements are satisfied:

- The program ... represents a wide knowledge base in the divisions and components of the program.
- The course content of the program includes theory... and foundation courses...

- The teaching theory and foundation courses in the program include courses on human development and learning and on the legislation and government policies relating to education. (February 27, 2014, personal communication)

Regulation 347/02 was amended in 2013 to support the development of the expanded teacher education program that took effect in September 2015. The enhanced teacher education program expanded initial teacher education from two semesters to four semesters (and doubled the practicum requirements from a minimum of 40 days to a minimum of 80 days). The amended regulation included the addition of Schedule 1. This schedule outlines the teacher education program requirements in greater detail than previously provided. It is divided into three sections: Curriculum Knowledge; Pedagogical and Instructional Strategies Knowledge; and The Teaching Context Knowledge. Each section includes requirements that either directly include, or lend themselves to the inclusion of special education,

Curriculum Knowledge

1. The program provides a student of a program of professional education with knowledge and understanding of the current Ontario curriculum and provincial policy documents that are relevant to the student's areas of study and curriculum, including planning and design, special education, equity and diversity, and learning assessment and evaluation.

Pedagogical and Instructional Strategies Knowledge⁷

6. Child and adolescent development and student transitions to age 21 and through kindergarten to grade 12.

10. The policies, assessments and practices involved in responding to the needs and strengths of all students identified as requiring special education supports.

The Teaching Context Knowledge

⁷ This section also includes a focus on student learning styles and differentiated instruction.

1. Educating students of a program of professional education in child, youth and parental mental health issues relevant to the elementary and secondary school environment in Ontario. (Regulation 347/02, 2013, "Schedule 1")

Faculties of Education: Pre-Service Programs

OISE/UT. In 1979 the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto (FEUT) began to offer its program of initial teacher education for elementary teachers. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) was established in 1996. This new faculty included FEUT (OISE, 2006). Their current programs are underpinned by seven shared principles: Teaching Excellence; Equity, Diversity and Social Justice; Research-Informed; Learning Communities; School/Field/University Partnerships; Faculty Collaboration; and Coherence (OISE/UT, 2016h).

2006-2007. In 2006-2007 OISE/UT offered a one-year Bachelor of Education program as well as a two-year Master of Arts in Child Study and Education, and a two-year Master of Teaching in Elementary and Intermediate Education. Both graduate programs included initial teacher preparation and led to teaching certification (OISE/UT, 2006-2007).

The Bachelor of Education program included seven components: Curriculum and Instruction (methods courses by division and The Elementary Student Teaching Experience Program); Teacher Education Seminar; Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development; School and Society; Related Studies (elective course chosen from a variety of options); Practicum; and Internship. The electives for the Related Studies covered a wide range of topics including: English as a Second Language; Equity; Special Education (Emotional and Behavioural Problems in the Classroom, and Gifted Education: Working with Students of High Academic Ability); The Teaching Profession; Technology; and International Education (OISE/UT, 2006-2007).

2013-2014. In 2013-2014 OISE/UT continued to offer a one-year consecutive Bachelor of Education program as well as the two-year Master of Arts in Child Study and Education, and the two-year Master of Teaching in Elementary and Intermediate Education that both included initial teacher preparation and led to teaching certification (OISE/UT, 2013-2014). Additionally, starting in 2008-2009 OISE/UT also offered a concurrent Bachelor of Education program (OISE/UT, 2008-2009).

The consecutive program continued to consist of seven components. A few new subjects were added to the methods courses, but the biggest change was in the elective Related Studies component. The overall number of courses was reduced from fifty-two to eleven and, of the eleven, four were new additions. The special education courses included in the reduced complement were Adapting and Differentiating Instruction for Students Experiencing Learning Difficulties in Inclusive Classrooms, and Emotional and Behavioural Problems in the Classroom (OISE/UT, 2013-2014).

The concurrent program allows students to earn two undergraduate degrees simultaneously. At the end of the program students will have a Bachelor of Education as well as either an Honours Bachelor of Arts, an Honours Bachelor of Science, a Bachelor of Music or a Bachelor of Physical and Health Education. The Bachelor of Education component includes an e-portfolio, coursework, and a practicum. In addition to the methods courses, candidates are required to complete the following courses: Child and Adolescent Development; Equity and Diversity in Education; Communication and Conflict Resolution; Principles of Teaching: Legal, Ethical, and Professional; Inclusive Education: English Language Learners and Exceptional Learners; Psychological Foundations of Learning; Social Foundations of Teaching and Schooling; and Mentored Inquiry in Teaching (OISE/UT, 2013-2014).

2015-2016. OISE/UT is phasing out its Bachelor of Education program. Teacher education will now be offered only through the Master of Teaching and Master of Arts in Child

Study and Education programs. Both programs continue to offer eligibility for teaching certification in conjunction with a graduate degree (OISE/UT, 2016g). The Master of Teaching allows candidates to choose a Primary-Junior (kindergarten to Grade 6), Junior-Intermediate (Grades 4 to 10), or Intermediate-Senior (Grades 7 to 12) focus, however, the Master of Arts in Child Study offers only the Primary- Junior (K-6) option. These programs consist of coursework, practicum placements, and either a professional practice project or a research project (OISE/UT, 2016a; OISE/UT, 2016b).

Master of Teaching. In addition to methods courses, the following courses are mandatory: Educational Professionalism, Ethics and the Law; Reflective Teaching and Inquiry into Research in Education; Child and Adolescent Development and Learning; Fundamentals of Teaching and Learning; Introduction to Special Education and Mental Health; Integrating Technology into the Classroom; Supporting English Language Learners; Anti-Discriminatory Education; Issues in Numeracy and Literacy; and From Student to Professional. Two additional elective courses must also be completed (OISE/UT, 2016c).

Master of Arts in Child Study. This program offers two fields of study. The first is Practice-Based Inquiry (PBI) in Psychology and Educational Practice and the second is Research-Intensive Training (RIT) in Psychology and Education. Students in both fields complete methods courses as well as Child Study, Childhood Education Seminar, and Introduction to Special Education and Adaptive Instruction. A number of elective courses are required as well and students are encouraged to select these courses based on particular areas. Students interested in Early Childhood Education (ECE) are encouraged to complete an ECE elective course. Students interested in a special education focus are encouraged to choose electives in this area. In addition, after taking these courses, students are eligible to take a condensed version of the Special Education Part 1 Additional Qualifications course. (OISE/UT, 2016a).

University of Ottawa. In 1974 the Ottawa Normal School merged with the University of Ottawa and became the Faculty of Education. Today their website states that their mission, “is to prepare teachers to educate students in English, French Immersion or Intensive French schools for the ethical, societal, and technological demands necessary toward fostering sustainable 21st century communities” (University of Ottawa, n.d.).

2007-2008. The Faculty offers a one-year consecutive Bachelor of Education program. It also offers both a Bachelor of Education and a Certificate in Native Teacher Education, however, these programs will not be the focus of discussion here. The consecutive program’s mandatory courses include: Reflection in Practice (Practicum); The Learning Process in the Educational setting; Schooling and Society; Curriculum Design and Evaluation in Education; Education of Exceptional Students; and a number of methods courses. Elective courses are offered as well and they are: Teaching in Roman Catholic Separate Schools; English as a Second Language; Kindergarten and the Early Years; Counselling Applications in School Contexts; Teaching for Global Justice & Peace; Integrating Technology in the Classroom; Equity in Education; and First Nations, Inuit and Metis Education (University of Ottawa, 2007-2008).

2013-2014. The one-year consecutive program continues to include a practicum and coursework. An additional course called Professional Inquiry in Practice has been added to the mandatory requirements. The elective courses have been expanded from eight options to eleven. Of the eleven, six remain from the offerings in 2007-2008: Teaching in Roman Catholic Separate Schools; Integrating Technology in the Classroom; Equity in Education; First Nations, Inuit and Metis Education; Counselling Applications in School Contexts; and Kindergarten and the Early Years. Five new options have been added: Second Language Perspectives in Education; Social Justice and Global Education; Holistic and Non-Traditional Approaches to Education; Creating Healthy, Safe and Supportive Learning Environments; and Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum (University of Ottawa, 2013-2014).

2015-2016. The consecutive teacher education program is now a two-year, full-time program. The mandatory component of the program includes the practicum experiences as well as expanded methods courses and two Curriculum Planning, Implementation and Assessment courses (Part I and Part II) and two Learning Theories and Practices in Inclusive Classrooms (Part I and Part II). The elective course offerings remain the same, however, in the Primary/Junior and the Junior/Intermediate divisions of the one-year program one elective course was required and now candidates must complete two elective courses. In the Intermediate/Senior division the requirement is now three elective courses whereas in the one-year program the requirement was two. Candidates in both the Junior/Intermediate and the Intermediate/Senior divisions are also now required to take a course entitled, The Context of Ontario Middle and Secondary schools (University of Ottawa, 2015-2016).

University of Western Ontario. The London Teachers' College became the Faculty of Education at the University of Western Ontario in 1973. Their current program prepares teachers, "for local, national, and international opportunities in education" (University of Western Ontario, 2016e, para. 2).

2013-2014. The University of Western Ontario offers a one-year, full-time consecutive program. All candidates are required to complete a practicum as well as methods courses, co-curricular courses, and elective courses (Bachelor of Education, 2013). In addition, two foundation courses are required: Educational Psychology and Special Education; and Social Foundations of Education. There are elective courses for all programs as well as a group of electives in Equity, Diversity, and Social Justice. Three of the courses in the second category make specific reference to disability: Safe Schools; Special Topic: Critical Disability Studies in Education; and Teaching for Equity and Social Justice: A Focus on Inclusive Curriculum (University of Western Ontario, 2013-2014).

2015-2016. The consecutive program is now a two-year, full-time program. As with the previous one-year program, candidates choose a Primary-Junior, Junior-Intermediate, or Intermediate/Senior focus. New to the two year program is the addition of a specialty area which candidates must also choose. The specialty program options are: Advanced Studies in the Psychology of Achievement, Inclusion & Mental Health; Early Years Education; Elementary School French; Secondary School French; International Education; and Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM); Urban Education (University of Western Ontario, 2016a).

Required courses for all candidates include: Special Education and Inclusion; Safe Schools; and Mental Health Literacy - Supporting Social-Emotional Development. Required courses for candidates who have chosen the Advanced Studies in the Psychology of Achievement, Inclusion & Mental Health specialty are: Introduction to Teaching Students with Exceptionalities; Social and Emotional Learning; and Academic Learning for Students with Exceptionalities. The Special Topic: Critical Disability Studies in Education course is no longer offered (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017).

Nipissing University. The North Bay Teachers' College merged with Nipissing University in 1973. The Teacher Education in North Bay page (Nipissing University, 2016d) of the university's website explains that,

The program aims to provide beginning teachers with an understanding of the basic philosophical, psychological and sociological foundations of education, to enable them to use a system-based approach in their teaching, and to introduce them to a rationale for curriculum design through a study of the various strands of the curriculum. (para. 3)

The faculty of education at Nipissing University offers both consecutive and concurrent programs.

2002-2003. The one year consecutive program consists of a practicum, methods courses, and two foundations courses: Educational Psychology and Special Education; and

Education and Schooling. Candidates may also choose one of three option courses for an additional tuition charge. They are: French as a Second Language, Part I; Education of Native Canadians; and Religious Education in the Roman Catholic Separate Schools. Nipissing University's concurrent program began as a pilot program in the 2002/2003 school year. It launched with one section of 35 students studying Education in the Junior/Intermediate (J/I) division. The program was offered in conjunction with Wilfrid Laurier University Brantford at Wilfrid Laurier's Brantford campus (Nipissing University, 2002-2003).

2013-2014. The consecutive program continues with the same requirements: practicum, methods courses and two foundations courses: Educational Psychology and Special Education; and Education and Schooling. The program continues to offer 'option courses' that candidates may take for an additional tuition charge. The options courses have expanded from three to ten and now consist of: Religious Education in the Roman Catholic Separate Schools; Mental Health Issues in School Populations; Kindergarten: Curriculum Theory and Practice; Music Education through Technology; English Language Learners (ELL/ESL); International Teaching; Application of Multimedia Technology in Education; Exclusion to Inclusion: Imagination and Creativity in the 21st Century Classroom; Outdoor and Experiential Education; and Education of Native Canadians.

The concurrent program has continued and grown since its infancy as a pilot project in 2002. It is now offered in North Bay in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Applied and Professional Schools (in addition to the continuing Nipissing-Laurier concurrent program). The education component of the program includes practicum experience, methods courses and the same foundational courses as required in the consecutive program: Educational Psychology and Special Education; Education and Schooling (Nipissing University, 2013-2014).

2015-2016. In September 2015 the consecutive program became a two year enhanced Bachelor of Education program. In addition to the practicum and the methods courses, all candidates must complete the following required courses: Legal and Social Foundations of Education; Diversity and Inclusion; Introduction to Curriculum Design and Teaching; Assessment, Evaluation and Communication of Student Learning; Curriculum Design and Inquiry; Technology Enriched Teaching and Learning (TETL); and Special Needs of Students (Nipissing University, 2015b).

The concurrent program is now a six-year program with the same required education courses as the consecutive program. Candidates must also complete the requirements for their corresponding degree program and include specific education courses based on the degree program chosen. Candidates may choose the Honours undergraduate degree or the Bachelor of Physical and Health Education (BPHE). Both programs require candidates to take: Fundamentals of Arithmetic for Teachers; Academic Writing; and Introduction to Teaching. Additionally, the Honours undergraduate degree includes courses in adult and child development and the BPHE degree includes a course in physical education (Nipissing University, 2015a).

Faculties of Education: In-Service Programs

In 1979 Ministry of Education courses became known as Additional Qualifications (AQ) courses. The basic structure of the AQ program has remained the same, however, there have been changes to course offerings over the years. By the 1980s Aqs had become prerequisites for certain roles in Ontario school boards and new government legislation led to new teaching priorities. This was the case with the introduction of Bill 82 and it led to many teachers taking AQ courses in special education (Bodkin, 2006).

Since 1996 the Ontario College of Teachers has overseen AQ courses. The college develops guidelines for courses, approves the providers, and accredits the courses. The

courses themselves are provided by faculties of education, school boards, and teachers' unions (Ontario College of Teachers, 2016a). OISE/UT, University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario, and Nipissing University all offer AQ courses on a variety of topics including a three-part specialist in Special Education. The University of Western Ontario and Nipissing University offer the three-part specialist in Teaching Students Who Are Blind, and Nipissing University also offers the three-part specialist in Teaching Students Who Are Deaf-Blind. The Ontario College of Teachers also provides guidelines for a three-part specialist in American Sign Language and a three part specialist in Aural and Oral Communication. None of the four focus faculties provide these courses.

The Impact of the Past on Current Practice

I have traced the evolution of teacher education from its establishment in 1847 to its current manifestation in Ontario's faculties of education to examine how teachers have been and continue to be prepared to work with students with disabilities. In the next chapter I will examine these practices to determine what they say about how we view disability in our schools and in our communities. I will also consider whether and how these views have changed over time, and to what extent they have been shaped by or are still rooted in the past.

Chapter 5: Remnants of the Past in the Present

A number of different models have developed to reflect understandings of disability at different points in time. Although these models developed chronologically, newer conceptions of disability did not necessarily replace those that came before. And models of disability continue to evolve as disability scholars and activists consider disability from a variety of perspectives and disciplines. There is not always agreement among those holding different perspectives, however, as Baglieri, Valle, Connor, and Gallagher (2011) point out, “it is necessary to engage new thoughts and alternative philosophical perspectives and to welcome ideas that do not sit easily with current beliefs and assumptions” (p. 276).

In their design, teacher education programs are reflective of particular models of disability whether this is acknowledged overtly or not. Examining these models and their impact on teacher education is intended to open an exploration into, “the medicalized view that has powerfully shaped both general and special education...” (Ware, 2009, p. 399).

Medical Model

In a medical model, disability is viewed as a problem that resides in the individual, conflating the terms impairment and disability (Goodley, 2011). The use of diagnostic categories to separate people according to conditions diagnosed by a medical or psychological professional is supported. A consequence of adopting this model is the development and testing of interventions designed to “fix” deficits in particular areas of human functioning (Danforth, 2008; Linton, 2010). There are a number of models (e.g., charity model; pity/tragedy model, etc.) that preceded the medical model and continue to permeate current approaches to disability, however, the medical model seems to be the primary one influencing current teacher education practices.

Critiques of the medical model. Critiques of the medical model began surfacing as the field of disability studies emerged and disability rights activists became more prominent.

Disability activists feel that adopting the medical model ignores social, cultural and environmental aspects of the conception of disability. Disability is viewed as personal tragedy that leads to attitudes of paternalism and dependency (Reindal, 2008). Using this model perpetuates the notion that people with disabilities are dependent and in need of care, resulting in their exclusion from functioning fully as members of society. Within the school system, this model provides the rationale for separate schools or separate classrooms. Those who support the medical model feel that the classification and labeling of disability serves to ensure that students receive the appropriate interventions, but critics point out that labeling devalues students with special needs and focuses on what they cannot do (Terzi, 2005).

Social Model

Out of these critiques grew the social model approach to disability. In the United Kingdom, The Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS), an early disability rights group pushed back against the predominant medical model. In 1976, the group, along with the Disability Alliance, released a statement entitled, *Fundamental Principles of Disability* in which they asserted, "In our view, it is society which disables physically impaired people. Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments, by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society" (UPIAS & The Disability Alliance, p. 4). The social model, articulated by Oliver in his 1990 text *The Politics of Disablement*, developed from this joint UPIAS and The Disability Alliance statement (Gallagher, Conner, & Ferri, 2014; Goodley, 2011).

The perspective taken in this model is that disability is socially constructed. The concept of impairment is separated from that of disability, reflected in the words of Reindal (2008) who asks, "...how does a reduced function become a state of *being disabled*?" (p. 140). The answer is found in societal barriers, and in a social model the question is focused on how they can be removed. Impairment is seen as a natural variation of the human condition. The focus is on

empowering people with impairments to live full lives and make independent decisions regarding what a full life is for them.

The Medical Model and The Social Model in Teacher Education

Descriptions of the disability related courses currently offered at the four focus faculties (OISE/UT, University of Ottawa, University of Western Ontario, and Nipissing University) reflect different components of the medical model. In a few cases there is some evidence of a shift from reflecting a medical model to adopting a social model, however, a closer look reveals evidence of a predisposition towards the medical model. The discussion in this section is organized around beliefs about disability and how these beliefs shift when moving from a medical model to a social model.

From ‘disability is abnormal’ to ‘disability as difference’.⁸ Students with disabilities are often seen as other within their classrooms and schools. This notion is perpetuated by teachers when they view these students as having difficulties or problems. These difficulties or problems may initially be in relation to the curriculum being taught or the strategies being employed in the classroom, but often these students themselves are viewed as difficulties or problems for the teacher. As Blackwell articulated in 1915, “in the long list of our school problems there is none more insistent or difficult than that of the backward child” (p. 622).

Prior to 2015-2016 OISE/UT offered courses focusing on these difficulties or problems. The course entitled, *Emotional and Behavioural Problems in the Classroom* used the term ‘problem’ not only in the title, but also used it, and the term ‘difficulties’, in the description,

This course explores innovative, practical and proactive strategies teachers can employ to manage child behaviour in the classroom. *Problems* [emphasis added] such as aggression, shyness, depression, attention problems and over-activity will be covered.

⁸ Sub-headings in this section are adapted from the medical model versus the social model of disability chart on page 2 of the Council of Ontario Universities’ *Introduction to Accessible Education* (<https://www.uwo.ca/tsc/resources/pdf/COU%20AODA%20Guide.pdf>).

Teacher candidates will learn how to conduct informal assessments of child *difficulties* [emphasis added] and how to modify the classroom environment to ensure optimal student performance and behaviour. Teacher candidates will consider how to work with parents and children concerning classroom-based *problems* [emphasis added].

(OISE/UT, 2006-2007, p. 26; OISE/UT, 2013-2014, p. 37)

A second course, *Adapting and Differentiating Instruction for Students Experiencing Learning Difficulties in Inclusive Classrooms* (OISE/UT, 2013-2014), recognizes that the needs of all students will have to be met within the context of inclusive classrooms, however, it also focuses on student difficulties, “Teacher candidates will be introduced to the types of learning *difficulties* [emphasis added] they are likely to frequently encounter in the classroom (e.g., learning disabilities, ADHD, mild intellectual disabilities) (OISE/UT, 2013-2014, p. 36). By so doing it reinscribes the medical model position of difference as negative.

In the 2015-2016 academic year, when OISE/UT phased out its Bachelor of Education program in favour of offering teacher education through its Masters programs, the required courses shifted focus as well. Each Masters program requires one special education course. The terms ‘problem’ and ‘difficulties’ are no longer part of the course titles or descriptions. Both courses reference ‘special education’ in their titles, but the descriptions indicate that students with special needs are *primarily* educated in inclusive classrooms. The description for the *Introduction to Special Education and Mental Health* course tells us that, “special education is not ‘special’ but is effective teaching that benefits all students” (OISE/UT, 2015-2016, p. 63).

This shift in terminology initially appears to reflect a shift towards a social model of disability; however, it ignores the mutually exclusive use of the terms ‘special education’ and ‘inclusive education’. According to Inclusive Education Canada,

Inclusive education means that all students attend and are welcomed by their neighbourhood schools in age-appropriate, regular classes and are supported to learn,

contribute and participate in all aspects of the life of the school. Inclusive education is about how we develop and design our schools, classrooms, programs and activities so that all students learn and participate together. (Inclusive Education Canada, n.d.)

Loreman, Deppeler, and Harvey (2005) clarify the concept of inclusive education by explaining what it is not,

Educating children part-time in special schools and part-time in regular schools is not inclusion. Educating children in special, mostly segregated, environments in regular schools is not inclusion. Educating children in regular classes, but requiring them to follow substantially different courses of study in terms of content and learning environment to their peers is also not inclusion. (p. 2)

If children are only *primarily* educated in inclusive classrooms as the OISE course description indicates, they are not truly included. As part of its 2015-2016 B.Ed program, the University of Western Ontario offers a course entitled, *Special Education and Inclusion*. The course description indicates that the material covered will include topics that reflect a merging of special education and inclusion by focusing on a traditional special education paradigm moved into a 'regular' classroom (University of Western Ontario, 2016a).

Repositioning 'special education' as 'inclusion' without challenging the theories that underpin special education results in a lack of substantive change. When disablement is not recognized as a field of cultural politics, it is reduced to a technical problem of resourcing, management, social groupings, and instructional design (Slee, 1997).

From 'disability residing in the individual' to 'disability arising from interactions between the individual and society'. The premise of a medical model of disability is that it, "locates children's disabilities unproblematically in their individual pathology" (Thomas & Loxley, 2007, p. 3). As a result these disabilities are diagnosed by psychologists or medical doctors. McKenzie and Macleod (2012) refer to this as the medico-psychological gaze. They explain that,

“disability expertise seeks to identify, describe and manage behaviour that is assumed to arise from the biological defect identified through the medico-psychological gaze” (p. 1086). Counter to this medical model view of the professional is the social model perspective which rejects, “the need for special skills, with greater value placed on ... the teaching skills of the regular teacher” (Mckenzie & Macleod, 2012, p. 1083).

This privileging of the specialized knowledge of the professional developed from two distinct, but related, domains of knowledge. One domain, “centred on the doctor and the knowledge archive that resulted from the medical and dental inspection of schoolchildren in the first decade of the twentieth century. This led to the formation of a pedagogical normal based on anthropometric measurement”, and the other, “centred on the professional psychologist and the ‘scientific knowledge’ formed by the academic discipline of psychology. It resulted in the making of a normal largely based on intelligence testing” (Milewski, 2010, p. 348). Although there is some evidence of a social model approach focusing on the skills of the regular teacher, there continues to be a clear focus on the diagnosing and labeling of students in the courses at the four focus faculties.

In the 2007-2008 and 2013-2014 school years, The University of Ottawa offered a course entitled *Education of Exceptional Students*. This course provided an, “overview of various exceptionalities” and focused on assisting, “teachers in addressing the special education needs of pupils in the regular classroom” (University of Ottawa, 2007-2008; University of Ottawa, 2013-2014). The *Learning Theories and Practices in Inclusive Classrooms* (Part I and Part II) courses continue to provide an, “understanding of learners with exceptionalities” and, “implications of learning and assessment in diverse and inclusive classrooms” (University of Ottawa, 2015-2016).

Categorizing students by their exceptionalities, “behavioural, communication, intellectual, physical or multiple” (University of Ottawa, 2015-2016) continues to privilege the professionals

who make these diagnoses/identifications. It is also difficult to see how we can identify students based on individual deficit and then focus on, “an asset-based approach” as the University of Western Ontario’s course *Special Education and Inclusion* purports to do (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017).

Nipissing University’s courses make an explicit link to the, “educational psychology principles that underlie exceptionality” in the 2015-2016 course *Special Needs of Students* (Nipissing University, 2015a; Nipissing University, 2015b), and in the earlier iteration of this course, *Educational Psychology and Special Education*, which stated that, “in this course, candidates are introduced to the fields of Educational Psychology and Special Education”. Topics covered included psychological assessment and types of exceptionalities (Nipissing University, 2002-2003; Nipissing University, 2013-2014).

Goodley (2011) refers to these diagnostic rituals as a new eugenics. This reference to eugenics may have an, “eerie, somewhat antiquated ring; yet, the taken-for-granted belief that genetics accounts for differences in intellectual ability, personal dispositions, and so on, remains culturally ubiquitous” (Gallagher, 2006, p. 70).

From ‘accessibility is the job of experts’ to ‘accessibility is the job of educators’.

Medical and psychological experts deploy their medico-psychological gaze to diagnose/identify children with disabilities (Mckenzie & Macleod, 2012). Once diagnosed, the implication is that these children require some type of remediation and/or cure. The strategies that are put in place often stem from the medico-psychological gaze. Mckenzie & Macleod (2012) refer to this as ‘disability expertise’ which, “seeks to identify, describe and manage behaviour that is assumed to arise from the biological defect identified through the medico-psychological gaze” (p. 1086).

Although the descriptions of some courses currently offered in teacher education focus on preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms, “if we perceive students labelled with disabilities as qualitatively not like other students, even the most frequently recommended educational

supports - adaptations and modifications - take on an exclusionary tone” (Baglieri, 2008, p. 587). Even differentiated instruction, which is embedded into courses at the University of Ottawa and the University of Western Ontario (University of Ottawa, 2015-2016; University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017), “too often materializes as a hierarchical tiering or tracking process. That is, differentiation assumes a baseline and then modifies ‘up’ or ‘down’ for particular individuals. Consequently, it recreates the same divisions it seeks to eradicate” (Baglieri, Valle, Connor, & Gallagher, 2011, p. 273).

In a social model educators are responsible for creating a classroom environment in which all students can learn. This becomes increasingly important as students with disabilities spend greater amounts of time in regular classrooms. The course descriptions reflect this and recognize that teacher candidates should have the ability to, “calibrate instruction to meet the needs of individual students” (OISE/UT, 2016c). Calibrating instruction is referred to in a variety of ways. In addition to differentiated instruction, The University of Western Ontario’s *Special Education and Inclusion* course refers to universal design and strategies for inclusive education, and their *Introduction to Teacher Students with Exceptionalities* course lists interventions, accommodations, and modifications among the topics covered (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017). Nipissing University’s Special Needs of Students course refers more generally to, “teaching strategies appropriate for use in the classroom and on an individual basis” (Nipissing University, 2015a; Nipissing, 2015b).

Such a focus on strategies positions education as predominantly a technical issue. Bartolome (2009) refers to this as a ‘methods fetish’ and tells us that,

Although it is important to identify useful and promising instructional programs and strategies, it is erroneous to assume that blind replication of instructional programs or teacher mastery of particular teaching methods, in and of themselves, will guarantee

successful student learning, especially when we are discussing populations that historically have been mistreated and miseducated by the schools. (p. 338)

Foregrounding the technical aspects of education leads teachers to assume that they, “do not need to identify, interrogate, and change their biased beliefs and fragmented views about subordinated students” (Bartolome, 2009, p. 339). These concerns are often raised in relation to the education of culturally and linguistically subordinated students (Bartolome,2009), but apply equally to students with disabilities.

Universal Design for Learning, referred to in the *Special Education and Inclusion* course at the University of Western Ontario (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017), however, is an example of an approach that encourages us to, “structure our teaching always and already designed for the many ways that learners can engage learning, thus allowing opportunity to emerge in each new moment, in each new day” (Baglieri et al., 2011, p. 272). Despite the allusion to a social model way of thinking embedded in the addition of Universal Design to course content, for the most part a medical model of disability continues to be reflected in these courses. The various approaches to supporting students still suggest that some students fall under the general heading of ‘normal’ and others need to be accommodated somehow in order to fit into the regular, or inclusive, classroom. This results in what Baglieri et al. (2011) refer to as, “retro-fitting instruction after the fact” (p. 272).

From ‘segregated settings’ to ‘inclusive classrooms’. Although many of the course descriptions at the four focus faculties refer to inclusive classrooms, they also acknowledge that there are still a range of placement options in Ontario schools. The course outline for the University of Western Ontario’s *Special Education and Inclusion* class explains that,

Provincial legislation in Ontario encourages that students identified as exceptional be provided with an education that is appropriate to their needs. Recently, this has become increasingly understood to mean providing a program within an inclusive setting with

their peers. In Ontario, approximately 80% of students identified with exceptionalities are taught in regular classrooms for at least 50% of each day. This movement to full inclusion means that every classroom teacher must be more knowledgeable, resourceful, and confident about working with all students to gain successful interpersonal and learning experiences in the classroom. This course will provide content related to working in the inclusive classroom. (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2016, p. 2)

This explanation is indicative of the misunderstandings that arise when the term inclusion is used in different contexts to mean different things, and it seems to support suspicions that inclusive education is really just exclusionary special education under a new name (Allan, 2010).

The Medical Model and The Social Model in the Ontario Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education regulated the implementation of Bill 82 of the Education Act that outlines the requirements for provision of special education in the province. Included in this is their responsibility to, “define exceptionalities of pupils and to prescribe classes, groups or categories of exceptional pupils and to require the use of these definitions by school boards” (The Education Act, 2016). When it comes to placement decisions, regulation 181/98 of the Education Act stipulates that,

...the committee shall, before considering the option of placement in a special education class, consider whether placement in a regular class, with appropriate special education services,

(a) would meet the pupil’s needs; and

(b) is consistent with parental preferences. O. Reg. 181/98, s. 17 (1). (Regulation 181/98, 2012-2016)

Although the intent is that regular class placement should be considered prior to a special class placement, there are a number of placement options available. These include: a regular class with indirect support; a regular class with resource assistance; a regular class with withdrawal assistance; a special education class with partial integration; and a special education class full-time (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2004).

The Ministry also articulates the programming options available in terms of accommodations, modifications, and alternative expectations. According to The Individual Education Plan Resource Guide (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2004) accommodations are, “special teaching and assessment strategies, human supports, and/or individualized equipment required to enable a student to learn and to demonstrate learning. Accommodations do not alter the provincial curriculum expectations for the grade” (p. 25). Modifications are, “changes made in age-appropriate grade-level expectations for a subject or course in order to meet a student’s learning needs” (p. 25), and alternative expectations are, “developed to help students acquire knowledge and skills that are not represented in the Ontario curriculum” (p. 26).

More recent Ministry resource documents recognize the classroom teacher as the, “key educator for literacy and numeracy development” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 4; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 7), and the importance of supporting classroom teachers in the development of learning strategies to support students’ diverse learning needs. Although the expert panel responsible for developing these documents has adopted what could be described as a social model, “inclusive, non-categorical - rather than exceptionality-based - approach to address programming for students with special education needs” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 3), the legislative context outlined above has not changed.

Despite the inclusive leanings of these new documents, school boards are still required to comply with the regulations set out in the Education Act and to indicate how by creating a special education plan that meets the standards set out by the ministry (Ontario Ministry of

Education, 2000) – requirements that can seem to run counter to a social model and notions of inclusion. These structures, along with accompanying processes like Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and Identification, Placement, and Review Committees (IPRCs), still reflect medical model thinking, developed from a longstanding tradition, expressed by Eric Kent Clarke in 1923, of removing, “the slowly progressing pupils from ordinary grades where they proved a drag on those of average intelligence” (p. 130). Ninety years later a similar sentiment is still being expressed. Thornton and Underwood (2013) explored educator attitudes towards inclusion and uncovered a range of responses from pathognomonic to interventionist. One educator explained that placement in the regular class depended on certain conditions being met,

If the student’s academic misunderstandings lead to social disruptions in the class constantly, like if there’s a major outburst and anger issues, I’ve had students where if they didn’t understand a concept or a certain idea they would break a ruler over the desk or snap a pencil [in] reaction to the lack of understanding and that caused disorder within the classroom ... you really have to start addressing the fact that maybe separation [is] ... the better option ... because maybe ... what’s causing the stress or the physical outburst is the thought that peers are judging them or the teacher is judging them... (pp. 66-67)

This response clearly represents a continuing ‘within child, medical model’ understanding of difference.

The four focus faculties have embedded these ministry requirements into their courses. OISE’s *Introduction to Special Education and Adaptive Instruction* places focus on, “curriculum being flexible in responding to diversity, so that teachers are guided to make appropriate accommodations and modified expectations for the various categories of exceptionality” (OISE/UT, 2016a). The *Learning Theories and Practices in Inclusive Classrooms (Part II)* at the University of Ottawa includes an emphasis on Ministry categories of exceptionality and other Ministry legislation related to special education (University of Ottawa, 2015-2016).

Nipissing University's *Special Needs of Students* course incorporates an examination of the range of special education services available in Ontario schools as well as the exceptionalities that students may present and how they are identified. Teacher candidates in this course will also learn to plan individual programs (Nipissing University, 2015a; Nipissing University, 2015b). The University of Western Ontario currently offers a number of courses that include topics related to Ministry of Education regulations. The list of topics addressed in the *Special Education and Inclusion* course include Ministry of Education documents as well as the IEP and IPRC processes. The *Introduction to Teaching Students with Exceptionalities* course covers accommodations, modifications, service delivery models and IEPs. Lastly, the *Social and Emotional Learning* course indicates that students will learn how to apply IEPs as well as program accommodations, modifications, and interventions (University of Western Ontario, 2015-2017).

The Medical Model and The Social Model in In-Service Programs

The three-part specialist in Special Education offered through the Additional Qualifications (AQ) courses continues to be offered through each of the four focus faculties. In April 2014 the Ontario College of Teachers published updated course guidelines for each of the three courses. The previous guidelines were published in 2003.

Special Education Part I. There have been some significant changes to the guidelines for this course. In the 2003 guideline the background section specifies that this course, "is a pre-requisite for assignment as a teacher of a special education class, or as a resource or withdrawal teacher, or for those teachers who are placed in charge of the special education program within a school" (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003a, p. 2). It goes on to say that, "although this course will be of greatest interest to those teachers who wish to deepen their information regarding students identified as exceptional, all classroom teachers may wish to better prepare themselves for teaching students who have special needs" (Ontario College of

Teachers, 2003a, p. 3). The 2014 guideline does not specifically indicate the intended audience for this course and the background section that included this information in the 2003 guideline has been removed entirely (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014a).

The 2003 guideline acknowledges that, “all students share elements of ability and disability” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003, p. 5), however, it almost exclusively focuses on the learning needs of students identified as exceptional. The updated guideline refers to inclusion and inclusive programs a number of times and highlights the importance of professional collaboration. Universal design and differentiated instruction have been added to the theoretical foundations section as supports for inclusive education. Teachers in this course are also asked to critically examine their, “professional assumptions, beliefs, knowledge and actions related to learners with diverse needs” as well as “societal and systemic assumptions about ability and disability” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003, p. 7). The 2014 guideline continues to include, “Ontario curriculum, resources and government policies, frameworks and strategies relevant to the teaching and learning of students with special education needs” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014, p. 8). These include IPRCs, IEPs, and relevant Policy/Program Memoranda (PPM) (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014).

The descriptions provided for this course by each of the four focus faculties are too brief to provide information about all topics to be covered. However, despite their brevity they vary in tone and emphasis. Nipissing University and the University of Western Ontario offer descriptions that seem to reflect a medical model. Nipissing University highlights, “the five categories of exceptionalities as recognized by the Ontario Ministry of Education, various teaching strategies, program planning, and other issues related to the teaching and learning of students receiving special education services in a variety of classroom settings”. Course requirements include exploring, observing and reporting on several areas of exceptionality, and developing an IEP (Nipissing University, 2016a). The course at the University of Western

Ontario stresses, “identification, description, evaluation and reporting techniques as well as teaching strategies for the various exceptionalities” (University of Western Ontario, 2016b).

The course descriptions from OISE/UT and the University of Ottawa each begin with an emphasis on topics that align more closely with a medical model, but then shift slightly in their focus to towards a more social model. The OISE/UT description of the course includes, “an introduction to the various exceptionalities, working with program planning and delivery challenges, awareness of assistive technology, classroom management skills, as well as knowledge of other issues related to teaching students with special needs in a variety of settings”. It continues with, “this course will be of greatest interest to those teachers who wish to deepen their knowledge regarding exceptional students noting the Ministry of Education’s move to greater inclusion” (OISE/UT, 2016d). The University of Ottawa’s course description begins with an overview of, “theory and practice underpinning special education”, but it goes on to include the, “study of commonalities that unite students”, as well as, “creating safe, equitable, accessible and supportive teaching-learning environments” (University of Ottawa, 2016a).

Although there is greater recognition that this course will benefit all teachers due to the Ministry’s “move to greater inclusion”, the conceptualization of inclusion as something that can be adopted by degree is not unpacked. Is it possible to be partially included? Is that really what we mean when we say inclusion? Ministry policies still provide for a continuum of placements and school boards continue to take advantage of this range of options. What does seem to be changing is the recognition that classroom teachers are responsible for the learning of students identified as exceptional for the portion of the day that these students are ‘included’ in the regular class. Although this is a positive step forward, it continues to reflect medical model thinking. This structure is still based on the view that disability resides in the individual and students continue to spend part of their day outside of the regular classroom. This thinking is embedded in Part II of the Special Education AQ course as well.

Special Education Part II. The 2003 course guideline (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003b) indicates that Part II builds on Part I by including the ten learning expectations from that course and then adding two new ones. The additional two expectations are:

- gaining a working knowledge of an array of formal and informal assessment strategies for the purposes of pedagogical decision-making;
- developing a holistic understanding of programming in order to meet the needs of individual students. (p. 4)

By 2014 that approach had shifted somewhat. Part II is now intended to provide participants with the opportunity to delve more deeply into the topics covered in Part I and requires them to move from developing and exploring new ideas to deepening and applying them. Formal and informal assessments are referred to in both courses whereas in the 2003 guidelines formal assessment is not introduced until Part II (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014a; Ontario College of Teachers, 2014b; Ontario College of Teachers, 2003b). Course descriptions, however, indicate that formal and informal assessments continue to be an integral component of Part II.

The course description for the University of Western Ontario's Part II provides only a very brief overview, "This course requires qualified teachers to study, in depth, the education of pupils with physical, intellectual, communications and behavioural abnormalities (University of Western Ontario, 2016c). The course descriptions at the other three focus faculties highlight assessment in their Part II course descriptions. Nipissing University's course description indicates that, "a variety of assessment tools appropriate for the five major categories of exceptionality will be explored and through informed inquiry and reflection, teachers will create, implement, and assess programs for students identified as exceptional..." (Nipissing University, 2016b).

OISE/UT's course description also highlights the role of assessment and points out that, "assessment includes both formal and informal tools, as well as information gathered from

observation, assessment and school documents to design effective programs for all exceptional students” and psychological assessments will also be studied (OISE/UT, 2016e). At the University of Ottawa Part II includes a focus on the, “development of individualized programs based on informal and formal assessments”, as well as the interpretation and communication of assessment results (University of Ottawa, 2016b).

This focus in these courses on assessment for the purposes of diagnosis/identification reflects the medico-psychological gaze articulated by McKenzie & McLeod (2012) and is consistent with a medical model view of disability. This labelling students stems from the assumption that these labels are neutral and objectively accurate. This assumption, however, “effectively depoliticizes and dehistoricizes labeling by locating negative stereotypes within the individual rather than the structure, history, and professional discourse of the labeling system itself” (Fitch, 2002, p. 466).

Special Education Part III. The 2003 and the 2014 guidelines for Part III focus on the development of leadership qualities. According to the 2003 guidelines these qualities include, “fostering commitment and confidence among staff to meet the needs of individual students”, and, “providing support for colleagues to develop, use, accommodate, and modify expectations, strategies, and assessment practices based on students’ developmental and special need as outlined in the IEP” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003c, pp. 3-4). The 2014 guidelines for the Specialist course incorporate, “providing leadership in the implementation of Ontario’s curriculum, policies, frameworks, strategies and guidelines”, and “critically exploring leadership in the creation of holistic learning environments conducive to the intellectual, social, emotional, physical, linguistic, cultural, spiritual and moral development of students” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014c, p. 6).

The course descriptions from all four of the focus faculties clearly indicate that the Specialist course is designed to develop leadership skills. Additionally, the course description

from the University of Western Ontario goes on to say that, “studies include current research, administrative and supervisory techniques and diagnosis” (University of Western Ontario, 2016d). Nipissing University’s course description lets potential participants know that they will be, “required to complete a professional development activity that describes and reflects an area of leadership in special education” (Nipissing University, 2016c).

In addition to its focus on leadership, the topics covered in the OISE/UT Specialist course include, “innovative approaches to developing structures for programs, learning about their role on the school teams, in-service delivery models, how to co-ordinate community resources, and program assessment and evaluation” (OISE/UT, 2016f). At the University of Ottawa the additional topics include, “extending knowledge and skills for designing and implementing programs for, and assessment of, exceptional students; developing strategies for collaborating with parents/guardians, school and community personnel...learning strategies to promote special education at school and board levels” (University of Ottawa, 2016c).

The 2014 guidelines for all three parts of the Special Education additional qualifications courses (Ontario College of Teachers, 2014a; 2014b; 2014c) highlight the importance of critical reflection. Two of the areas for reflection included in the Framework for Inquiry are, “one’s professional assumptions, beliefs, knowledge and actions related to learners with diverse needs”, and “societal and systemic assumptions about ability and disability” (p.7). Giving consideration to both these areas has the potential to shift educator beliefs and attitudes about disability. However, they do not appear to be a priority for course providers given that they are not included in the course descriptions. Perhaps AQ course providers are responding to the constraints of, “legislation, terminology and board practices that do not fully embrace the shift towards a reconceptualization of schooling that supports inclusive learning environments for all children” (Killoran et al., 2013, p. 242).

Barriers to Inclusion

Examining the course offerings at the four faculties has revealed hints of the social model thinking that is required to create inclusive schools. However, recognizing that classroom teachers have to take on increased responsibility for all students regardless of their identification and placement, and using the language of inclusion are not enough to move our schools in that direction. If what we call inclusion leaves all the structures of special education intact then inclusive education becomes, “a casualty of a form of ‘*eduspeak*’ [emphasis in original] characterised by reductionism and disconnection and devoid of its original political intent” (Slee, 2008, p. 104). Importantly, even where there is some evidence of social model thinking, it is not named. Models of disability are not included in the curriculum. In order to understand how our educational system evolved into its current manifestation teachers should be exposed to and reflect upon these models and how they impact on our system. Additionally, the structure of optional additional qualifications courses, even if they were truly inclusive in their focus, still imply that only certain teachers need this learning, and these teachers are only exposed to it if they choose to be. And, as Killoran et al. (2013) contend,

Maintaining this separate form of qualifications for teachers to enable them to work with children with exceptionalities has unfortunately contributed to the misperception that there is some body of knowledge that the general educator does not possess and is therefore unqualified to work with children with exceptionalities. (p. 242)

Despite the requirement to work within the constraints of our current system, engaging teacher candidates in critical disability studies provides them with the opportunity to find ways to push back. It explores the pedagogical practices that impact directly on the schooling experiences of students with disabilities and asks us to question our assumptions about what disability is, what students with disabilities need, want and deserve and what the responsibilities of education and educators should be in relation to students with disabilities (Danforth & Gabel,

2006). In the next chapter I reimagine teacher education from a Disability Studies in Education perspective.

Chapter 6: Reimagining Teacher Education

Simon (1992) challenges us to engage in a pedagogy of possibility that, “attempts to provoke a process through which people might engage in a transformative critique of their everyday lives” (p. 60). The ‘everyday life’ of teacher education tends to be entrenched in a medical model approach to disability. Mutua and Smith (2006) maintain that teachers who are socialized within a medical model of disability will continue to see their role, “...as that of correcting or remediating the effects of student disability on student learning” (p. 125). The social model, although never fully realized in teacher education programs, represented a positive move away from the personal tragedy, medical model approach to disability. Despite this, the social model has its critics as well. As Connor, Gabel, Gallagher, and Morton (2008) point out, “there are countless interpretations of the social model and an equal number of critiques” (p. 443). Critics of the social model point out that it ignores the reality of impairment and overemphasizes the impact of the social in creating disability (Reindal, 2008). Anastasiou and Kauffman (2011) argue that replacing biological determinism with cultural determinism assumes that people with disabilities are devoid of biological features. They argue that disability is not solely the product of biological or social constraints.

Despite these challenges to the social model of disability, the examination of current teacher education programs in Ontario indicates that there has been some movement in that direction. There is recognition that students with disabilities are spending part of their school day in regular classrooms and as a result regular classroom teachers should have an understanding of strategies that they can employ to meet the needs of these students. However, there is little evidence that teacher candidates are asked to consider their current conceptions of disability and where these conceptions may have originated. The courses in the current programs do not seem to include references to models of disability or disability history. I believe these omissions

create a situation in which the remnants of the past remain unacknowledged and as a result, the creation of inclusive classrooms is impeded.

Disability studies in education supports reimagining teacher education practices so that they lead to the establishment of inclusive classrooms in which disability is recognized and valued as, “a natural part of human diversity” (American Educational Research Association [AERA], 2016). In this chapter I propose a re-envisioning of teacher education that explicitly challenges the constructions of disability embedded in the medical model. I explain the origins of disability studies in education as well as its characteristics and then go on to explore the many ways I believe that the adoption of a disability studies in education approach by teacher education programs can lead to the development of teachers who believe in and advocate for inclusion in our schools.

Critical Disability Studies (CDS)

Disability studies, which emerged as a growing area of academic research and professional education in the 1970s,

...seeks neither to jettison, nor to embrace medical paradigms of disability, but to transcend them. It explains personal experiences of disability, not simply in terms of the functioning of bodies that operate in nonstandard ways, but by locating those differences within the larger context of the cultural milieus that shape disability experiences.

(Garland-Thomson & Longmore, 2003)

It began with the development of new paradigms of disability in the social sciences that challenged the medicalized view of disability and then expanded into the humanities as well by engaging with various disciplinary perspectives including history, literature, philosophy, anthropology, and religion (Meekosha & Shuttleworth, 2009; Ware, 2009).

More recently, the term ‘critical disability studies’ (CDS) has been used in scholarly work. Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009) identify four key factors underpinning this shift. CDS

indicates a move away from the earlier focus on binary understandings of disability - medical vs. social; disability vs. impairment. It incorporates an increasingly complex understanding of disability oppression while employing key ideas about disability that emerged from the development of the social model. Secondly, CDS continues the struggle for social justice and diversity, but at the same time moves beyond the social, economic, and political to include the psychological, cultural, discursive, and carnal. Thirdly, concern has arisen that the language of disability studies has been co-opted by institutions still closely aligned with a medical model of disability. CDS signifies a separation from these institutions. And lastly, CDS identifies itself with other areas of critical theory including critical race theory, and critical legal theory. Both explore race as socially constructed providing examples for CDS to follow.

Goodley (2013) explains that late-twentieth century disability studies focused on establishing the factors that led to the structural, economic, and cultural exclusion of people with sensory, physical, and cognitive impairments whereas twenty-first century disability studies has expanded to include the development of theoretical responses to these factors. Central to these developments is the politicization of disabled people.

Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009) and Goodley (2013) identify a number of characteristics that distinguish CDS from its predecessor, disability studies. They recognize CDS as a maturing and broadening of the discipline that incorporates a social transformative perspective that draws from a much more eclectic mix of critical theories than earlier work in disability studies. CDS has its detractors as well. Vehmas and Watson (2014) suggest that CDS does not account for some significant ethical and political issues confronting disabled people, and it has distanced itself from its initial emphasis on material and economic circumstances to its detriment. Concerns have also arisen about CDS becoming an academic field of study that is increasingly removed from its activist origins. Despite these concerns, Goodley (2013) views CDS as, "a logical consequence of disabled people and their allies unpacking and illuminating

the complex nature of disability” (p. 641). He goes on to suggest that CDS provides spaces for, “the development of praxis - the inter-twining of activism and theory” (p. 641).

Disability Studies in Education (DSE)

The field of DSE applies this notion of praxis to education. As Connor et al. (2008) point out,

The aim of DSE is to deepen understandings of the daily experiences of people with disabilities in schools and universities, throughout contemporary society, across diverse cultures, and within various historical contexts. More specifically, and within the realm of praxis, DSE works to create and sustain inclusive and accessible schools. (pp. 441-442)

DSE grew out of a dissatisfaction with the traditional medical model approach to disability research in education and the, “obvious dearth of special education inquiries about teaching practices, organizational dynamics, and, particularly, educational policies that further the development of more inclusive and egalitarian schools” (Danforth & Gabel, 2006, p. 3). A second source of the expansion of interest in DSE is the perpetual omission of disability from critical educational research traditions that focus primarily on race, class, and gender. DSE offers, “intellectual and practical tools, forms of thought and action that nurture a deeper awareness among educators about disability rights, inclusive participation, and disability identity” (Danforth & Gabel, 2006, p. 2).

The Disability Studies in Education special interest group (DSE-SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) was established in 2000. According to Connor et al. (2008), the annual DSE conferences bring together scholars who are united by three broad interests. First, they share dissatisfaction with the narrow perspective on scholarly diversity in the field of special education. They are uncomfortable with the ways in which special education limits forms of what it considers acceptable research methodologies, as well as its entrenchment in a medical model of disability that uses damaging labels and highly problematic

instructional practices. Second, these scholars are interested in exploring their own understandings about working within a DSE paradigm and the impact these understandings will have on theorizing, teaching, and researching disability. And lastly, those interested in DSE share an interest in what is happening with inclusive education globally.

Concerns arose about the co-opting of DSE by those who did not understand its radical nature or its implications for inclusive education so it became necessary to clarify why, “DSE and special education could not be used interchangeably” (Connor et al., 2008, p. 446). As a result, the following mission statement was developed,

The mission of the Disability Studies in Education SIG is to promote the understanding of disability from a social model perspective drawing on social, cultural, historical, discursive, philosophical, literary, aesthetic, artistic, and other traditions to challenge medical, scientific, and psychological models of disability as they relate to education.

(Connor et al., 2008, p.447; AERA, 2016)

This stands in stark contrast to special education which, “ensures that layers of human complexity are minimized, nuances are erased, and inimitable distinctions that characterize human beings as individuals are recast through a hierarchy of labels that authorize identities few would seek to claim” (Ware, 2008, p. 564). DSE’s fundamental purpose is to advocate for educational inclusion and provide viable, meaningful approaches for its enactment (Connor et al., 2008).

Benefits of Disability Studies in Education (DSE)

The multiple perspectives reflected in DSE support the work of teacher educators who, “seek to interrupt the contradictory subtexts in pedagogy and practice when special education’s core concerns of cure, care, and remediation are contrasted with the reflection, transgression, and emancipation that lie at the center of liberatory praxis” (Ware, 2009, p. 399). Some of the

ways that DSE supports this work are outlined below. Although these elements of DSE will be discussed separately, they overlap with, and inform each other.

Human Rights Approach. DSE acknowledges that, “inclusion is as much a moral and political issue as it is an instructional one” (Gallagher, Conner, & Ferri, 2014, p. 1138). Teachers who engage with counternarratives of a medical model are more likely to view inclusive education as a moral and political concern. This perspective encompasses an appreciation of the lived experience and capabilities of disabled people as well as the capacity to recognize and critique exclusionary school practices (Baglieri, 2008). DSE asks us to move beyond asking what works to consider instead, “What works for whom?” (Gallagher et al., 2014, p. 1137)

Jones (2011) describes what a rights-based approach to disability encompasses when it comes to the right to education. She explains that,

The right to education has been said to consist of four elements: availability (to ensure no-one is excluded); accessibility (in terms of non-discrimination, physical accessibility and financial accessibility); acceptability (demonstrating a commitment to human rights); and adaptability (meeting the needs of all learners). Further, there are four cornerstones of the right to education and each of the elements of the right to education must be applied in each area: the composition of the school community; the classroom and the curriculum; the concern of the teacher; and the values of the educational system. (pp. 74-75)

Positioning inclusion as a human right encourages teacher candidates to confront ableist⁹ norms that re-inscribe exclusionary special education practices and instead develop the critical consciousness that enables the creation of inclusive classrooms (McLean, 2008).

⁹ Goodley (2011) defines ableism as, “social biases against people whose bodies function differently from those bodies considered to be ‘normal’ and beliefs and practices resulting from and interacting with these biases to serve discrimination (p. 12).

Teacher Beliefs and Attitudes. Changing practice is predicated on changing beliefs. Teacher education programs that provide opportunities to challenge beliefs about ability and disability through reflection and discussion in a supportive context may result in teacher candidates developing a new understanding of the impact of their beliefs on their teaching practices (Jordan, Schwartz & McGhie-Richmond, 2009). Although Kozleski and Waitoller (2010) indicate that,

...teacher preparation programmes tend to prepare teacher candidates to be transmitters of the dominant culture, practices and knowledge by focusing on technical skills that fail to examine, contest and transform hegemonic assumptions of difference and therefore more often teach teachers to reproduce inequities. (p. 659)

However this is not inevitable if the considerable research recognizing the impact of teacher beliefs on classroom practice is put to use (Florian, Young & Rouse, 2010; Jordan et al., 2009; Sousa, Mtika & Colucci-Gray, 2010).

DSE challenges us to engage in critical reflection in which people think about, “the nature of their thoughts, the process through which thoughts are formed, and the meanings that their thoughts purport in order to examine or pose possibilities for change” (Baglieri, 2008, p. 590). Baglieri (2008) also highlights the importance of activating teachers’ prior knowledge and background experience. Making these personal connections visible and engaging in critical reflection may lead to a transformed consciousness wherein teachers become aware of the theoretical orientations towards inclusion which underpin their beliefs, and ultimately their practice (Baglieri, 2008; Thornton & Underwood, 2013).

Reconceptualizing students. DSE moves the focus away from student remediation towards remediation of the classroom and school context (Gallagher et al., 2014). As Baglieri (2008) points out,

Engaging in complexity toward imagining the education of students labelled with disability beyond prescribed, deceptively neat categorical approaches is at the heart of intellectual, imaginative approaches to teaching - particularly in school systems in need of inclusive approaches yet to be realized. (p. 589)

Rethinking our understanding of students with disabilities involves moving beyond the limiting nature of labels/identifications. We must 'presume competence' and create a space within which students can exceed the expectations attached to their labels/identifications (Gallagher et al., 2014).

Interdisciplinarity. DSE incorporates thinking from a variety of disciplines. It is informed by, "history, literature, philosophy, anthropology, religion, medical history, and rhetoric rooted in the humanities" (Ware, 2009). Scholarship in applied fields contributes to DSE as well. Ultimately, there is, "synergistic potential in interdisciplinary collaborations between applied fields, social sciences and the humanities" (Ferri , 2008, p. 506). Alternative ways of knowing about disability present themselves through the expanding number of disciplines falling under the umbrella of DSE (Ferri, 2008).

Disability performance art is one element of DSE that supports the destabilization of the traditional deficit model of disability. Disabled artists provide an opportunity to 'know' disability outside of the traditional clinical setting. Through their playful and strategic flaunting of difference they challenge commonly held views of disability as tragedy. The counter-stories they provide encourage teacher candidates to, "question their own and society's taken-for-granted assumptions about dis/ability and embrace the person with a disability as an important source of knowledge about their own lived experience" (Ferri, 2008, p. 499).

Ware (2008) explores painter Riva Lehrer's *Circle Stories* series as an alternative way of knowing about disability. She goes on to suggest that Lehrer's portraits challenge typical depictions of disability just as the traditional quantitative research methods employed by special

education are challenged by the qualitative research methods of many DSE scholars. DSE scholars adopt an approach to research on disability that, “aims to reveal lives layered more richly than quantitative observation can either detect or comprehend” (p. 573).

Intersectionality of identity. Recognizing the intersectionality of identity categories and their impact on education is another imperative of DSE. By using intersectional analyses the compounding effect of interconnected social and cultural categories on oppression, marginalization, and discrimination can be considered. In 1989 the term intersectionality was coined by the American critical race theorist Kimberle Crenshaw. She examined the impact that identifying with multiple identity categories has on African American women. Intersectional analysis was then expanded to include race, class, sexuality, and ability (Liasidou, 2013). James and Wu (2006),

stress the importance of understanding how disability has always been racialized, gendered, and classed and how racial, gender, and class difference have been conceived of as “disability.” We call for a more nuanced understanding of a multiplicity of identities-both minority and majoritarian-so that critics can examine the interplay of exclusion and privilege that situate individuals in complex and often contradictory ways. (p. 8)

Gallagher, Conner, and Ferri (2014) point to the longstanding problem of overrepresentation of students of colour in special education as evidence of the intersectionality of race and disability. They also remind us that in addition to race we must also consider the ways that gender, social class, and sexuality intersect with disability. Teacher candidates should be prepared to challenge these intertwined structures of inequality. Liasidou (2013) points out that relying on universal design is not enough to ensure inclusive classrooms because, “exclusion on the basis of disability is a multifaceted and complex phenomenon that needs to be tackled in politically informed ways that are not restricted to instructional interventions and

modifications” (p. 305). The impact of intersections of race, ethnicity, gender, and class must also be explored. This type of analysis can serve to highlight the issues of power and domination embedded in the process of identifying and labeling students as having disabilities.

Lived Experience of Disability. Another avenue to transformed consciousness involves developing an understanding of the lived experiences of adults with disabilities as well as those of children with disabilities. Historically, researchers and practitioners making proclamations about disability have done so from a position that is removed from the lived experience of disability. Special education has maintained its ‘expert’ status by positioning disabled people as the embodiment of deviance, deficiency, and otherness. Alternatively, grounding counter-narratives in lived experience that, “account for multiple subject positions” (Ferri, 2008, p. 506) can challenge oppressive ideologies of racism and ableism (Ferri, 2008).

Interdisciplinarity allows for these counter-narratives to be represented in multiple ways. Ware (2006a) advocates for the use of humanities-based disability studies literature to incorporate these lived experiences into teacher education courses. She goes on to say that including lectures, films, and performances can enhance this understanding as well.

Adults. As Ware (2006b) points out, “rewriting the inherited scripts on disability in schools must be informed by the writings of disabled people...” (p. 154). Micheline Mason writes from that perspective. She was born in England in 1950. When she was four days old she was diagnosed with Osteogenesis Imperfecta, or Brittle Bones, and was immediately christened in preparation of what was assumed to be her imminent death. More than 60 years later she is a writer, artist and disability activist (Mason, 2005). Mason (2005) describes her book, *Incurably Human* as,

an attempt to take the reader on my journey of discovery, starting from my childhood certainty that I was already fully human, and therefore not in need of a “cure”, to a much later understanding that all human beings are “incurable” at our core, and that the

inclusion movement is this inextinguishable flame made visible. (p. 9)

As an example of a counter-narrative that challenges traditional medical model thinking while also highlighting the need to consider the intersection of multiple sources of oppression, Ferri (2008) refers to *Weights*, “an autobiographical solo performance of poetry and spoken word”, in which Lynn Manning, “recounts his experience of acquiring a disability after being shot in a bar at 23 years of age” (p. 500). His story is situated at the intersection of race, gender, and disability where, “as a black man he is reviled, while as a blind man he is patronized and pitied” (p.503).

Standing in contrast to traditional narratives of either ‘overcoming’ or ‘curing’ disability, Manning explains that after losing his sight as a result of the shooting his priority is learning how to live as a blind man. The ‘normals’ around him expect him to go through prescribed steps in a grieving process and when he counters their expectations with almost immediate acceptance he then has to spend time helping these same ‘normals’ come to terms with his acceptance. Manning is expected to defer to the expertise of the clinicians surrounding him. He wants to be a writer, but the rehabilitation counsellor explains that, “in vocational rehabilitation, they discourage careers in the arts and would want him to focus on a more practical vocation, such as selling peanuts or other snacks” (Ferri, 2008, p. 501). It does not seem to occur to her to give Manning, “authority over his own experience.” (Ferri, 2008, p. 501)

Providing opportunities for teacher candidates to bear witness to the lived experiences of adults with disabilities is intended to challenge them to rethink the medical model of disability embedded in special education. However, adult voices are not the only ones that need to be heard.

Children. The voices of students themselves are often missing from the conversation. Solis and Connor (2006) tell us that,

The goals of students with disabilities in school are often spelled out for them by

teachers and/or parents in their Individual Educational Plans (IEPs). Goals are clinical in nature, quantifiable in terms of evidence, and, ultimately appear to primarily serve the function of accountability in institution rather than work for real 'live' students. (p. 109)

DSE challenges us to draw attention to the voices of students with disabilities. Student voices offer disabilities studies scholars and teacher candidates opportunities for critical self-reflection as well as for reflection on the contributions of disability studies as a whole (Peters, 2010).

This is illustrated by Peters' (2010) experience with a group of high school students identified as 'learning disabled'. She asked them the question, 'How does it feel to be a problem?' This question was used to explore the ways in which the students in this particular special education class experienced social segregation and low academic expectations over the course of their schooling. The students shared the names they had been called: 'retarded', 'backward', and 'idiot'. One student expressed the injustice this way,

There are some people
That just beat you any kind of way,
No matter who you are
Or what classes you are in.
There are those who think that they're better than you
And those who treat you special
And those who think
You can't do anything right. (p. 594)

Ultimately, the experience of listening to these student voices prompted Peters (2010) to change the question. It was no longer, "How does it feel to be a problem?", but 'How does it feel to recognize that school is the problem?' and 'Am I a part of the problem?' (p. 597). DSE asks teacher candidates to recognize the problem and find ways to be part of the solution.

Courses in Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and Their Impact

For teacher candidates to have these opportunities for reflection we must consider embedding the components of DSE into teacher education courses even, and perhaps

especially, when these ideas cause discomfort. Ferri (2008) points out that teacher candidates are not always open to counter-narratives about disability. They might, “understand racism, sexism, and homophobia as forms of social inequity infused with power, but nonetheless continue to see disability as personal problem or tragedy” (p. 500). DSE provides an avenue for raising teacher candidates’ consciousness about disability. This section highlights a few examples of courses that operate from a disabilities studies perspective. These examples include pre-service and graduate level courses offered primarily in the American context, however, the last example is from Ontario. Each offers ideas worthy of consideration for all Ontario teacher education programs.

In the edited text, *Vital Questions Facing Disability Studies in Education* (2006), two of the contributors discuss the impact of teaching disability studies courses to education students. Ware (2006a) discusses her experiences with two graduate courses, and Ferri (2006) references courses taught in a pre-service program.

Ware (2006a) describes conversations among students in two courses that include humanities scholarship, educational and curriculum theorists, insider accounts, fiction and other media. The first course is *Severe Disabilities*, a fifteen-week course open to both elementary and secondary educators in the Inclusion Masters Program. The second course is *Issues for Secondary Teachers: Special Education, Second Language Acquisition and Literacy*. This is a mandatory graduate course for secondary general educators in the Education Masters Program. Each topic is covered in its own five-week component. Students in these courses became conscious of hidden assumptions about disability, and they began to realize that disability issues extend beyond schooling. An assignment that required students to define ‘severe disability’ encouraged students to recognize the ways in which disability categories are socially constructed. Recalling personal experiences with disability enabled students to consider the language used to describe students in their individual education plans (IEPs) with a more critical

gaze. Many students also felt compelled to translate their new understandings into action.

Ferri (2006) embeds disability studies into a number of different courses. She structures these courses around three interrelated goals. First, she seeks to trouble identity categories and expose the interconnectedness of issues of disability, race, class, gender, and sexuality. Second, in an attempt to broaden students' ideas about sources of disability expertise she uses autobiography, narrative and fiction. The third goal is to disrupt students' assumptions about disability by increasing awareness of the constructed nature of ability and disability categories. Her courses begin with activities aimed at curriculum transformation. These activities expose students to new ways of thinking about disability across the curriculum. Another assignment requires students to recall their earliest memory of disability. This assignment often raises questions about definitions of disability and leads to conversations about changes in disability categories over time.

Such destabilizing moves in the classroom can be troubling to students and teachers alike. I find that when students take a disability-related class they are seeking what they describe as "practical knowledge" about what to do in the classroom – they do not typically expect it to be a "political" class. (Ferri, 2006, p. 299)

In *Worlds Remade: Inclusion through Engagement with Disability Art*, Ware (2008) shares her experience teaching Curriculum 320, a required course for pre-service teachers majoring in childhood special education. This course takes an interdisciplinary approach to exploring disability by invoking history and the arts to challenge teacher candidates' understandings of disability. Ware (2008) points out that, "as these pre-service students begin to explore their own narrow constructions of disability, it then becomes important to stress the impact of historical influences on the attitudes educators possess" (p. 578).

To that end, Ware (2008) screens the 2004 short documentary film *Disability Takes on the Arts* for her students. The film utilizes the arts to provide a retrospective historical viewpoint

that explains the historical gaze. It includes portrayals of disability in freak shows and medical training texts as well as the work of a number of popular visual artists. It also provides exposure to contemporary disabled artists, comedians, and dancers prompting, “us to re-imagine a world *enriched* [emphasis in original] by disability experience rather than by the spectacle of disability” (p. 580). Given the often jarring impact of the film, Ware (2008) supports the viewing with readings grounded in disability studies along with class discussions. Despite some students describing the film as ‘too confrontational’, or perhaps because of it, the film is an essential component of the course. After all, “many educators would be hard pressed to imagine these lives were they restricted to knowing disability exclusively through the lens of the medical model and special education” (p. 580).

Although some students complete the course not having shifted from a medical model of disability, “most declare radically different beliefs about disability” (Ware, 2008, p. 580). These new understandings, “prompt many students to recognize that indeed, they can remake the communities in which they teach” (Ware, 2008, p. 580).

Connor (2015) also advocates for adopting a disability studies framework in pre-service teacher education. The course he teaches is meant to stand in opposition to typical deficit-based, disability of the week courses that focus mainly on laws and regulations. He describes his experience teaching a pre-service inclusion course called *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in General Education Classrooms* and its impact on teacher candidates. He explains that,

...framing disability using DS/DSE theory within what is largely a traditional special education program serves to challenge and inform students’ rethinking of instructional planning, delivery, and assessment of diverse learners; managing classrooms; selecting responsible curricula, and; engaging with universal design for learning (UDL). (p. 123)

The introduction to the course lets teacher candidates know that their values and beliefs about disability will be engaged and challenged. Throughout the course they will consider disability not just in school, but in society as well since, “the former is actually a microcosm of the latter” (p. 127).

Although Connor (2008) recognizes the importance of good instructional practices, he argues that, “without the theoretical grounding of DS/DSE, practices appear to be understood on a very superficial level - as if ‘what works’ is largely free of theory and ideology” (p. 136). Because of this, the course begins with the theoretical foundations of DS/DSE prior to the ‘how to’ of inclusion. These foundations include,

Topics such as: who is speaking for whom?; ableism throughout society and within schools; the social model of disability, and how it differs from the medical model; the construction of ab/normalcy throughout history and in contemporary times; disability stereotypes proliferated by the media; and, always, implications for educators and education. (p. 128)

The remaining two-thirds of the course focuses on a variety of inclusive practices. These include creating positive classroom environments that recognize disability as an ordinary and expected part of human diversity, responding to diverse needs, differentiating instruction and assessment, and collaborating with colleagues and parents.

The benefits of this type of course emphasize, “shifting the education of students with disabilities from deficit-based perspectives that continue to undergird special education’s adherence to scientism and redirects them toward the social and moral dimensions of viewing inclusion primarily as a civil right that celebrates disability as a natural part of human differences” (Connor, 2015, p. 137).

The final example is an inclusive education course taught at York University in Toronto. Although Killoran, Woronko, & Zaretsky (2014) do not refer specifically to disability studies in

their description, the course includes many elements of DSE. It is grounded in a rights-based approach that recognizes the importance of teacher candidates adopting a social justice lens when considering inclusion. To support this, teacher candidates are introduced to models of disability and they also examine bias and disability stereotypes in schools and the society in which those schools are situated. Lived experiences of disabled people are shared through, “real-life stories, case studies, and guest speakers” (p. 429). The course also explores disproportionate representation of minority students in special education through the intersection of disability, poverty, and race.

Practical aspects of inclusion are discussed as well. Universal design and differentiated instruction are introduced and collaboration with parents, teachers, paraprofessionals, and peers is emphasized. Additionally, teacher candidates are encouraged to recognize their own skills to help them challenge the notion that, “special education teachers are privy to a wealth of teaching strategies foreign to general education teachers” (Killoran, et al., 2014, p. 429).

Ultimately this course is designed to promote positive attitudes and shared responsibility towards inclusion as a foundation for the creation of equitable learning environments. To determine how effectively this goal was being met, teacher candidates completed a questionnaire about their attitudes on the first day of class and then again at the end of the course. Five areas were examined for a shift in attitude. They were: “(a) general attitude about educator’s perceived ability to include; (b) attitude towards behaviour of children with disabilities; (c) attitude towards children with disabilities; (d) attitude towards the social and emotional development of children with disabilities; and (e) overall attitude about inclusion” (pp.432-433). Killoran et al. (2014) found that course participants demonstrated considerable positive shifts in their thinking. Shifting attitudes during pre-service teacher education is particularly significant because any negative opinions that teacher candidates may hold have not yet become, “solidified and more resistant to change” (p. 437).

Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and School and Classroom Realities

When providing teacher candidates with a disabilities studies approach, there is a need to acknowledge that when they begin their teaching careers they may find themselves struggling with the disconnect between a rights-based approach to disability, and schools that address disability within a special education approach based on a medical model. Sousa, Mitka, and Colucci-Gray (2010) highlight the need to prepare new teachers for the challenges they may face when attempting to put this new learning into practice. Without this preparation new teachers may find themselves absorbed into the school culture without any strategies for challenging the status quo.

Broderick, Reid, and Valle (2006) acknowledge this challenge and share some of the ways that teachers employ a DSE perspective in schools that continue to implement traditional special education practices. A high school teacher coach explains that, “in schools, I always discuss the theme of disability with teachers when they plan to teach novels, plays, films - seeing it as a lens, a perspective (along with other possible readings/lenses, like race and class)” (p. 148). Despite this, he goes on to say that when disability awareness is attempted, “the best teachers inadvertently slide into simulations that become trite...the entire SOCIAL positioning is not examined in such activities, and this makes me frustrated” (p. 148).

Another high school teacher explains that,

I can't (yet) seem to create the type of DS education I envision within the settings that I have to work with....At times, it's too draining to constantly engage in the debates that surround the conflict of DS with school ideology and the power struggles over whether or not my ideas can be enacted in the inclusive classroom... (p. 154)

Although these teachers express, “how difficult and painful/ isolating/ exhausting/ draining/ discouraging/ disheartening resistance can be” (p. 157), this resistance is central to effecting change. Different teachers have reported diverse forms of resistance for different contexts

resulting in reports that they have achieved, “*some* [emphasis in original] modicum of satisfaction, seen *some* [emphasis in original] progress” (p. 158). Ultimately, “knowing others are struggling too, we may find that small gains may be just enough to keep us going” (p. 158).

New Possibilities

DSE opens up a space to consider inclusive education from a new perspective. Applied to teacher education, it recognizes that teacher candidates may not have thought much about disability and if they have, most likely it has been from a medical model perspective. They may be worrying about how to manage ‘difficult behaviour’ in the classroom without any awareness of the theoretical position this type of concern signifies. DSE challenges teacher candidates to think about disability beyond the label and beyond the walls of the classroom or school because, “the classroom should mirror the kind of society in which we want our students to live and lead” (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010, p.29).

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Infusing a disabilities studies approach into teacher education programs in Ontario would create a space for having potentially difficult conversations about disability and inclusion in our schools and in our communities beyond school walls. Hearing the voices of those with disabilities can provide a powerful jumping off point, and engaging in discussions anchored in deep reflection is critical, however, the ultimate goal is action that leads to change for the students in our classrooms.

History from Below and Lived Experience

My focus on the intersecting histories of special education and teacher education is not just about making an argument for the need for a disability studies approach to teacher education; it also aligns with DSE's support of interdisciplinarity and provides a starting point for challenging our understanding of disability within such an approach. This interdisciplinary approach is important because, "when unexamined attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions about disability are challenged, multiple perspectives prove more useful than any one field's perspective (Ware, 2009, p. 399). History provides a powerful starting place for examining societal conceptions of disability. Although we can only, as Stiker (1999) points out, "try to understand (where possible) how these different persons were situated and, when asked, say what seem to be the consequences for me, for us, in our very limited present world" (p. 14), recognizing that our understandings have changed over time allows us to recognize that they can continue to evolve.

In addition to exposing teacher candidates to disability history from above, providing opportunities to explore history from below as well may provide a fuller picture of the history of disability in Ontario's education system.

History from below is essentially the study of the non-elite; the exploited classes in a social order, the forgotten voices of the anonymous men and women ignored by the

official histories, and thus a critique of dominant and elite versions of the past. However, rather than the passive 'of below', we have the active 'from below' which denotes that history is being *made* by these people rather than merely being *done to them*. Making is thus the history of self-organisation and resistance in the face of oppression, dispossession and poverty. (History is the New Punk, n.d.)

And Neither Have I Wings to Fly: Labelled and Locked Up in Canada's Oldest Institution by Thelma Wheatley (2013) does an excellent job of juxtaposing the perspectives of the elite with the lived experience of one family directly impacted by their decisions. Wheatley (2013) alternates between telling the story of Daisy Lumsden and her experience as a resident at the Orillia institution initially called the *Ontario Asylum for Idiots* with the elites in Toronto who supported the institution and the processes by which children became its residents. Among others, these elites include Dr. Helen MacMurchy, Inspector for the Feeble-Minded of the Province of Ontario; and Dr. C. K. Clarke, former Superintendent of the Toronto Hospital for the Insane. Wheatley (2013) was inspired to write Daisy's story because Daisy wanted to know what her records would reveal. "She wanted to know whether they had written about the rapes and the tortures that took place on the wards" (p. 2). Daisy's story is an example of history 'from below'.

Understanding the lived experience of people with disabilities past and present helps us understand why our education system needs to change. Talking about inclusion while still offering a range of special education placements sends a contradictory message to new and practicing teachers. Whether consciously or not, teachers end up asking themselves why they need to find out how to meet the learning needs of all their students if there is somewhere outside of their classroom for students with disabilities to be sent for at least part of their day. Classroom teachers also tend to assume that the special education teachers who offer these programs have a distinct skill set that they do not possess. On the other hand, understanding

the eugenic thinking that is tied to the development of special education and the impact that had on students and families may lead teachers to wonder why separate classrooms still exist.

History from below, whether it is shared through literature, art, or traditional historical texts can provide an avenue for the consciousness raising that is required to make change possible.

Moving Towards Inclusion

“We have come a long way towards realizing our vision of equity and inclusive education in Ontario schools. However, realizing that vision must be understood as a journey, not a destination” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014, p. 5). The Ontario Ministry of Education recognizes the importance of inclusive education and over time there have been positive changes in that direction, however, we still have a long way to go. Resistance to unpacking the medical model thinking that underpins our approach to educating students with disabilities continues to be a barrier to meeting this goal.

Pedagogical Practices. In 2005 the Ministry of Education released *Education For All: The Report of the Expert Panel on Literacy and Numeracy Instruction for Students with Special Education Needs, Kindergarten to Grade 6*. One of the guiding principles of this document is, “classroom teachers are the key educators for a student’s literacy and numeracy development” (Ontario, 2005, p. 4). The expert panel clearly acknowledges the critical role of the classroom teacher as well as the importance of understanding inclusion as program and not just placement. The expert panel argues that regular classroom teachers should be skilled at meeting the learning needs of all students because, “most students with special needs spend at least 50 per cent of their instructional day in a regular classroom, being taught by regular classroom teachers”. What they do not specifically acknowledge is the amount of time students with disabilities are still spending in segregated settings.

Learning for All: A Guide to Effective Assessment and Instruction for All Students, Kindergarten to Grade 12 was released in draft form in 2011 and in its final version in 2013. It

incorporates the guiding principles of *Education for All* and,

outlines an integrated process of assessment and instruction designed to improve student learning at both the elementary and secondary levels. Educators from Kindergarten through Grade 12 can use this process to help plan and deliver instruction that benefits all students, from high achievers to those who need additional support and those who have special education programs that include alternative learning expectations or alternative courses. (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 7)

Both of these documents are examples of educator resources filled with valuable information about teaching approaches and strategies. These approaches and strategies support learning for all students, however, students with identified special education needs often spend at least part of their instructional day in settings outside the regular classroom. So even though, “recent Ministry documents have voiced the intention of moving towards inclusive and more equitable education, the reality is we have two clearly delineated streams, general and special education” (Killoran et al., 2013, p. 242).

Although recent Ministry documents support inclusive practices, school boards are operating under legislation that requires schools to offer a variety of special education placements. The education act directs the Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC) to consider, “whether placement in a regular class, with appropriate special education services, would meet the pupil’s needs; and is consistent with parental preferences” (O. Reg. 181/98, s. 17 [1]) prior to placing a student in a special education class, however, in my experience, special education classes are frequently chosen first. Although this choice is often a reflection of concerns that students’ needs will not be met in the regular classroom, as long as these alternative placements are readily available classroom teachers are released from their responsibility to learn how to meet all students needs.

This stands in contrast to teachers who welcome all students into their classrooms and implement supportive instructional strategies (i.e., universal design, differentiated instruction). These teachers make instructional decisions based on their foundational beliefs in inclusive education. They may use pedagogical documentation as a process for understanding and assessing student learning.

Because pedagogical documentation is intended to uncover the student's thinking and learning processes, it has the potential to help us look at learning in new ways, to assess flexibly with particular needs in mind and to individualize and differentiate our response.

(Ontario Ministry of Education, 2015, p. 1)

Pedagogical documentation supports teachers in keeping each child at the centre of responsive decision making. The information gathered helps teachers choose from a variety of instructional groupings (whole class, small group, or individual) depending on the goals of particular learning experiences for particular students.

These teachers understand that students can be engaged in a learning experience together while working on separate goals. In *Visible Learners: Promoting Reggio-Inspired Approaches in all Schools* (Krechevsky, Mardell, Rivard, & Wilson, 2013), there is a description of an English teacher and a Science teacher working together to, “facilitate a year-long interdisciplinary inquiry into a local natural habitat to advance the writing skills, scientific reasoning, and citizenship of their middle school students” (p. 13). The interdisciplinary nature of a project like this allows for multiple entry points and the ability to focus on different goals for different students.

Another key factor in the continuation of general and special education as separate streams is the structure of additional qualifications courses. Although there have been some changes to the content of the special education additional qualifications courses they are still designed to align with the same legislation under which school boards operate. And, as optional

courses for certified teachers, there is content that some teachers are missing out on entirely. If, as the ministry has outlined, classroom teachers are 'key educators' for all students then all teachers should be provided with the opportunity to develop the necessary attitudes, knowledge, and skills to support them.

Teacher Education. As educational practices have evolved, so too has teacher education. As it moved from Normal Schools to Teachers' Colleges and then to faculties of education its structures and foci have shifted. Its most recent iteration is the two-year program that was instituted in 2015. In addition to the increased length of the program in terms of both class time and practice teaching, there is also a,

- i. greater focus on students' mental health and well-being, parent engagement and communication, and special education among other core elements
- ii. greater attention to diversity in Ontario classrooms and knowledge of the Ontario context, and
- iii. greater understanding of how to use technology in teaching. (Ontario College of Teachers, 2016b)

In the context of my research, it is heartening to see the addition of special education as a required element of the program. At the same time, this is not accompanied by any direction or discussion about how this should be approached. The continuing challenge is to move from a medical model, 'disability of the week' approach, to one that is grounded in a disability studies approach which challenges these traditional, often harmful, constructions of disability.

Because of the historical nature of my research I have focused on the four faculties in the province with histories tracing back to the first four normal schools. I recognize that this narrow focus is a limitation of this work. Going forward, important information could be garnered from investigating current practice at all of Ontario's faculties of education.

Disability studies in education (DSE). Despite the lack of direction, there is some

evidence of a disability studies approach being taken in teacher education courses. One example is the 36-hour Inclusive Education course offered in the Faculty of Education at York University (Killoran, Woronko, & Zaretsky, 2014) as described in chapter 6. However, In some cases these courses seem to be temporary and/or localized based on the professor assigned to teach it. An example of this was found at one of the four focus faculties. In the 2013-2014 school year Western University offered a course entitled *Critical Disability Studies in Education* which it described as,

An introduction to the field of Critical Disability Studies in Education [CDSE] which challenges medicalizing and individualizing ways of understanding disability. Teacher candidates will examine disability issues in classroom practices, educational spaces, and society, and consider the place of disability-related issues in curriculum. (University of Western Ontario, 2013-2014)

This course was offered as a special topic and it was taught by a doctoral student. It is no longer included in the course catalogue and I surmise that it was removed because the instructor is no longer available to teach it.

I have described examples from within Ontario and from a number of jurisdictions in the United States as well. DSE is a relatively new offshoot of the interdisciplinary field of inquiry known as Disability Studies. Having only recently been formalized with the establishment of the Disability Studies in Education special interest group (DSE-SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in 2000 (Connor et al., 2008) may explain its lack of consistent presence (if present at all) in teacher education programs.

However, with Ontario's new two year teacher education program mandating the inclusion of a special education course, this is a critical time to explore what this course should look like and what its impact might be. The tendency for programs to take existing elective 'disability of the week' courses and make them mandatory may meet the new requirements but

it results in a missed opportunity to challenge thinking about disability and provide teacher candidates with a foundation for making positive changes for the students in their future classrooms. The requirement to include a special education course in the two year teacher education program is an excellent opportunity to include a course which focuses on disability studies in education and views disability through an equity lens. As outlined in chapter 6, there are a few courses like this in both pre-service and graduate programs and they provide a great starting place for developing courses in programs where they do not currently exist.

DSE challenges us to view inclusion as a moral and political issue as well as a pedagogical one. Utilizing DSE in teacher education challenges beliefs and attitudes by using an interdisciplinary approach to foreground the voices of people with disabilities and acknowledge intersectionality of identity. It invites us to consider disability as a category of oppression alongside race, class, and gender. It asks us to dig deeper than inclusive instructional strategies to explore the reasons why inclusion matters.

Impact of Disability Studies in Education

There are many positive ways that a disability studies approach to teacher education can impact teacher practice. To ensure that these practices can be sustained new teachers must be prepared for the challenges they may face as they put inclusive practices into action in a school that may not currently operate that way. Teacher education programs that develop teachers who are passionate about inclusion will also prepare teachers to work collaboratively with students, parents, and colleagues to surmount any challenges they may face.

Cognitive dissonance. DSE involves providing teacher candidates with the why and the how of inclusion. Sinek (2009) explains that, “if you don’t know WHY, you can’t know HOW” (p. 70). Technical skills are important but teachers need a reason to employ them. Starting with a focus on the why is a critical foundation upon which the strategies and approaches can sit. DSE offers teacher candidates avenues to challenge ministry requirements and structures that

still reflect medical model thinking. Once teacher candidates begin their teaching careers they may find a disconnect between a disability studies approach and medical model practices in place in schools. One aspect of DSE is readying teacher candidates to face this challenge. Discussions about possible strategies for changing practice should be had to enable new teachers to push back. Keeping in mind that the motivation to push back comes from the foundational understanding of why it matters. Pushing back can take a variety of forms. Advocacy cards were developed by a teacher in my school board to help her students understand their own learning needs and to support them in communicating those needs to all their teachers. Through word of mouth the idea of advocacy cards spread to other schools and now information about developing these cards is available to all teachers through the school board's website. Inclusive extra-curricular activities are another possibility. This could take a variety of forms but one possibility is PlayFair Teams. This is a program in which students with and without disabilities work together to inform communities about disabilities. "It is aimed at disability, social justice, and inclusion" (Bunch, Valeo, & Pearpoint, 2006).

Donohoo (2013) challenges educators to consider their realm of control vs. their sphere of influence. In guiding educators through a collaborative inquiry process, she asks educators to think about their concerns about student learning needs so that all concerns are acknowledged and then focus in on the concerns over which they have direct influence. I believe that this process could be used very effectively with teacher candidates. They may have to work within the parameters of ministry requirements and structures but there are still many aspects of their practice that they have control over. By narrowing in on those aspects, teacher candidates may increase their feelings of efficacy when they get into the classroom. One example that comes to mind is the often misconstrued relationship between program and placement. In my experience, teachers often believe that if a student requires a modified program in language or math that the program must be offered in a segregated setting. This, however, is not the case. If teacher

candidates understand this then they can advocate for keeping students in the regular classroom regardless of the program that the student requires. Having the confidence to work with all students, they will be more likely and willing to advocate for these placements

Collaboration. It is also important for teacher candidates to understand that including students with disabilities in their classrooms does not mean that they have to work in isolation to meet the needs of all their students. Honouring the voices of students, parents, and colleagues is at the centre of inclusive education.

Students. Student voice provides, “an interstice for re-examining some central tenets in the sociology of disability and education” (Peters, 2010, p. 592). Peters (2010) explains that student voice provides a counterpoint to medical model thinking and allows us to re-examine disability identity from the perspective of resistance and resilience. Teachers who embrace a disability studies perspective in their teaching are able to support students in becoming self-advocates. These teachers also recognize the importance of engaging all students in conversations about disability.

Ware (2009) worked with a language arts teacher to introduce a unit on disability to his inclusive high school creative writing class. This provided an opportunity for all students to consider their understanding of and experience with disability. It also left the teacher wondering why his students had never written about disability before. Ware (2009) explained that,

...although conversations about disability occur in schools every day, for the most part they are restricted to procedural issues of identification, referral, and placement in special education, or they focus on related problems of staffing, curriculum, and inappropriate student and parent behaviour. This discourse of containment and control has failed to consider disability through a cultural lens and what it might mean to live with a disability over a lifetime. (2009, p. 410)

Inviting *all* students into conversations about disability opens up opportunities for transforming

education for everyone.

Parents. In addition to recognizing the importance of student voice, DSE also emphasizes the importance of rethinking the role of parents in their children's education. Acknowledging parents as experts changes the power dynamic between families and schools. Sauer and Kasa (2012) found that providing teacher candidates with the opportunity to interview parents of children with disabilities led them to realize that working with parents as partners is a key component of successful inclusion.

Colleagues. The ministry advocates for a collaborative approach in which classroom teachers and special education teachers work together to support students. The board in which I work advocates for this as well. Unfortunately, when special education teachers are spending the majority of their time providing pull out programs there is very little time for them to work collaboratively with their regular education counterparts to support them in providing inclusive programs. If classroom teachers advocated for providing programming for all their students in the regular classroom then perhaps special education teachers would have the time to work with them in their classrooms to support that goal.

This might also lead to reconsidering how some current structures can be used to support inclusion. In *Learning for All* (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013), it is explained that,

The planning of assessment and instruction for students who need additional support is an integrated and often collaborative process. It begins with the teacher in the classroom, and it is supported as needed by the in-school team(s). When chosen teaching strategies have been applied for an adequate period of time, their effectiveness is reviewed, in collaboration with members of the in-school team, who may provide further advice and recommendations. (p. 43)

Often, despite best intentions to the contrary, the focus of these meetings is on the additional assessments needed (e.g., psycho-educational, language) in order to identify a student and

have him/her placed in a setting outside of the regular classroom. With a DSE approach embedded in teacher education programs perhaps classroom teachers would be more comfortable explaining that they are coming to these meetings to get support with strategies that they can use in their classrooms. Or perhaps, classroom teachers would at least feel more comfortable in these meetings altogether. Informal conversations that I have had with classroom teachers have led me to understand that often classroom teachers find these meetings very intimidating. When the team is large and includes a number of professionals it can be very daunting for classroom teachers. A DSE approach can help classroom teachers recognize that they are part of a team and that it is okay not to have all the answers. And if the role of special education teachers can change to allow them to spend more time in regular classrooms supporting classroom teachers that may change the dynamic as well. To support special education teachers and classroom teachers working together successfully in this new paradigm teacher education programs should consider including strategies for collaboration.

Additionally, classroom teachers may also find themselves struggling to meet all their students' needs and by the time they get to the in-school team meeting they are feeling frustrated and less open to trying new strategies than they might have been. Opening up the lines of communication between classroom teachers, special education teachers and other professionals is important to ensure that the support of the team is readily available. Discussing the importance of collaboration and strategies for ensuring that it happens would better prepare new teachers to work with their colleagues. They also need to be prepared to have difficult conversations with colleagues who may still be entrenched in a medical model approach.

Another aspect of current special education practices that needs rethinking is the role of psycho-educational assessments performed by psychologists and language assessments conducted by speech-language pathologists. In our current medical model based system these assessments tend to be used to identify and label students as having special needs and then

determine 'appropriate' placement. Considering these assessments from a disability studies perspective might lead classroom teachers to seek out the information provided by the assessments in order to program more strategically for students in their classrooms and not as a means of removing students from the classroom. This approach would take us back to the intention of Binet, the developer of intelligence tests that they are meant to provide insight into a student's current intellectual functioning in order to support learning going forward.

One other area I would like to address is in-service opportunities. Too often these opportunities are offered separately to special education teachers and regular classroom teachers. When the topics relate to disability, these sessions tend to be offered only to special education teachers. This is often because the content is focused on the technical aspects of special education. In my board a few years ago we had the opportunity to develop and facilitate a full day of learning for school teams consisting of classroom teachers, special education teachers, and administrators. The learning focused on the implementation of IEP goals in the regular classroom. The sessions provided an opportunity to build collaborative teams to support the learning of students with disabilities in the regular classroom. It was very well received but unfortunately opportunities like this are all too rare. Teachers who are educated in a DSE approach may be more willing to advocate for (and perhaps facilitate) joint learning opportunities like this that embrace a DSE perspective.

Passionate teachers. Current special education practices involve a lot of bureaucracy that includes a lot of time-consuming paperwork. It is easy for teachers to feel overwhelmed with all the process pieces and lose sight of the moral purpose of education, however, "teaching is a values-led profession concerned, at its heart, with change, directly for the betterment of pupils but ultimately for the betterment of society as a whole" (Day, 2004, 18).

A DSE approach to teacher education is about igniting a passion for teaching that will raise consciousness about disability and inspire new teachers to work with students, parents,

and colleagues towards the creation of inclusive classrooms and inclusive schools.

Passionate teachers are aware of the challenge of the broader social contexts in which they teach, have a clear sense of identity and believe that they can make a difference to the learning and achievement of all their pupils. They care deeply about them. They like them. They care also about how and what they teach and are curious to learn more about both in order to become and remain more than merely competent. They are aware of the role played by emotion in classroom learning and teaching. They are committed to working co-operatively and, at times, collaboratively with colleagues in their own and other schools and seek and take opportunities to engage in reflection of different kinds in, on and about their practices. (Day, 2004, pp. 2-3)

Final Thoughts

Changing current practice in teacher education and by extension in our schools is a complex process. I believe that it begins with the WHY that Sinek (2009) quite simply defines as beliefs. While there are many practical elements to be resolved, if we believe that inclusion is a moral imperative then we will seek out the necessary strategies to make it work. Disability Studies in Education provides a framework for getting at the why and at the same time moving beyond the why to collaboratively determine the how. My purpose here is to challenge thinking, generate questions, and open up a conversation. Drawing on a number of sources, Allan (2010) describes the academic 'duty' of writing. She suggests that, rather than producing writing wherein, "the thinking is assumed to be complete before the article is written" (p. 613) we consider writing as a form of meditation that is intended to arouse and provoke thinking. My intention here is to write in a way that challenges thinking and ultimately leads to action. After all, "it is the translation of passion into action that embodies and integrates the personal and the professional, the mind and the emotion, that will make a difference in pupils' learning lives" (Day, 2004, p. 14).

References

- Allan, J. (2010). The sociology of disability and the struggle for inclusive education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(5), 603-619. doi:10.1080/01425692.2010.500093
- American Educational Research Association. (2016). Disability studies in education SIG 143. Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/SIG143/DisabilityStudiesinEducationSIG143/tabid/12121/Default.aspx>
- Anastasiou, D., & Kauffman, J. H. (2011). A social constructionist approach to disability: Implications for special education. *Exceptional Children*, 77(3), 367-384.
- Ankersmit, F. R. (2004). The ethics of history: From the double binds of (moral) meaning to experience. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 84-102.
- Archives of Ontario. (2012-2015a). *Ontario: Department of education*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved from [http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll?get&file=\[ARCHON\]search.htm](http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll?get&file=[ARCHON]search.htm)
- Archives of Ontario. (2012-2015b). *Ontario: Teacher education branch*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved from [http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll?get&file=\[ARCHON\]search.htm](http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll?get&file=[ARCHON]search.htm)
- Armstrong, F. (2007). Disability, education and social change in England since 1960. *History of Education*, 36(4/5), 551-568.
- Arondekar, A. (2005). Without a trace: Sexuality and the colonial archive. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 14(1/2), 10-27.
- Auxiliary Classes Do Effective Work for Backward Children. (1925, July 25). *The Globe*, p. 17. Retrieved from Proquest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail.

- Axelrod, P. (1997). *The promise of schooling: Education in Canada, 1800-1914*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Baglieri, S. (2008). 'I connected': Reflection and biography in teacher learning toward inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(5-6), 585-604.
doi:10.1080/13603110802377631
- Baglieri, S., Valle, J. W., Connor, D. J., & Gallagher, D. J. (2011). Disability studies in education: The need for a plurality of perspectives on disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32(4), 267-278. doi:10.1177/0741932510362200
- Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (2003). *Disability*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bartolome, L. I. (2009). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (61-83). New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, S., Dworet D., & Weber, K. (2008). *Special Education in Ontario Schools* (6th ed.). St. Davids, Ontario: Highland Press.
- Binet, A., & Simon, T. (1980). *The development of intelligence in children*. Nashville: Williams Printing Company.
- Blackwell, M. E. (1914). Auxiliary classes in public schools. *The Public Health Journal*, 6(12), 622-626.
- Bodkin, B. (2006). Additional qualifications: Barbara Bodkin on the continuing education of teachers. In J. Humphreys, & D. Martin, (Eds.). *Inspiring education, 1907-2007: Celebrating 100 years of studies in education at the University of Toronto* (p. 38). Toronto, ON: OISE/UT.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklin, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Brittain, H. L. (1916). Feeble-mindedness. *The Public Health Journal*, 7(12), 495-496.

- Broderick, A. A., Reid, D. K., & Valle, J. W. (2006). Disability studies and in education and the practical concerns of teachers. In Danforth, S., & Gabel, S. L. (Eds.). *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (133-160). New York: Peter Lang.
- Brown, I. (2010). *The boy in the moon*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Bunch, G., Valeo A., & Pearpoint, J. (2006). *Playfair teams: disability, social justice, inclusion*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.
- Carcraft, J. (2004). Implicit morality. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 31-42.
- Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. (n.d.). Definition of historical consciousness. Retrieved from <http://www.cshc.ubc.ca/about/>
- Clarke, E. K. (1920). *Mental Hygiene in the Public Schools*. Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Convention of the Ontario Education Association , Toronto.
- Clarke, E. K. (1923). Mental hygiene in Toronto Public Schools. *The Public Health Journal*, 14(3), 127-133.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Connor, D. J. (2015). Practicing what we teach: The benefits of using disability studies in an inclusion course. In D. J., Connor, J. W. Valle, & C. Hale (Eds.), *Practicing disability studies in education: Acting toward social change* (123-139). New York: Peter Lang.
- Connor, D. J., Gabel, S. L., Gallagher, D. J., & Morton, M. (2008). Disability studies and inclusive education - implications for theory, research, and practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(5-6), 441-457. doi:10.1080/13603110802377482
- Curtis, B. (1988). *Building the educational state: Canada West, 1836-1871*. London, Ontario: The Althouse Press.
- Danforth, S. (2008). John Dewey's contributions to an educational philosophy of intellectual disability. *Educational Theory*, 58(1), 45-62.

- Danforth, S., & Gabel, S. L. (2006). Introduction. In S. Danforth, & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp. 1-15). New York: Peter Lang.
- Day, C. (2004). *A passion for teaching*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- De Baets, A. (2004). A declaration of the responsibilities of present generations toward past generations. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 130-164.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Donohoo, J. (2013). *Collaborative inquiry for educators: A facilitator's guide to school improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.
- Dupuis, L. J. (1952). *A history of elementary teacher training in Ontario* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://www.ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/22382/1/EC56112.pdf>
- Ermarth, E. D. (2004). Ethics and method. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 61-83.
- Farrell, P. (2000). The impact of research on developments in inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(2), 153-162.
- Fay, B. (2004). Historians and ethics: A short introduction to the theme issue. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 1-2.
- Ferri, B. A. (2006). Teaching to trouble. In S. Danforth, & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp. 289-306). New York: Peter Lang.
- Ferri, B. A. (2008). Changing the script: Race and disability in Lynn Manning's *Weights*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(5-6), 497-509.
doi:10.1080/13603110802377524
- Fitch, E. F. (2002). Disability and inclusion: From labeling deviance to social valuing. *Educational Theory*, 52(4), 463-477).
- Fleming, W. G. (1971). *Supporting institutions and services* (Ontario's Educative Society, Vol. V.). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Florian, L., Young, K., & Rouse, M. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive and diverse

- educational environments: Studying curricular reform in an initial teacher education course. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(7), 709-722.
- Forlin, C. (2010). Reframing teacher education for inclusion. In C. Forlin (Ed.), *Teacher education for inclusion: Changing paradigms and innovative approaches* (pp. 3-12). London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *History of madness*. London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gallagher, D. J. (2006). The natural hierarchy undone: Disability studies' contributions to contemporary debates in education. In S. Danforth & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp. 63-75). New York: Peter Lang.
- Gallagher, D. J., Connor, D. J., & Ferri, B. A. (2014). Beyond the far too incessant schism: Special education and the social model of disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(11), 1120-1142. doi:10.1080/13603116.2013.875599
- Galton, F. (1865). Hereditary talent and character. *Macmillan's Magazine*, 12, 157-166, 318-327.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Galton, F. (1907). *Inquiries into human faculty and its development*. Retrieved from <http://www.mugu.com/galton/books/human-faculty/text/galton-1883-human-faculty-v4.pdf>
- Garland-Thomson, R., & Longmore, P. K. (2003). *Statement of Principles*. Retrieved from <http://dsq-sds.org/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope>
- Gidney, R. D. (1999). *From Hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gilderhus, M. T., (2003). *History and historians: A historiographical introduction* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Giroux, H. & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213-238.
- Goodley, D. (2011). *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage.
- Goodley, D. (2013). Dis/entangling critical disability studies. *Disability & Society*, 28(5), 631–644. doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.717884
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gokyigit, E. A. (1994). The reception of Francis Galton's "Hereditary Genius" in the Victorian periodical press. *Journal of the History of Biology*, 27(2), 215-240.
- Gorman, J. (2004). Historians and their duties. *History and Theory*, 43(4), 103-117.
- Griffith, A., & Smith, D. E. (2005). *Mothering for schooling*. New York: Routledge/Taylor-Francis.
- Historians and Ethics. (2004). *History and Theory*, 43(4), 1-178.
- History is the New Punk*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://radical.history-from-below.net/about/>
- History of the Ontario College of Teachers* (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.oct.ca/about-the-college/what-we-do/college-history>
- Houston, S. E., & Prentice, A. (1988). *Schooling and scholars in nineteenth-century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Inclusive Education Canada. (n.d.). What is IE? Retrieved from <https://inclusiveeducation.ca/about/what-is-ie/>
- James, J. C., & Wu, C. (2006). Race, ethnicity, disability, and literature: Intersections and interventions. *MELUS*, 31(3), 3-13. doi:10.1093/melus/31.3.3
- Johnson, F. H. (1971). The first Canadian journal of education: An historical review. *McGill Journal of Education*, 6(2), 170-176.
- Jones, M. (2011). Inclusion, social inclusion and participation. In M. H. Rioux, L. A. Basser, & M. Jones (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on human rights and disability law* (pp. 57-82). Leiden, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

- Jordan, A., Schwartz, E., & McGhie-Richmond, D. (2009). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 535-542.
- Killoran, I., Woronko, D., & Zaretsky, H. (2013). Exploring preservice teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. *International Journal of Education, 18*(4), 427-442.
doi:10.1080/13603116.2013.784367
- Killoran, I., Zaretsky, H., Jordan, A., Smith, D., Allard, C., & Moloney, J. (2013). Supporting teachers to work with children with exceptionalities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*(1), 240-270. Retrieved from <http://ojs.vre.upei.ca/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/1461/1471>
- Kirby, S. L., Greaves, L. & Reid, C. (2010). *Experience research social change: Methods beyond the mainstream* (2nd ed.). North York, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Waitoller, F. R. (2010). Teacher learning for inclusive education: understanding teaching as a cultural and political practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(7), 655-666.
- Krechevsky, M., Mardell, B., Rivard, M., & Wilson, D. (2013). *Visible learners: Promoting Reggio-inspired approaches in all schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lalvani, P., & Polvere, L. (2103). Historical perspectives on studying families of children with disabilities: A case for critical research. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 33*(3). Retrieved from <http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3209/3291>
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Liasidou, A. (2013). Intersectional understandings of disability and implications for a social justice reform agenda in education policy and practice. *Disability & Society, 28*(3), 299-312.

- Linton, S. (2010). Reassigning meaning. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (3rd ed.), (pp.223-236). New York: Routledge.
- Loreman, T., Deppeler, J., & Harvey, D. (2005). *Inclusive education: A practical guide to supporting diversity in the classroom*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- MacMurchy, H. (1915). *Organization and management of auxiliary classes*. Ontario: L. K. Cameron.
- Marshall, D. E. (1990). *The education of exceptional children in the public schools of Ontario: A historical analysis, 1910-1982* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto: Toronto.
- Marx, U., Schwarz, G., Schwarz, M. & Wizisla, E. (Eds). (2007). *Walter Benjamin's archive*. London: Verso.
- Mason, M. (2005). *Incurably human*. UK: Inclusive Solutions.
- McCulloch, G. (2011). Historical and documentary research in education. In L. Cohen, L. Manion & K. Morrison, *Research methods in education* (pp. 248 -255). London: Routledge.
- McCulloch, G. & Richardson, W. (2000). *Historical research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McGhie, B. T. (1937). The problem of the subnormal in the community. *Canadian Public Health Journal*, 28(3), 105-111.
- Mckenzie, J. A., & Macleod, C. I. (2012). The deployment of the medico-psychological gaze and disability expertise in relation to children with intellectual disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(10), 1083-1098. doi:10.1080/13603116.2010.540042
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (61-83). New York: Routledge.

- McLean, M. (2008). Teaching about disability: An ethical responsibility? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(5-6), 605-619.
- Meekosha, H., & Shuttleworth, R. (2009). What's so 'critical' about critical disability studies? *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, 15(1), 47-75.
- Milewski, P. (2010). The scientisation of schooling in Ontario, 1910-1934. *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 46(3), 341-355.
- Millar, L. (1998). Discharging our debt: The evolution of the total archives concept in English Canada. *Archivaria*, 46, 103-146.
- Mutua, K. and Smith, R. M. (2006). Disrupting normalcy and the practical concerns of classroom teachers. In S. Danforth, & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp.121-132). New York: Peter Lang.
- Newman, S. (2005). The archival traces of desire: Vernon Lee's failed sexuality and the interpretation of letters in lesbian history. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 14(1/2), 51-75.
- Nipissing University. (2002-2003). Bachelor of education degree. Retrieved from <http://www.nipissingu.ca/departments/admissions-registrar/Documents/nuAcademicCalendar2002-2003.pdf>
- Nipissing University. (2013-2014). Academic calendar. Retrieved from <http://www.nipissingu.ca/departments/admissions-registrar/Documents/nuAcademicCalendar2013-2014.pdf>
- Nipissing University. (2015a). Bachelor of education: Concurrent. Retrieved from <http://academiccalendar.nipissingu.ca/~Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catalogid=2&topicgroupid=1030>

- Nipissing University. (2015b). Bachelor of education: Consecutive. Retrieved from
<http://academiccalendar.nipissingu.ca/~Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catalogid=2&topicgroupid=1029>
- Nipissing University. (2016a). Special education, part I. Retrieved from
<http://www.nipissingu.ca/calendar/Pages/Course.aspx?CourseName=EDUC-1235&back=%2facademics%2ffaculties%2fschulich-school-of-education%2fpd-for-teachers%2fcourses--programs%2fPages%2fGroup-4.aspx>
- Nipissing University. (2016b). Special education, part II. Retrieved from
<http://www.nipissingu.ca/calendar/Pages/Course.aspx?CourseName=EDUC-2235&back=%2facademics%2ffaculties%2fschulich-school-of-education%2fpd-for-teachers%2fcourses--programs%2fPages%2fGroup-4.aspx>
- Nipissing University. (2016c). Special education, specialist. Retrieved from
<http://www.nipissingu.ca/calendar/Pages/Course.aspx?CourseName=EDUC-3235&back=%2facademics%2ffaculties%2fschulich-school-of-education%2fpd-for-teachers%2fcourses--programs%2fPages%2fGroup-4.aspx>
- Nipissing University. (2016d). Teacher education in North Bay. Retrieved from
<http://www.nipissingu.ca/academics/faculties/schulich-school-of-education/about-the-schulich-school-of-education/Pages/Teacher-Education-in-North-Bay.aspx>
- Numbers in Attendance at Special Summer Courses. (1919, July 30). *The Globe*, p. 9.
 Retrieved from ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail.
- Ontario. (1966). *Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers*. Toronto: Ontario Dept. of Education.
- Ontario. (1968). *Living and learning: Report*. Toronto: Published for the Committee by the Newton Pub. Co.
- Ontario., & Hope, J. A. (1950). *Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario*.

Toronto: King's Printer.

Ontario College of Teachers. (2003a). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education part I. Retrieved from

[https://web.archive.org/web/20060720152939/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_\(part_1\)_e.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20060720152939/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_(part_1)_e.pdf)

Ontario College of Teachers. (2003b). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education part II. Retrieved from

[https://web.archive.org/web/20070130214122/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_\(part_2\)_e.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20070130214122/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_(part_2)_e.pdf)

Ontario College of Teachers. (2003c). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education specialist. Retrieved from

[https://web.archive.org/web/20060720153848/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_\(specialist\)_e.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20060720153848/http://www.oct.ca/teacher_education/additional_qualifications/schedule_d/pdf/special_education_(specialist)_e.pdf)

Ontario College of Teachers. (2014a). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education part I. Retrieved from <http://www.oct.ca/>-

[/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Part%20I/i_special_education_e.pdf](http://www.oct.ca/-/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Part%20I/i_special_education_e.pdf)

Ontario College of Teachers. (2014b). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education part II. Retrieved from <http://www.oct.ca/>-

[/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Part%20II/ii_special_education_e.pdf](http://www.oct.ca/-/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Part%20II/ii_special_education_e.pdf)

Ontario College of Teachers. (2014c). Additional qualification course guideline: Special education specialist. Retrieved from <https://www.oct.ca/>-

[/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Specialist/spec_special_education_e.pdf](https://www.oct.ca/-/media/PDF/Additional%20Qualifications/EN/Schedule%20D/Specialist/spec_special_education_e.pdf)

- Ontario College of Teachers. (2016a). Additional qualifications overview. Retrieved from <https://www.oct.ca/members/additional-qualifications/overview>
- Ontario College of Teachers. (2016b). Enhancing teacher education: FAQ – general. Retrieved from <https://www.oct.ca/public/newteachered/faq-general>
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2006-2007). Initial teacher education calendar. Retrieved from <http://ro.oise.utoronto.ca/Archive/200607/Calendar.pdf>
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2008-2009). Initial teacher education calendar. Retrieved from <http://ro.oise.utoronto.ca/Archive/200809/Calendar.pdf>
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2013-2014). Initial teacher education calendar. Retrieved from <http://ro.oise.utoronto.ca/Archive/201314/Calendar.pdf>
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2015-2016). Graduate studies in education bulletin. Retrieved from <http://ro.oise.utoronto.ca/Archive/201516/Bulletin.pdf>
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016a). About our program: Master of arts in child study and education. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ics/M.A._Program/Prospective_MACSE_Students/About_the_MACSE/index.html
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016b). About our program: Master of teaching. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/mt/About_Our_Program.html
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016c). Master of teaching courses. Retrieved from http://pepper.oise.utoronto.ca/~jhewitt/mtresources/MT_Courses.pdf
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016d). Special education, part I. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/aq/Additional_Qualifications_Course_Offerings.html
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016e). Special education, part II. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/aq/Additional_Qualifications_Course_Offerings.html

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016f). Special education, specialist. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/aq/Additional_Qualifications_Course_Offerings.html

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016g). Teacher education information. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ro/Teacher_Education_Info/index.html

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2016h). Why choose OISE: Ten reasons. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ro/Teacher_Education_Info/Why_Choose_OISE.html

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (2012). Video transcript: Why Ontario built the institutions. Retrieved from

http://www.mcsc.gov.on.ca/en/mcsc/about/videos/transcripts/built_institutions.aspx

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (2013). Ontario's last three institutions. Retrieved from

<http://www.mcsc.gov.on.ca/en/mcsc/programs/developmental/improving/lastThreeInst.aspx>

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2000). *Standards for school boards' special education plans*.

Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2001). *Special education: A guide for educators*. Toronto, ON:

Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2004). *The individual education plan (IEP): A resource guide*.

Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education (2005). *Education for all*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education (2013). *Learning for all*. Retrieved from

<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/elemsec/speced/LearningforAll2013.pdf>

Ontario Ministry of Education (2014). *Equity and inclusive education in Ontario schools:*

Realizing the promise of diversity. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

- Ontario Ministry of Education (2015). *Capacity building series: Pedagogical documentation revisited*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/CBS_PedagogicalDocumentation.pdf
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Peters, S. J. (2010). The heterodoxy of student voice: Challenges to identity in the sociology of disability and education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(5), 591-602. doi:10.1080/01425692.2010.500092
- Phillips, C. E. (1957). *The development of education in Canada*. Toronto: W. J. Gage and Company Limited.
- Piva, M. J. (1979). *The condition of the working class in Toronto 1900-1921*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Putman, J. H. (1912). *Egerton Ryerson and education in Upper Canada*. Toronto: William Briggs. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/stream/egertonryersoned00putmuoft>
- Regulation 191/98*. (2012-2016). Retrieved from <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/980181>
- Reindal, S.M. (2008). A social relational model of disability: a theoretical framework for special needs education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(2), 135-146. doi:10.1080/08856250801947812.
- Rice, N. (2006). Promoting 'epistemic fissures': Disability studies in teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 17(3), 251-264. doi:10.1080/10476210600849722
- Rogers, K. (2012, January 26). UWO rebrands to a familiar name: Western. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
- Rossiter, K., & Clarkson, A. (2013). Opening Ontario's "Saddest Chapter": A social history of Huronia Regional Centre. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 2(3), 1-29.

- Ryan, A. M., & Stoskopf, A. (2008). Public and Catholic school responses to IQ testing in the early 20th century. *Teachers College Record*, 110(4), 894-922.
- Ryerson, E. (1847). *Report on a system of public elementary instruction for Upper Canada*. Montreal: Lovell and Gibson.
- Ryerson, E. (1851). Introduction sketch of the system of public elementary instruction in Upper Canada. In *Proceedings at the ceremony of laying the chief corner stone of the Normal and Model Schools and Education Offices for Upper Canada* (pp. 4-12). Toronto: Thomas Hugh Bentley. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/proceedingsatcer00elgi>
- Sandall, R. (2008). Sir Francis Galton and the roots of eugenics. *Society*, 45(2), 170-176.
- Sandiford, P. (1916). Attitude of the educator towards the feeble-minded. *The Public Health Journal*, 7(12), 496-497.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2007). *Widening the circle*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sauer, J. S., & Kasa, C. (2012). Preservice teachers listen to families of students with disabilities and learn a disability studies stance. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21(2), 165-183.
- Seixas, P. (2004). Introduction. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 3-20). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Shor, I. (2009). What is critical literacy? In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (397-416). New York: Routledge.
- Simmons, H. (1982). *From asylums to welfare*. Toronto, ON: National Institute on Mental Retardation.
- Simon, R. I. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Simon, R. I. (2004). The pedagogical insistence of public memory. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 183-201). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action*. New York: Portfolio/Penguin.
- Slee, R. (1997). Imported or important theory? Sociological interrogations of disablement and special education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18(3), 407-419.
doi:10.1080/0142569970180306
- Slee, R. (2008). Beyond special and regular schooling? An inclusive education reform agenda. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 18(2), 99-116.
doi:10.1080/09620210802351342
- Smyth, E. (2006). Learning to teach: Ontario's elementary school teacher education 1960-1974. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 33(2), pp. 80-101.
- Smyth, E. (2008/2009). A wedding has been arranged? The unhappy courtship of the Hamilton Teachers' College and McMaster University. *History of Intellectual Culture*, 8(1), pp. 1-22.
- Solis, S., & Connor, D. J. (2006). Theory meets practice: Disability studies and personal narratives in school. In S. Danforth, & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp. 103-119). New York: Peter Lang.
- Sousa, D. A. (2007). *How the special needs brain learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sousa, E. M., Mtika, P., & Colucci-Gray, L. (2010). Does initial teacher education make a difference? The impact of teacher preparation on student teachers' attitudes towards educational inclusion. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 389-405.
doi:10.1080/02607476.2010.513847
- Steedman, C. (2002). *Dust: The archive and cultural history*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Stiker, H. J. (1999). *A history of disability*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Sutherland, N. (2000). *Children in English-Canadian society: Framing the twentieth century*

- consensus*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Terman, L. M. (1916). *The measurement of intelligence: An explanation of and a complete guide for the use of the Stanford revision and extension of the Binet -Simon intelligence scale*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Terzi, L. (2005). Beyond the dilemma of difference: the capability approach to disability and special educational needs. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39(3), 443-459.
- The Education Act*. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/elemsec/speced/edact.html>
- The Little School with a Big Name. (1970, March 10). *The Globe and Mail*, p. 31. Retrieved from ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail.
- The Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation, & The Disability Alliance. (1976). *Fundamental Principles of Disability*. Retrieved from <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/UPIAS-fundamental-principles.pdf>
- Thomas, G., & Loxley, A. (2007). *Deconstructing special education and constructing inclusion* (2nd ed.). New York: Open University Press.
- Thornton, C., & Underwood, K. (2013). Conceptualisations of disability and inclusion: Perspectives of educators of young children. *Early Years*, 33(1), 59-73.
doi:10.1080/09575146.2012.682975
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Toronto Normal School, 1847-1947*. (1948). [Toronto: s.n.]
- Trone, C. J. (1999, April). *Fads and frills in the classroom: Perceptions of testing in the schools, 1920-1930*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec: Houghton Mifflin.
- University of Ottawa. (n.d.). Teacher education. Retrieved from

- <http://education.uottawa.ca/en/programs/undergraduate-studies/teacher-education>
University of Ottawa. (2007-2008). Education: Teacher education. Retrieved from
<http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/info/regist/0708/calendars/edu/EDU.html>
- University of Ottawa. (2013-2014). Faculty of education: Teacher education. Retrieved from
<http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/info/regist/1314/calendars/programs/edu.html>
- University of Ottawa. (2015-2016). Faculty of education: Teacher education. Retrieved from
<http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/info/regist/calendars/programs/edu.html>
- University of Ottawa. (2016a). Special education, part I. Retrieved from
<https://web30.uottawa.ca/v3/SITS/pdpProd/Pages/Course.aspx?code=PDP1220>
- University of Ottawa. (2016b). Special education, part II. Retrieved from
<https://web30.uottawa.ca/v3/SITS/pdpProd/Pages/Course.aspx?code=PDP2220>
- University of Ottawa. (2016c). Special education, specialist. Retrieved from
<https://web30.uottawa.ca/v3/SITS/pdpProd/Pages/Course.aspx?code=PDP3270>
- University of Western Ontario. (2013). Bachelor of education. Retrieved from
<https://web.archive.org/web/20131011215546/http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/index.htm>
- University of Western Ontario. (2013-2014). Course descriptions: Bachelor of education.
Retrieved from
<https://web.archive.org/web/20131011075413/http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/documents/CurrentCourseDescBooklet.pdf>
- University of Western Ontario. (2015-2016). Special education and inclusion. Retrieved from
<http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/documents/outlines/5016Q%20Spec%20Ed%20and%20Inclusion%20Specht.pdf>
- University of Western Ontario. (2015-2017). Course descriptions: Bachelor of education.

- Retrieved from <http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/documents/2015-16coursedescribbooklet.pdf>
- University of Western Ontario. (2016a). Bachelor of education program. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/index.html>
- University of Western Ontario. (2016b). Special education, part I. Retrieved from <http://www.aspire.uwo.ca/registration/listing.asp?subject=specEd>
- University of Western Ontario. (2016c). Special education, part II. Retrieved from <http://www.aspire.uwo.ca/registration/listing.asp?subject=specEd>
- University of Western Ontario. (2016d). Special education, specialist. Retrieved from <http://www.aspire.uwo.ca/registration/listing.asp?subject=specEd>
- University of Western Ontario. (2016e). Teacher education: Take charge of your future. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.uwo.ca/programs/preservice-education/index.html#program>
- Vehmas, S., & Watson, N. (2014). Moral wrongs, disadvantages, and disability: A critique of critical disability studies. *Disability & Society, 29*(4), 638-650.
doi:10.1080/09687599.2013.831751
- Vislie, L. (2003). From integration to inclusion: Focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18*(1), 17-35.
- Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, G. D. (1992). Educational psychology's first century. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(1), 6-19.
- Ware, L. (2006a). A look at the way we look at disability. In S. Danforth, & S. L. Gabel (Eds.), *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (pp. 271-287). New York: Peter Lang.

- Ware, L. (2006b). Urban educators, disability studies and education: excavations in schools and society. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(2), 149-168.
doi:10.1080/13603110500256111
- Ware, L. (2008). Worlds remade: Inclusion through engagement with disability art. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(5-6), 563-583. doi10.1080/13603110802377615
- Ware, L. (2009). Writing, identity, and the other: Dare we do disability studies? In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (397-416). New York: Routledge.
- Wheatley, T. (2013). *“And Neither Have I Wings to Fly”: Labelled and locked up in Canada’s oldest institution*. Toronto: Inanna Publications and Education Inc.