Brigham Young University
BYU ScholarsArchive

All Theses and Dissertations

2009-06-05

Cultural Responsiveness in the Special Education/ESL Department: Faculty Perceptions at Brigham Young University

Temma Jo Devereaux
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Counseling Psychology Commons, and the Special Education and Teaching Commons

CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS IN THE SPECIAL EDUCATION/ESL PROGRAM:

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AT BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

by

Temma J. Devereaux

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Educational Specialist

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Brigham Young University

August, 2009

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Temma J. Devereaux

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority

vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date	Mary Anne Prater, Chair
Date	Aaron Jackson
Date	Melissa Allen Heath

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Temma J. Devereaux in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

_____   _____
Date   Mary Anne Prater
                                          Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

_____   _____
Date   Ellie L. Young
                                          School Psychology Program Coordinator

Accepted for the College

_____   _____
Date   Barbara Culatta
                                          Associate Dean, School of Education

ABSTRACT

CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS IN THE SPECIAL EDUCATION/ESL PROGRAM:

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AT BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Temma J. Devereaux

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Educational Specialist in School Psychology

Faculty members from Brigham Young University's special education/ESL program participated

in professional development centered on increasing multicultural competence. The primary

investigator interviewed faculty members regarding their perceptions of professional

development. After conducting the interviews, faculty members' feedback was coded to

determine whether or not the professional development aided them in infusing more culturally

sensitive practices into the curriculum and created a more sensitive learning environment for

students from diverse backgrounds. Researchers also coded the faculty members' feedback to

determine if faculty members felt they have changed at an individual/personal level in terms of

how they view their own cultural background as well as how they view their students' cultural

backgrounds. Information is summarized, providing insight into factors that strengthen

professional development, ultimately increasing cultural competence. Additionally, suggestions

are made to improve consultation skills and build stronger rapport with those from diverse

backgrounds and at the university level, more effectively recruiting and retaining diverse

students in school-based professions, including special education programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

From the days of the United States of America's founding fathers, America has been composed of individuals from many different countries and locations. The nation's current status is no exception to this phenomenon. The 2000 U.S. Census bureau's report indicated that 17.9% of individuals 5 years and older spoke a language other than English in the home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a). This percentage rose from 13.8% in 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau). The country's demographics are reflected in its educational system as well. Diverse students are not only attending public elementary, middle, and high schools, but they are also attending postsecondary institutions such as universities and community colleges, requiring all levels of education to respond accordingly to diverse educational needs.

Though the citizens of the United States' population represent a rich variety of differing cultures and origins, they are still predominantly White/non-Hispanic, English-speaking individuals. This is, however, beginning to change as the demographics of the nation continue to change and represent more diverse citizens. As mentioned, the nation's demographics are reflected within U.S. schools. For example, the portion of students of color attending U.S. schools (K–12) jumped from 22% in 1972 to 43% in 2006 (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2006a). Identifying the underlying reasons for changing demographics, Merrell, Ervin, and Gimpel (2006) point to rising birthrates across particular ethnic minority groups, as well as immigration and steady migration across U.S. borders.

Beginning in 2003, ethnically diverse enrollment in public school exceeded that of White enrollment in the West (NCES, 2006a). Almost every state, however, has seen an increase in non-White enrollment in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary institutions (NCES, 2006a). For example, the percentage of non-White student enrollment in Utah's elementary and

secondary schools rose from 8.5% in 1993 to 16.5% in 2003 (NCES, 2006b). Currently, approximately 19% of Utah's public school students are ethnically diverse (Utah State Office of Education, 2007). Additionally, roughly 11.6% of postsecondary students are non-White students within the state of Utah (NCES, 2005). Zhou, Bray, Kehle, Theodore, Clark, and Jenson (2004) estimated that by the year 2050, half of the population in the United States will be people of color.

A change in the nation's demographics is also evidenced by the percentage of individuals whose predominant or native language is not English. The 2000 U.S. census reported that nearly 47 million individuals in the nation aged 5 years and older speak a language other than English at home (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006).

While the ethnically diverse population is growing in general education, so, too, is the number of non-White children that are receiving special education services. Nationally, African American and American Indian/Alaskan Native students are heavily represented in our special education programs (Merrell et al., 2006). For example, the risk ratio of a student being identified for special education services based on his/her race/ethnicity is 1.50 for American Indian/Alaskan Native students, 1.31 for African American students, 1.07 for Hispanic students, 0.98 for White students, and 0.39 for Asian/Pacific Islander students (United States Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). Risk ratios help to compare the proportion of a specific racial/ethnic group to the proportion of all other racial/ethnic groups combined (USDOE). A risk ratio of 1.0 indicates that there is no difference between the racial/ethnic groups (USDOE).

These figures indicate that students of color are overrepresented in special education. Though the demographics of ethnically diverse students in the public schools have seen an increase, the demographics of educators have not reflected this change (Gay, 1993; NCES,

2006a; National Education Association, 2003). Only 10% of American public school teachers are from ethnically diverse backgrounds, and most of these diverse educators are located in the larger school districts (National Education Association [NEA], 2003). The difference in student demographics versus educator demographics (43% and 10% respectively) is significant (NCES, 2006a; NEA, 2003). This is particularly a problem within the realm of special education because of the high representation of ethnically diverse students receiving special education services and the low number of ethnically diverse special education teachers providing those services. For example, Campbell-Whatley (2003) indicated that, as of 2003, 37% of the students in special education were racially/ethnically diverse while only 14% of special education teachers were considered diverse.

The ability of special education teachers to relate to and understand their diverse students is therefore diminished when they are either (a) not ethnically diverse themselves or (b) ill-prepared to work with such a population as a result of inadequate cultural competency. Both reasons stem back to the programs at the university level that are selecting and preparing potential special educators. Several studies suggest that, while non-White student enrollment in post-secondary institutions has increased, there is still a huge deficit in recruiting and retaining students of ethnically diverse status (American Council on Education [ACE], 2004; Caldas, 1997; Castellanos & Jones, 2003; Nevares, 2001; Ntiri, 2001; Sidel, 1995). In addition, those teachers that are recruited and retained are not prepared to handle the issues that arise as a result of working with diverse students (Barnes, 2006; Peske & Haycock, 2006; Singh, 1997).

Definitions

In order to facilitate and clarify communication, four frequently used terms/phrases, pertinent to this study's subject matter, are defined as follows:

Diverse: In broad terms, *diverse* can be defined as a population "composed of distinct or unlike elements or qualities" (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2008). For the purpose of this thesis, "diverse" refers to those individuals who are "students of color."

Culturally Responsive Teaching/Pedagogy: Within context of this thesis, culturally responsive teaching/pedagogy is the "ability of teachers … to adapt their pedagogy and content knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the culturally and linguistically diverse populations served by this nation's schools" (Patton, Williams, Floyd, & Cobb, 2003, p. 289).

Multicultural Education: Multicultural education as used in this thesis means "understanding the social and cultural factors which influence teaching and learning and address[ing] these issues to promote higher achievement and positive social, personal, and societal development" (Winter & Austin, 1993, p. 3).

Accommodation: Accommodation refers to anything that "changes the input and/or output method used by the teacher and/or the student related to the intended instructional outcome" (King-Sears, 2001, p. 73).

Student Diversity in Education

The nation's demographics are changing and candidates who attend post-secondary institutions are becoming increasingly diverse. However, the low proportion of ethnically diverse students graduating from high school, entering college, and even more, the small percentage of ethnically diverse students graduating from college speak to the challenges facing these individuals. For example, approximately 1.23 million students drop out of high school each year, more than half of whom are from minority groups (Alliance for Excellent Education [AEE], 2007). Additionally, though 70% of students graduate from high school on time with a regular

diploma on a national level, little more than half of African American and Hispanic students earn diplomas on time with their peers (AEE).

The number of individuals receiving bachelor's degrees by race/ethnicity in the year 2004 is also indicative of a problematic discrepancy between White and non-White students' educational success. Though the percentage of non-White students receiving bachelor's degrees in the U.S. has progressively increased over the years (National Science Foundation [NSF], 2006), non-White students are still struggling with degree completion. For example, in 2004, of the students receiving bachelor's degrees, 68% were White, 9% were African American, and 7.5% were Hispanic (NSF). These percentages are not representative of the percentage of African American and Hispanic individuals in the overall U.S. population (12.9% and 12.5%, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000b). Therefore, it is imperative for university faculty to be culturally responsive in meeting diverse students' needs.

One prime reason for improving faculty multicultural responsiveness is that a major factor to students' success in upper education is their social integration within the institution (Hurtado & Carter, 1997; The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2001; National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education [NCPSE], 2003; Nevares, 2001). The Institute for Higher Education Policy reported several ways that integration is obtained and maintained, including student interaction with peer groups, participation in campus activities, advising, and interactions with faculty. Faculty responsiveness to students' needs is a fundamental piece in contributing to diverse students' success in higher education.

Additionally, faculty at post-secondary institutions must prepare their students, future special educators who will, in turn, provide culturally competent/responsive classroom instruction and support to diverse children and youth (Barnes, 2006; Peske et al., 2006; Singh,

1997). Research has noted the need for culturally responsive educators within our public schools
(Prater, 2005; Seidl, 1997; Taylor, 1999). This need is even more evident in our special
education classrooms in order to meet the demands of a growing diverse special education
population. This is evidenced by the fact that 38% of those students receiving special education
services under Part B of IDEA are considered non-White (USDOE, 2003).

Increasing Faculty's Multicultural Competencies

For educators to become culturally responsive, they must begin developing these skills
during their own education at the university level. As a result, we are pointed back to the faculty
who prepare future special educators (Ambe, 2006; Taylor, 1999). Obiakor and Utley (1997)
emphasized that to better address the "multidimensional needs of multicultural students" (p.
103), teacher preparation programs need to be restructured.

Examining personal biases. Reforming teacher preparation programs to be more
culturally responsive begins with the reform that occurs within the faculty members themselves.
Oltjenbruns and Love (1998) explain that biases and distorted perceptions are often so deeply
imbedded in societal beliefs that they can become a part of an institution, thus making these
beliefs difficult to recognize. In examining their own thoughts and beliefs, faculty can then more
effectively offer students assistance. Additionally, understanding students' personal beliefs and
attitudes strengthens the university's ability to help students develop more effective coping
strategies and adaptive behaviors, increasing the likelihood of positive participation in an
academic setting (Oltjenbruns & Love).

Brigham Young University's special education/ESL program in the Department of
Counseling Psychology and Special Education has admitted an increasingly ethnically diverse
group of students. In response to students' needs, faculty members within this department

expressed a desire to learn how to interact with and instruct these students in a more culturally responsive manner. In response to these requests, opportunities were provided for faculty to engage in professional development aimed at providing opportunities for learning culturally responsive practices.

Interviewing students. One major professional development activity was faculty interviewing ethnically diverse/bilingual teacher candidates in the candidates' homes. This activity was initiated by those who coordinated the grant for the professional development activities. Faculty members were instructed that the purpose of the interview was to learn first-hand what cultural or language barriers were preventing the candidates from learning in the classroom (Wilder & Prater, 2005). This was to be achieved by seeing the world through the candidate's eyes in an environment in which the candidates felt comfortable sharing personal insights about themselves (Wilder et al.). Information obtained from the student interviews was intended to aid faculty in knowing how to better assist diverse students in the special education/ESL program.

In these interviews, faculty members asked teacher candidates several questions about their culture, their family life, their perceptions and opinions about the special education/ESL program at BYU, and any personal sacrifices candidates made in order to participate in the current program. Faculty members were encouraged to conduct the interviews without pushing their own biases or preconceived notions onto the candidates. Faculty simply listened and learned from the candidates' experiences. The specific questions asked are as follows:

1. Tell me about your family and home prior to living in Provo, Utah.

2. Tell me about your parents and what they mean to you.

3. Tell me about some of your childhood memories.

4. Tell me some of the things you and your family have given up or sacrificed in order to be in the Sped/ESL program.

5. What are some of the activities/assignments you have had in your Sped/ESL classes that you enjoyed and that helped you learn?

6. How do you like to show what you have learned in a course? Essay tests? Multiple choice tests? Classroom activities? Cooperative, group activities? Presentations? Other?

7. Describe your greatest academic challenges or difficulties in the Sped/ESL program at BYU.

8. Describe the best thing a professor ever did to help you succeed academically.

9. If I could explain to teachers how to help me/my children succeed in school, I would say…

10. What would you like me to know about your culture or language and how may language or culture affect your ability to be successful at academics at BYU?

Participating in additional activities. Other professional development activities in which faculty participated include the following: First, faculty members participated in several hours of training. This included faculty learning the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) standards (i.e., joint productivity in the classroom, language development across curriculum; contextualization of curriculum to students' home, community, and school; challenging activities in the classroom; and instructional conversations that emphasize student-teacher dialogue) and implementing these standards in faculty's instruction and in teacher candidates' special education field work (Prater, Wilder, & Dyches, 2008). Professors were measured on how well they implemented the CREDE standards in their university classes by

having the teacher candidates anonymously rate the degree to which their classes reflected those standards by using the Classroom Environment and Teaching Style Survey (Prater et al.).

Further professional development activities included faculty learning how to help teacher candidates infuse the CREDE standards into the candidates' field work as well as how to evaluate candidates' performance of doing so (Prater et al., 2008). Faculty members also participated in identifying Council for Exceptional Children competencies related to diversity and infusing these into their courses (Prater et al.). Another focus of professional development was to help faculty identify the multicultural competencies that were most important for the teacher candidates to possess and assess their demonstration of said competencies (Prater et al.). Finally, during the final session of the professional development activities, several of the culturally and linguistically diverse teacher candidates presented their personal journeys to the faculty members in order to assist faculty in becoming more sensitive to their students' needs while learning how to better aid them in being successful in the special education/ESL program (Prater et al.).

The purpose of conducting the interviews and engaging in the other professional development activities was for faculty members to understand how they could modify their courses and their teaching in order to create an atmosphere in the classroom that is more conducive to meeting the needs of diverse students while at the same time exemplifying to all students how to be more culturally responsive and competent.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if, in response to participating in professional development activities including interviewing students in their homes, faculty members modified their special education courses and practicum experiences.

Another purpose of this study was to determine if faculty members felt they have changed at an individual/personal level in terms of how they view their own cultural background as well as how they view their students' cultural backgrounds.

Research Questions

In response to participating in professional development activities including interviewing students in their homes, have faculty members modified their special education courses and practicum experiences? Specifically,

1. Have faculty members made changes to model culturally responsive instruction in their classes and practicum experiences and, if so, what are these changes and how were they made?

2. Have faculty members made any changes to infuse cultural diversity knowledge and skills in the content of their courses and practicum experiences and, if so, what are these changes and how were they made?

3. Have faculty members changed at an individual/personal level in terms of how they view their own cultural background as well as how they view their students' cultural backgrounds?

Importance of the Study

If faculty members are more culturally responsive and competent, universities and colleges will successfully recruit and retain more ethnically diverse teacher candidates. This will, in turn, benefit ethnically diverse special education students in schools. Additionally, all special education candidates will benefit from culturally responsive faculty by learning about cultural sensitivity in an educational environment. They can, in turn, apply this knowledge to their future classrooms as they leave the university and embark on careers as special educators.

On a broader scale, if BYU's special education/ESL program is successful, it can act as a model to other programs within other universities to demonstrate how to effectively recruit and retain ethnically diverse students, as well as how to model cultural responsiveness and competency at a classroom and a program level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Nation's Changing Demographics

In 1988, Zapata stated that by the year 2000, 33% of U.S. student enrollment would consist of diverse students (Zapata, 1988). Similarly, Wunsch and Chattergy (1991) predicted that by the year 2000, one third of all school-age children would be ethnically diverse. Another study projected that 40% of students would be minorities by 2010 (Taylor, 1999).

Garcia and Cuellar (2006) reported that as of 2000, non-White enrollment in elementary and secondary education rose to 40%, up from 24% in 1976. The 2006 Condition of Education reported that non-White enrollment increased from 22% in 1972 to 43% in 2004, with Hispanic enrollment seeing the largest increase from 6% to 19% ([NCES], 2006b). Clearly the projected rates of enrollment were not only met, but quickly surpassed within a matter of a few years. Because the demographic changes that occurred during the past decade were accurately predicted 10 years in advance, continued growth in student diversity is confidently anticipated (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006).

Although these changes in national demographics have occurred, research indicates that social institutions have not adequately met the needs of the increasingly diverse population. This is evidenced by the fact that, despite the growing numbers of students of color in the nation's educational systems, these individuals are unfortunately not completing high school and enrolling in and completing college at rates comparable to their White peers (ACE, 2004; Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; Ward, 2006). For example, though 70% of U.S. students graduated from high school on time with a regular diploma, little more than half of African American and Hispanic students earned diplomas on time with their peers (AEE, 2007). Additionally, while 68% of the

students receiving bachelor's degrees in 2004 were White, only 9% were African American and 7.5% were Hispanic (NSF, 2006).

Legal and Historical Overview of Diverse Students in Education

In order to understand the non-White student's position within our educational systems, it is important to consider the historical events that surround the issues of race and diversity as they pertain to education within the United States. One legal case that made a tremendous impact on the American public school system was the 1954 case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. This case held that it was unlawful to segregate schools based on race (Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts, 2007). As a result of this ruling, non-White students began attending what were once all-White schools (Marbley et al.). African American teachers lost their jobs as schools for non-White students shut down, and diverse students began to be educated by White teachers (Marbley et al.).

The matters of ethnicity, affirmative action, and bilingual education continued to be prominent topics in the face of the civil rights movements during the 1960s and 1970s (Quiocho & Rios, 2000). These movements required the federal government to respond to the inequity of the current policies of the time in a positive manner. Jordan (2007) confirmed this notion by citing several legal incidents that have contributed to students of diversity within higher education in the past as well as recently: namely affirmative action (1960s); the Civil Rights Act (1964); and two court cases, including Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978) and Grutter v. Bollinger (2003). All of these resulted in the Supreme Court allowing higher institutions to consider race and ethnicity in awarding financial aid and in setting admissions' quota to ensure that university and college enrollment more accurately reflected the nation's demographics (Jordan).

The Grutter v. Bollinger case in particular represents the fact that, while historically our nation has taken steps to address the inclusion of diverse students, our schools, colleges, and universities are still in a position where they must continue to be attentive to the issue of leveling out the playing field for non-White students (e.g., Morfin, Perez, Parker, Lynn, & Arrona, 2006; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007; Schneider, 2006).

The literature has documented the historical landmark cases that have propelled this country into being more inclusive of diverse individuals in our educational systems. Indeed, many positive reforms have been made to embrace diversity within our educational systems despite ever persistent opposition (Jordan, 2007; Marbley et al., 2007; Rothenberg, 2007). The literature is, however, continuing to call for more reform among our public schools, colleges, and universities. Several sources indicate that, while huge steps have been made to foster inclusion of diverse students in an educational setting, there is still a disparity in the academic success of students of color versus Whites (e.g., ACE, 2004; Gloria & Robinson-Kurpius, 2001; Ward, 2006).

Status of Diverse Students

Special education. An issue of particular importance is that of the current condition of diverse students within special education. As reported by the United States Office of Civil Rights, disproportionality in special education has occurred since the 1970s (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Ferri & Connor, 2005). Several studies cite overrepresentation in special education as one of the most pressing problems our education system has seen over the past many years (Coutinho & Oswald, 2000; Donovon & Cross, 2003; Ferri & Connor, 2005; Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; Zhang & Benz, 2006). While 38.3% of students being served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) during the 2001–2002 school year were non-White, the

general population was only represented by 30.9% non-White individuals, revealing a 7.4% overrepresentation of diverse students in special education (Zhang & Benz, 2006).

Ferri and Connor (2005) reported on a recent government report that claimed that, while African American students constitute 14.8% of the school-age population, this population constitutes 20.2% of students in special education. Additionally, though Hispanics account for 12–13% of the population, they represent over 17% of students identified as having learning disabilities (Gerber & Durgunoglu, 2004).

The issue of non-White overrepresentation in special education has been one of the most pressing issues faced by the U.S. public school system within the last 30 years (Coutinho & Oswald, 2000). As a result, several initiatives have been taken to determine how overrepresentation can be eliminated, such as federal law requiring states to report on ethnic representation within special education (Donovon & Cross, 2003).

Higher education. Another important area to consider when looking at non-White student participation is that of higher education. Though universities and colleges have attempted to increase their responsiveness to meeting diverse students' needs, students of color are still not attending secondary institutions at the same rate as their White peers, nor are the graduation rates comparable to White peers (ACE, 2004; California Tomorrow, 2002; Fischer, 2006; Gloria & Kurpius, 2001; Hobson-Horton & Owens, 2004; Jones, Castellanos, & Cole, 2002; Malveaux, 2006; Murdock & Hoque, 1999; Scherer, 2007; Ward, 2006). For example, as of 2003, 66% of Caucasians were likely to complete some college in comparison to 51% of African Americans and 31% of Hispanics (Ward, 2006).

Statistics from the United States Department of Education (2001) and the U.S. Census Bureau (2000b) indicate that a discrepancy exists in the percentage of bachelor's degrees

conferred among dominant ethnic groups in the U.S. during the 1997–1998 school year and the

portion of the national population that is actually represented by each ethnic group. For example,

while African Americans represented 12.5% of the U.S. population, only 5.8% of bachelor's

degrees were conferred upon African Americans. Additional percentages are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of Bachelor's Degrees Conferred and National Population Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group

Racial/Ethnic Group	Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Conferred[a]	Percent of U.S. Population[b]
White	78.7%	77.1%
African American	8.6%	12.9%
Hispanic	5.8%	12.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6.3%	4.5%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.7%	1.5%

Notes. [a]Percentages retrieved from USDOE (2001).
[b]Percentages retrieved from U.S. Census Bureau (2000b).

Seven years later (2004–2005) the figures do not improve much for the percentage of

bachelor's degrees that were conferred: 9.5% to African American students, 7.0% to Hispanic

students, 6.8% to Asian/Pacific Islander students, and 0.7% to American Indian/Alaska Native

students, all in comparison to 72.9% of degrees conferred upon White students (USDOE, 2006).

Several sources point to the primary reasons for diverse students not enjoying the same

success within the higher education setting as their White peers. Although current court rulings

uphold that it is acceptable to take race into consideration when making admissions and financial

aid distribution decisions, many universities have moved away from affirmative action and from proactively engaging in methods to recruit students from diverse backgrounds (ACE, 2004). Another reason is the lack of adequate support in place once these students are enrolled in the university. Such needed support can be very different from that needed by the White, middle-class population as a result of dealing with factors such as attending a predominantly White campus and dealing with stereotypes among faculty and peers (Madkins & Mitchell, 2000).

Furthermore, diverse individuals experience difficulty in higher education as a result of feelings of alienation, financial distress, lack of academic preparation and support, difficulties with test taking, and inadequate contact with advisors, mentors, and peers (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; NCPSE, 2003). These difficulties lead to a much lower degree-completion rate than that reported for White students (ACE, 2004).

Teacher education programs. More diverse students are entering and graduating from teacher education programs than in past years. Teacher education programs, however, are not immune to the discrepancy of non-White student enrollment rates at universities and colleges. The proportion of students of color receiving degrees in education is still below the proportion of students of color in the general population (13.2% and 34.1%, respectively) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005; USDOE, 2006).

Between the school years 1993–1994 and 2004–2005 the percentage of bachelor's degrees in education conferred upon non-White individuals only increased from 10.7% to 13.2% (USDOE, 1996, 2006). While culturally and linguistically diverse individuals are continuing to enroll in undergraduate programs, very few of them are entering teacher education programs, especially for special education (Campbell-Whatley, 2003). This can in part be attributed to the bias that diverse students experience in the admissions process into higher education programs,

as well as the lack of diverse faculty in special education programs (Campbell-Whatley). Furthermore, ethnically diverse individuals are not choosing special education as a career. While teaching once represented the opportunity for upward mobility among ethnically and culturally diverse individuals, it is now being replaced by more prestigious opportunities such as medicine, law, computer science, and engineering (Campbell-Whatley).

The Digest of Education Statistics cited the overwhelming prevalence of White students graduating from teacher education programs (USDOE, 2006). During the 2004–2005 school year, 86% of the bachelor's degrees of education went to White individuals, as compared to 6% conferred to African Americans, 5% to Hispanic, 2% to Asian/Pacific Islander, and 0.9% to American Indian/Alaska Native Individuals (USDOE, 2006). Furthermore, 77% of Master's degrees of Education were conferred upon White individuals during the 2004–2005 school year, in contrast to 20% of degrees conferred upon non-White individuals (USDOE, 2006). Consequently, a few diverse students enter and graduate from teacher education programs.

These numbers should not be surprising since many sources have documented the fact that the vast majority of educators are White and from a middle socio-economic status (e.g., Gay, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 2005; National Education Association, 2003; Prater, 2005). Specifically, only 10% of educators represented ethnically diverse backgrounds (National Education Association, 2003). Another source reported the gap between diverse student representation and diverse educator representation within American schools to be large as well, with 40% of the students representing diverse cultures while only 12% of educators are diverse (NCPSE, 2003). The percentage of ethnically diverse educators in special education has been cited to be 14%, while approximately 37% of students receiving special education services are ethnically diverse (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Prater, 2005).

Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Students

　　Higher education. Clearly there is a need for recruiting and retaining students of diversity in higher education institutions. There is a need for higher education institutions need to implement specific strategies to improve the performance of diverse students (Olivia & Nora, 2004). Furthermore, recruitment and retention of diverse students is a necessity in teacher education programs because of the growing number of diverse students in the nation's elementary and secondary schools and the lack of diverse educators. The shortage of diverse educators can limit diverse students' access to teachers that are sensitive to their cultural perspectives, experiences, learning styles, and language needs (Salend, Whittaker, Duhaney, & Smith, 2003).

　　Several sources indicate that much work has already gone into recruiting diverse students into universities, colleges, and specific departments (e.g., Ayalon, 2004; Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Frazier, 2007; Henniger, 1989; Middleton, Mason, Stilwell, & Parker, 1988; NCPSE, 2003). However, while much attention has been given to recruiting diverse students, not enough focus has been placed on retaining them (Patton et al., 2003). Recruitment efforts must be followed up by adequate support to ensure continued success for diverse students in postsecondary institutions (Madkins & Mitchell, 2000; Sidel, 1995). The NCPSE (2003) reported that students' success in a special education teacher program was largely a factor of the support that was provided to them once they were in the program versus the skills with which they entered the program.

　　Teacher education programs. An overarching theme in the literature as it pertains to retaining diverse students in teacher education programs is that faculty must be actively involved in providing a supportive environment to students. Faculty who engage in personal and informal

interactions with students, provide mentoring assistance (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Gloria &
Robinson-Kurpius, 2001; Hobson-Horton & Owens, 2004; Voltz, 2000), and help diverse
students adjust to campus life (Madkins & Mitchell, 2000) have a great impact on students'
academic success. This personal support from faculty members could be considered the "human
touch" that Gonzalez (1997) referred to when diverse students indicated that one of the most
important characteristics of a preservice teaching program was that of feeling nurtured by faculty
and peers. Other factors that appear to be effective in retaining diverse students in teacher
education programs are as follows:

1. Providing faculty mentors to diverse students (Salend et al., 2003; NCPSE, 2003);

2. Providing peer tutors as well as teaching diverse students how to study and learn
   (Gonzalez, 1997; NCPSE, 2003; Salend et al., 2003)

3. Providing time for small-group discussions for students to express any frustrations and
   concerns (NCPSE, 2003)

4. Providing financial support for expenses not usually covered by financial aid (NCPSE,
   2003; Salend et al., 2003)

5. Having students engage in recruitment (Gonzalez, 1997)

6. Providing students with early and intense experiences in the schools (Gonzalez, 1997)
   Making certain students are aware of educational and social resources at the institution
   (Torres, 2003)

7. Institutions working to employ a diverse faculty (Salend et al., 2003)

8. Faculty diversifying the curriculum (Salend et al., 2003)

9. Providing students with field experiences with other diverse students and families
   (Salend et al., 2003)

10. Providing flexibility in scheduling and program structure (NCPSE, 2003; Ornelles & Goetz, 2001)

Special education teacher programs. In addition to the need for diverse teacher candidates in general, there exists a critical need for diverse special educators. This is due to the overrepresentation of diverse students and the underrepresentation of diverse teachers in special education (Ornelles & Goetz, 2001; Patton, et al., 2003; Tyler, Cantou-Clarke, Easterling & Klepper, 2003). Special education teachers are predominantly female, White, and from a middle-class socioeconomic status (Barnes, 2006). Upon investigation of this deficit of diverse special educators, it is easy for one to see that many special educators would experience difficulty in understanding and relating to their ethnically/racially diverse students. Barnes (2006) commented that a "cultural discontinuity" exists when teachers hold negative beliefs and stereotypes about their diverse students, which is common among preservice teachers even after taking a multicultural course.

Because the majority of educators are White and from a middle-class background, they live in different "existential worlds" and do not have the same frame of reference or point of view as their students (Gay, 1993). This difference can lead to a cultural mismatch which may result in teachers negatively stereotyping what diverse students are capable of doing. This stereotyping can then create negative interactions between teacher and student (Barnes, 2006) as well as increased placement of diverse students in special education (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Ferri & Connor, 2005; Prater, 2005; Skiba, Simmons, Ritter, Kohler, Henderson, & Wu, 2006). Recruiting more diverse students in special education teacher programs would help to alleviate the deficit that contributes to the cultural mismatch, which in turn can result in teachers adhering to negative stereotypes about students' abilities.

Diverse Students' Attitudes of Persistence

While a review of effective retention strategies is important, before one can successfully engage in retention efforts one must be aware of the factors that affect diverse students' attitudes of persistence at a college and university level. Research on diverse students in higher education highlights the fact that the status of being non-White is considered an additional strain on top of the typical stressors that accompany a competitive college life (Jones et al., 2002). Thus, non-White students are at an increased risk for negative educational outcomes because of this additional stressor (Jones et al.). It is necessary, then to review what factors seem to affect diverse students' attitudes of persistence and academic experiences in a college and university setting. These factors can be good indications of what goals to work towards when recruiting and retaining diverse students. Indeed, when programs focus on reducing the negative factors and increasing the positive factors that affect students' attitudes of persistence, then the programs can achieve success in retaining those students. Table 2 lists the factors that affect diverse students' academic persistence in higher education institutions.

In addition to the factors listed in Table 2, researchers have indicated that non-White students often experience difficulty in adjusting to campus life due to the nature that most campuses are predominantly White; therefore potential biases or stereotypes may exist as a result (Madkins & Mitchell, 2000). Case et al. (1988) explained that non-White students often have difficulty adjusting to predominantly White campuses, and that they often leave teacher education programs because of sociocultural alienation as well as academic factors.

Need for Diverse/Culturally Competent Educators in School Systems

In addition to increasing the number of diverse students preparing to become teachers, universities and colleges need to do a better job of preparing all preservice teachers to work with

Table 2

Factors that Affect Diverse Students' Academic Persistence in Higher Education Institutions

<div align="center">Factors</div>

1. Instructor Characteristics
   a. Faculty mentoring including frequent, informal contact (Gloria & Robinson-Kurpius, 2001), a positive rapport with students (Patton et al., 2003), supportive attitudes, fair treatment by instructors (Helm, Sedlacek, & Prieto,1998), engaging in instructional versus lecturing teaching, encouraging multiple perspectives in the classroom (Villalpando, 2002), and having diverse faculty (Jones et al., 2002) all positively affect diverse students' academic success and persistence.
   b. Low expectations as well as negative, invalidating, stereotypical, and disrespectful attitudes act as barriers to diverse students' academic persistence (California Tomorrow, 2002; George & Aronson, 2003).
2. Campus Climate
   a. Diverse students' perceptions of a negative racial climate, racial tension, and lack of support negatively affect their adjustment to college (Hurtado, Han, Saenz, Espinosa, Cabrera, & Cerna, 2007).
   b. Incorporation of multiculturalism in class curriculums, feeling an understanding of diversity, having a cultural center on campus and/or a cultural/racial awareness workshop (Jones et al., 2002; Villalpando, 2002), socializing with someone of a different race/ethnic group (Villalpando), and experiencing a high cultural congruity on campus (Constantine, Robinson, Wilton, & Caldwell, 2002) positively influence diverse students' academic experiences.
3. Support
   a. Social support, mentoring and tutoring services, family support, faculty support, integration of ethnic centers with the rest of the campus community, and same-race/ethnicity peer support (Arellano & Padilla, 1996; Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Case, Shive, Ingebretson, & Spiegel, 1988; Constantine et al., 2002; George & Aronson, 2003; Harrell & Forney, 2003; Hurtado et al., 2007; Jones et al.; Olivia & Nora, 2004; Vasquez, 1982; Ward, 2006).
4. Individual Characteristics
   a. Having respect for other cultures and being comfortable in cross-cultural situations positively correlated with diverse students' overall satisfaction with their university (Helm et al., 1998).
   b. Inadequate financial resources, increase in tuition costs (California Tomorrow, 2002; Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Vasquez, 1982), minimal parental education (Ward, 2006), language barriers, poor ethnic identity, negative social comparisons, and poor self-beliefs (Castillo, Conoley, Choi-Pearson, Archuletea, Phoummarath, & Landingham, 2006; Gloria & Robinson-Kurpius, 2001; Hurtado et al., 2007; Torres, 2003) negatively affect diverse students' academic persistence.

diverse students. White, as well as non-White, teachers are not prepared or lack confidence in their abilities to work with students of diversity in the school systems (Ambe, 2006; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2003; Brisk, Estela, Barnhardt, Herrera, & Rochon, 2002; Cho & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, 2005; Murrell & Foster, 2003; Prater, 2005; Quiocho & Rios, 2000; Scherff, 2005; Taylor, 1999). This is particularly a problem in the realm of special education due to the overrepresentation of ethnically diverse children (Artiles, Trent, Hoffman-Kipp, & Lopez-Torres, 2000; Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Prater). Campbell-Whatley (2003) explained,

> The lack of diverse teachers contribute significantly to negative biased expectations for ethnic school-aged learners….Lower expectations can make it difficult for students to make a positive attachment to the teacher, as well as to the system. This is one of the reasons that diverse students do less well in school, resulting in disproportionate placements in special education. An increase in cultural understanding within school climates would reduce the occurrence of referrals, mislabeling, and consequential overrepresentation of diverse students in special education. (p. 259)

Barriers that prevent educators from being culturally competent. As mentioned previously, a significant portion of the student population is composed of racially and ethnically diverse individuals while the overwhelming majority of teachers are White. The disproportion of the ethnically diverse teaching force is only intensified by the fact that most middle-class White teachers have a monocultural perspective, have little significant contact with diverse individuals, are not prepared to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students, and struggle with building

bridges between diverse students' home and school environments (Smolen, Colville-Hall, Liang, & Mac Donald, 2006).

Because of the prevalent monocultural perspective among teachers and preservice teachers, many students in teacher education programs adhere to misconceptions about multicultural educational issues and preconceived notions and myths that are condoned by society (Parameswaran, 2007). Teachers may make incorrect assumptions as to why diverse children may perform differently in academics (Athanases & Martin, 2006). Additionally, while new teachers often understand content knowledge, they do not have the pedagogical technique and ability to teach diverse students (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2003).

Furthermore, Quiocho and Rios (2000) indicated that many new teachers felt unprepared to deal with issues of cultural diversity due to a lack of experience with a culturally relevant curriculum in their own teacher education programs. Though these students commented that they had a multicultural education course, they felt that it was only a superficial focus and that some of their professors even adhered to racist assumptions. Special education personnel and administrators even claimed to be uncomfortable with addressing the issues of race and diversity as they pertain to students they see in the schools (Skiba et al., 2006).

Importance of teacher characteristics. Just as with diverse students in post-secondary institutions, research has identified how important teacher characteristics are in elementary and secondary students' academic success. An instructor's expectations largely contribute to the success of diverse students in an academic setting. When a teacher treats a child as if he/she can or cannot excel, that child will most often meet that teacher's expectations (Ambe, 2006; Borman

& Rachuba, 2001; Ward, 2006). Caldas and Bankston (1997) posited that teacher expectations can positively or negatively influence the academic success of a student.

This can especially be a problem when teachers hold pre-conceived, stereotyped notions about a particular race or population of students. Caldas and Bankston (1997) explained that students, specifically referring to African Americans, could be performing poorly academically because of the low expectations their teacher may hold for them. Additionally, when teachers use weak or Eurocentric instructional strategies and curriculums, diverse students often perform more poorly than non-diverse students (Ambe, 2006; Ward, 2006). Furthermore, when students are exposed to teachers who demonstrate cultural awareness and sensitivity, student achievement is found to be higher (Patton et al., 2003). When teachers have a greater understanding of cultures and can apply that cultural information to their attitudes, beliefs, and interactions with students, diverse students tend to have better academic performance (Patton et al., 2003; Winter & Austin, 1993).

Because teacher characteristics have such a profound effect on students, teachers must be taught how to develop culturally responsive skills and characteristics as they are preparing to work in elementary and secondary schools. For this to happen, teacher educators must first be culturally responsive themselves.

Policies mandating educators be culturally responsive. Not only does research point to the necessity of culturally responsive educators, so do current educational polices. For example, No Child Left Behind requires that students of all races and ethnicities gain proficiency in all basic skills, while at the same time all students must be provided high quality educations, which can only happen when educators abandon the low expectations that are often set for students of diversity (Scherer, 2007). The Council for Exceptional Children requires that teachers be able to

attend to issues of diversity in the classroom (Dieker, Voltz, & Epanchin, 2002). Additionally, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has set forth standards that require teacher educators and teacher education programs to ensure they are teaching candidates how to meet the needs of diverse learners (NCATE, 2001).

Need for Multicultural Faculty Development /Being Culturally Responsive

For the purposes of this study and literature review, the focus on culturally responsive programs has been narrowed to those that occur within teacher education programs. Several sources emphasize, however, that if a program is to be successful in fostering cultural responsiveness, it needs to be expanded to an institutional level (e.g., Jones et al., 2002; Talbert-Johnson & Tillman, 1999; Wunsch & Chattergy, 1991).

There exist two primary reasons that teacher educators need to be culturally competent. First, the predominantly White teaching force lacks the abilities to teach and work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, especially because they come from a monocultural perspective (e.g., Smolen et al., 2006). Teachers can no longer ignore the need for cultural responsiveness in the classroom. All teachers must be culturally responsive in order to be considered competent educators (Ambe, 2006). The responsibility rests on the shoulders of teacher educators to prepare preservice teachers to work in multicultural classrooms (Ambe; AACTE, 2003; Athanases & Martin, 2006; Smolen et al., 2006; Talbert-Johnson & Tillman, 1999). Teachers who are not prepared in programs that are based on culturally relevant pedagogy or who experience racism among their own professors will have difficulty engaging in culturally responsive pedagogy in their own classrooms. (Quiocho & Rios, 2000). Any long-lasting change that will occur within the K–12 public school system will happen when it is successfully instituted at the teacher education program level.

The second reason that teacher educators need to be culturally competent stems from the fact that in order to better address the changing demographics, teacher educators must engage in culturally responsive practices themselves in order to meet their own diverse students' unique needs. Faculty members must be aware of the barriers that are present among culturally and ethnically diverse groups' perspectives, beliefs, and experiences (Wunsch & Chattergy, 1991). Often times, when faculty members are not responsive to their diverse students, they can easily engage in misunderstandings and interactions with students that leave the students feeling disrespected and belittled (California Tomorrow, 2002). These effects can seriously hamper diverse college students' persistence, and thus it becomes necessary to provide professional development activities that help faculty members become more culturally responsive (California Tomorrow).

Faculty report to believe in the importance of being culturally responsive to diverse' students needs, as well as the importance of emanating that cultural responsiveness to their preservice teachers (Hasseler, 1998; Smolen et al., 2006; Tatto, 1996). Unfortunately, a problem seems to exist in their abilities to implement culturally responsive attitudes into their interactions with students and their curriculums. Many faculty members do not feel knowledgeable enough about how to infuse multiculturalism into their courses and curriculum (Ambe, 2006; Morrier, Irving, Dandy, Dmitriyev, & Ukeje, 2007). Additionally, faculty admit not feeling prepared to address emotionally and socially difficult issues surrounding the issues of diversity that come up in the classroom (Taylor, 1999).

Perhaps this problem of implementation at the individual level is due to what Smolen et al. (2006) refer to as weak implementation of diversity training at the institutional level. In order to sustain a change in faculty's ability to be more culturally responsive to diverse students as

well as teach a more culturally responsive approach to all preservice teachers, they must experience transformation in their own pedagogies. For this to happen, system-wide change must occur. This is done when faculty participate in programs that are geared towards helping them develop a more culturally responsive attitude in their curriculum and interactions with others (Oltjenbruns & Love, 1998).

It is not enough, however, for institutions to simply encourage faculty to change the curriculum to be more culturally responsive; teacher educators must also change themselves (Ambe, 2006; Morrier et al., 2007). Research indicates that one's preconceived notions, worldviews, paradigms and pedagogical theories and techniques are deeply embedded and ingrained in individuals because they are such a part of the social and institutional structures (Ambe; Hobson-Horton & Owens, 2004; Oltjenbruns & Love, 1998). Teacher educators, who are predominantly White, still maintain deficit thinking as it pertains to issues of diversity (Ambe). These beliefs and assumptions are emitted in their pedagogy and curriculum and passed on to preservice teachers, who consequently take them into their own classrooms (Ambe). Even faculty's self-identity, cultural identity, and awareness have been found to affect their ability to educate preservice teachers to be multiculturally competent (Morrier et al., 2007; Smolen et al., 2006). In order to interrupt this process, faculty must first examine and evaluate their attitudes. It is thus necessary for college professors to change faulty and damaging preconceived notions towards those from diverse backgrounds as they prepare teachers to attend to the needs of diverse students (Ambe; Oltjenbruns & Love; Parameswaran, 2007; Quezada & Louque, 2002; Tatto, 1996). Teacher educators will not have a positive effect on preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity if they do not exemplify the values they espouse (Tatto, 1996).

Culturally Responsive Development Activities

Many sources discuss culturally responsive programs geared towards helping preservice teachers becoming more culturally responsive in their classrooms (e.g. Barnes, 2006; Farmer, Hauk, & Neumann, 2005; Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts, 2007; McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Morrier et al., 2007; Rodriguez & Sjostrom, 1995; Seidl, 2007; Winter & Austin, 1993). Few sources, however, discuss programs geared towards faculty members. Nonetheless, of the sources that do, they give examples of components that have been included in specific programs aimed at helping faculty become culturally responsive. The different components that have been used in professional development activities for teacher educators include the following:

1. Conduct a needs assessment among the faculty (Gallavan, Troutman, & Jones, 2001).

2. Encourage faculty to engage in self-reflection (Cooper & Chattergy, 1993; Ambe, 2006; Morrier et al., 2007), including the use of narrative (Cooper & Chattergy).

3. Provide orientation for new faculty, including department chair leadership training (Wunsch & Chattergy, 1991).

4. Train teaching assistants in diverse issues and hiring diverse students as graduate assistants (Wunsch & Chattergy; Gallavan et al.).

5. Teach how to infuse cultural responsiveness into pedagogy and curriculum (Ambe; Gallavan et al.; Oltjenbruns & Love, 1998; Parameswaran, 2007).

6. Collaborate with local school districts and community colleges to reach diverse students before they enter the university and to have school district teachers work as adjunct university instructors (Gallavan et al.).

7. Provide an in-service on multicultural education (Ambe; Gallavan et al.).

8. Create a multicultural education newsletter (Gallavan et al.).

9. Create a multicultural education bibliographic database resource center (Gallavan et al.).

10. Ask faculty to study individuals different from themselves (Ambe).

11. Create a mentoring program between faculty and diverse students to facilitate rapport and support students (Gallavan et al.).

   The intended outcomes of such activities listed above include the following:

1. Faculty must value diversity, be willing to self-reflect, and be able to evaluate their own culture, beliefs, and attitudes and be able to adapt to the dynamics of differences and understand how they fit into the picture of diversity (Allan, 2003; Ambe, 2006; Cooper & Chattergy, 1993; Helm et al., 1998; Oltjenbruns & Love, 1998; Quezada & Louque, 2002; Taylor, 1999).

2. Faculty must be able to build bridges between students' home and school (Rodriquez & Sjostrom, 1995).

3. Faculty must understand that equal power relationships must exist among groups (Helm et al.) by working to create and open climate to all students (Ambe).

4. Faculty must be able to incorporate multicultural perspectives into their pedagogy and curriculum (Ambe; Gallavan et al.; Oltjenbruns & Love; Parameswaran, 2007) through a variety of means, such as instructional aids, assignments, speech, and attitude (Ambe).

5. Faculty must be able to model cultural responsiveness to their students by modeling the values of social justice, allowing students to express themselves, communicating the dynamic nature of cultures to students and emphasizing that mainstream students have cultures as well, guiding students to examine power inequalities among social groups, and teaching individuals in power how to play roles as allies (Parameswaran).

Though several ideas are provided as effective professional development activities, there is yet to be a consensus on the most effective model of professional development activities for teacher educators. Despite the emphasis placed upon institutions that they teach faculty how to incorporate culturally responsive pedagogy into their curriculum and instruction, no sources were identified that explain how this can best be accomplished. Because of controversies that surround how teacher education programs should go about providing multicultural education, they have not yet successfully found a way to show preservice teachers how to be competent in working with students from diverse backgrounds (Ambe, 2006).

METHOD

Prior to this study, special education faculty members at Brigham Young University participated in professional development activities focused on cultural responsiveness. One activity was interviewing university students preparing to be special educators in their homes. The purposes of this study were to determine if the faculty members (a) modified their courses and practicum experiences to make them more culturally responsive, and (b) felt they had changed at an individual/personal level in terms of how they view their own and the students' cultural backgrounds.

Participants

Participants for this study were Brigham Young University faculty members from the special education/ESL program in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. Fourteen faculty members participated in the culturally responsive professional development. One faculty member relocated to a different university before the primary investigator started conducting the present study. Thirteen faculty members (one male and 12 female) were therefore contacted to participate in the professional development and were recruited by the researcher to participate in the study. They were contacted by e-mail and in writing and asked to participate. Due to the health issues of one faculty member, a total of 12 faculty members were interviewed.

Procedures

The primary investigator conducted separate interviews with each participating faculty member. The job of the interviewer was to listen to the participants' explanations of how they perceived and have reacted to the professional development activities that centered on cultural responsiveness. The interview questions were designed to eliminate as much bias as foreseeable

so that the interviewer was not asking questions that may lead the participants to respond in any particular way.

Upon receipt of the faculty members' consent to participate, the primary investigator contacted each faculty member to coordinate a time, place, and date for the interview. Each interview lasted approximately 20 to 30 minutes. Transcriptions often lose the essence of the interview experiences (Kvale, 1996). Thus, interviews were audio-taped to aid in maintaining, as much as possible, the unique elements that arise in each interview.

The interviews were guided by the following questions:

1. What is your overall perception of the professional development activities that you have participated in and the interviews you have conducted with students?

2. Do you feel that you have changed in any way, or have made any changes, in response to the professional development and/or interviewing? If so, why? How? Do you feel that you could have made these changes without the activities/interviewing?

3. If not, why?

4. What did you like about the activities and the interviewing?

5. What did you dislike about the activities and the interviewing?

6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the professional development activities and/or interviewing?

The above questions were considered a flexible format for conducting the interviews. They were not meant to be an all-inclusive outline of what could be asked or discussed during the interview. The primary investigator used follow-up questions to address any concerns or responses that might have come up during the course of the interview that could not be addressed by the already-formulated interview questions but that were related to the purpose of the study.

As soon as the first interview was completed, verbatim transcription of the interviews began. Upon completion of the transcription, all interviews were subjected to the data analysis procedures as taken from Hatch (2002).

The interviews took place during the Winter and Spring Semesters of the 2007–2008 school year. Transcriptions of all interviews were completed by the end of the Spring Term 2008. Analysis of the interviews was completed by the end of the Summer Term 2008.

Research Design

Qualitative research can be utilized in interview studies when a researcher is interested in obtaining a rich description of the participants' experiences and their unique perspectives in order to gain understanding about their worlds (Hatch, 2002). The present study was conducted within the post positivist paradigm. This research paradigm declares that reality exists but can never fully be seized or understood due to human limitations (Hatch). Approximations of reality, however, can be obtained through disciplined research (Hatch).

Other important components to the present study that must be considered are the background, the values, and the worldview of the researcher. Worldview can be defined as a person's insight regarding his or her culture and individuality as well as how he or she perceives the world given his or her own experiences, culture, etc. (Merrell et al., 2006). The primary investigator is a White female graduate student in the School Psychology program at Brigham Young University. The primary investigator adheres to the assumptions of the post positivist paradigm. The primary investigator also asserts that, while many ultimate universal truths exist, it is necessary to understand how individuals have constructed their reality since one's lived experiences, culture, and personal values and beliefs greatly contribute to one's own worldview.

The present study followed an inductive analysis design for qualitative research. Hatch (2000) described this design as generating understandings by "starting with specific elements and finding connections among them" (p. 161). Additionally, with inductive analysis the researcher should be "looking for patterns across individual observations, then arguing for those patterns as having the status of general explanatory statements" (Hatch, p. 161).

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed verbatim and then analyzed according to the nine steps that characterize the Inductive Analysis design (Hatch, 2002). The steps applied were as follows:

1. The transcriptions were read and the frames of analysis identified. Hatch (2002) describes frames of analysis as "a segment of text that is comprehensible by itself and contains one idea, episode, or piece of information" (p. 163).

2. The researcher created domains that reflect relationships represented in the data.

3. The researcher identified which domains are pertinent to the present study and assign them codes.

4. The interviews were reread to determine whether the data support the identified domains. During this fourth step the researcher also kept a record of where relationships were found in the data.

5. Upon rereading the interviews, the researcher decided if the data supported the chosen domains and looked for examples that may disconfirm the domains. This step allowed the researcher to have a higher degree of confidence that the findings of the study were confirmed by the data.

6. The researcher conducted an analysis within the domains to identify new links, relationships, or subcategories.

7. The researcher looked for themes and connections across domains. Hatch (2002) describes this step as "looking across the data for broad elements that bring the pieces together" (p. 173).

8. An outline was created that illustrated relationships within and among domains.

9. Excerpts were carefully selected from the interviews that support the identified domains and themes as described in the outline.

A *memoing* process was used throughout the entire process of data analysis in order to track important ideas. During the memoing process, researchers kept track of the important frames of analyses (important ideas or pieces of information that could be identified as segments of text) by writing them in the margins of the transcriptions and subsequently assigning those frames of analyses codes according to the outline that was developed. Reliability was achieved by having two individuals identify domains and themes.

Both individuals read all of the interviews, first separately, and then together, in order to reach agreement on domain formation. Both researchers first read the interviews separately and identified and recorded any frames of analyses that appeared significant and pertinent to the study's objectives. The researchers then read each interview together and discussed the separate frames of analyses that they identified. Frames of analyses were only kept if both researchers determined that they were pertinent to the objectives of the study.

Next, the researchers collaboratively developed preliminary domains according to patterns and themes they observed amongst the identified frames of analyses. Domains were not used to categorize data unless both researchers agreed on the validity of that domain being represented amongst the data. Additionally, frames of analyses were not assigned to a domain

unless both researchers agreed upon the assignment. Both researchers determined which preliminary domains were pertinent to the present study.

The primary investigator was responsible for re-reading the transcriptions to determine if they supported or disconfirmed the domains that were created by both researchers. During this step, the primary investigator recorded where relationships existed within the text. Subsequently, the primary investigator conducted an analysis within each domain to identify new links, relationships, and subcategories. The primary investigator additionally looked for themes and connections across domains, and identified where these themes were represented within the text. The primary investigator created a master outline that illustrated the relationships within and among the domains. Additionally, the researcher listed the themes that were apparent in the outline, as well as other themes that were common in the interviews but that were not represented in the outline. Finally, the primary investigator selected excerpts from the interviews that supported the identified domains and themes.

RESULTS

Analysis of the interviews was conducted according to the method defined above. Results include a comprehensive outline of the domains that emerged from the interview data. Additionally, results include themes that were embedded within the interview data upon further analysis by the primary investigator. The primary investigator included a participant comment in the comprehensive outline if the comment was made by at least three participants. The primary investigator also required that, for an embedded theme to be considered prevalent enough to report upon, data from at least six participants (with the exception of one theme) had to support the identified theme. The primary investigator tried to capture all of the faculty perceptions and to report on themes and ideas that, though some may not have had every participant comment upon, were determined pertinent to the results of the present study.

The outline in Appendix A summarizes the domains and categories created from the data. This outline creates a sense of order and context for this study's results.

Domain I: Faculty Perceptions of the Professional Development Domain

During the interview, the primary investigator asked the participants what they liked about the professional development, what they disliked, and what suggestions they had to improve the professional development activities and workshops in which they participated. As a result of the directness of the interview questions, participants' responses could be classified into three sub-domains under the Faculty Perceptions domain: *Expressed Likes, Expressed Dislikes*, and *Proposed Suggestions*.

Most of the participants' expressed likes, dislikes, and proposed suggestions could be classified into two categories: the content of the professionally development activities and the structure of the professional development activities. There is one exception to these types of

classification: Under the sub-domain, Expressed Dislikes, participants expressed a dislike for a lack of time. This dislike did not easily fit under the content or structure category because it did not refer to a specific aspect of the professional development; it merely refers to the aspect of a lack of time in general. This result, therefore, was not forced into either category and was considered a separate category.

Expressed likes. With regards to the content category of the Expressed Likes sub-domain, participants' likes could be categorized even further into four overall aspects of the content of the professional development. Participants indicated that they liked when the content was informative, or when the content included information explaining why what they were learning was important. Included in the informative aspect of the professional development, participants also explained that they liked being given concrete examples of what cultural responsiveness looks like. Participants also liked certain characteristics and approaches of the presenters. Participants explained that they liked when presenters were knowledgeable, personable, when they could use presenters as resources in the future, and when presenters seemed to validate the faculty. Another content aspect that participants reported they liked was that of getting to conduct the student interviews. Finally, participants reported that they liked when the activities involved faculty members, allowing them to contribute to the content of the activity by participating in and being active learners during the activity.

In terms of the informative aspect of the professional development, participants said the following:

Participant #85475: "I thought the professional development covered a lot of areas. I appreciated the information on the BEEDE, from the BEEDE perspective. And I also liked the information we got from Presenter #1 and I appreciated the specific training we received from

Presenter #2 in linguistic ways of thinking and how things are maybe different for kids. So it's been a pretty good mix, I think, of both multicultural aspects and also the language aspect. My opinion is it's been a pretty…it's covered a pretty broad area that's very informative."

Participant #10480: "I also like to hear about the reasons that we should be doing this. I think that really helps to change my philosophy, like why is this valuable, why do we need to have that happen. So those things have been really helpful."

In terms of characteristics and approaches of the presenters, participants said the following:

Participant #85475: "I found all of our presenters to be very personable and I felt it wasn't just professional…For me it was a good, comfortable way to do things. I felt like I gained information, but I also felt like I could talk to those people again if I had questions, which I have done."

Participant # 77921: "I think with both of them [the presenters], they shared information about second language learners that just fit and aligned back into my concept of how we need to teach."

In terms of doing the student interviews, participants said the following:

Participant #42167: "I liked the interviewing, and I liked that we did it in the student's home. I felt like it allowed me an even stronger opportunity to understand the student's, […] background. And it just really, putting that personal note on it really made me be more sensitive to that [the student's background]. It really made me connect to it better I think."

Participant #77921: "That [the interview] was one of the neatest experiences that I've had as we've done this over the past several years. […] It was really neat just to see where they

were at, what their life was like, and to be in a more informal setting where you could talk and

learn more about them than what you get in the classroom, which is pretty limited."

In terms of activities that involved the faculty, participants said the following:

Participant #99562: "I liked when there was opportunity for interaction [during the

workshops], instead of just being lectured to. I liked experiencing some things. The first year the

[…] instructor […] actually had us do some activities that you would typically do with ESL

training, and so we experienced some things that way."

Participant #96301:

P: "We saw a movie [during a workshop] that was made about a group of girls from New

York City who came to BYU.

I: "[…] What did you like about that?"

P: "Oh, we had an excellent discussion afterwards. And I just remember being very

touched, on the inside. It gave me some understanding; I was very moved by that, when we

watched that video. And then we had an exchange and I guess what I took away from that was

'wow…we don't mean to exclude people, but we do that sometimes, without meaning to.' For

me the video plus the discussion was a moving experience."

With regards to the structure category of the Expressed Likes sub-domain, participants'

likes could again be categorized even further into four overall aspects of the structure of the

professional development. Participants reported that they liked when they had the opportunity to

collaborate during the professional development and share ideas of techniques that they'd

attempted that worked or didn't work. Additionally, faculty reported that they liked when they

collaborated with the grant coordinators and had input into the design of the professional

development. Faculty indicated that they liked when they were personally held accountable for

their own involvement and progress in the professional development. They indicated that being able to choose personal goals allowed them to focus on things that were already important to them. Finally, faculty also reported that they liked when the activities were held off campus.

In terms of when the professional development activities included faculty collaboration, participants said the following:

Participant #46573: "I think the most effective professional development […] activities have been when we as faculty have been able to share. Specifically we've had a couple where we've been able to talk about things that have worked for us and gleaned from each others' ideas… Things that haven't worked for us, being able to talk about concerns that we have and problem solve how to resolve those concerns. So those have been the most meaningful [activities]."

Participant #96301: "One thing that I think [has] been very helpful is that those who wrote the grant […] solicited our input along the way. You know, 'what have you liked, what would you like to change?' And I remember last year, when we kind of reevaluated the direction we were going, there were some suggestions made that we needed to change […] They responded to the feedback and so experiences this year have been much different, and I think it's good. It gives us more variety."

In terms of when the faculty members were individually and personally held accountable for their own involvement and progress in the professional development, participants said the following:

Participant #89579: "I liked choosing the IEP (Individualized Education Plan) […] because it helped me hone in on something that was important to me."

Participant #48360: "I liked that we had to be there (at the professional development activity/workshop) every time and our attendance mattered."

Participant #46573: "[…] We had to come up with identified goals of what we were going to do that […] got to be individualized and how we were going to proceed with our own training. […] In the end I have quite liked that because it's been a self-study approach, and I got to focus on things that I was really invested in and that were matched up with other pieces of my profession."

In terms of when the professional development activities were held off campus, participants said the following:

Participant #48360: "I thought it was a good idea that we left our immediate faculty room. We typically had them in a different location, and I think that helped us to be more focused and to see that it was more of a commitment."

Participant #99562: "I liked them [the professional development activities] when they were offsite, at least not in the McKay (Education) building, so that [we] didn't feel torn between [our] office […] and [we] could really focus."

Expressed dislikes. With regards to the content category of the Expressed Dislikes sub-domain, participants' dislikes could be categorized further into two overall aspects of the content of the professional development. Participants indicated that they disliked certain characteristics and approaches of the presenters from the professional development activities. Specifically, participants reported that they disliked when presenters did not attend to the objectives of the professional development workshop and when presenters only engaged in a lecture style of presentation. Participants also reported that they disliked the lack of honest faculty reflection during the professional development activities.

In terms of the characteristics and approaches of the presenters, participants said the following:

Participant #48360:

I: "[…] Is there anything […] that you really didn't care for during the workshops or the interviewing?"

P: "[…] The inability of presenters to really focus on the topic and to give their message succinctly […] It seemed like there was a lot of rambling along and then we'd finally get to the topic or something […] It was just undesirable because we were already sacrificing time from something else, and then to not feel like it was used in the best way was disappointing."

Participant #46573: "I did not care for when [presenter name] was here […] I don't do well when somebody's talking at me for hours on end. So I don't find that productive […] I didn't even find a lot of what he talked about to be very relevant to what we were doing […] I like it more when it's more engaging, when we can ask questions and the questions pertain to what we're doing […] I think when you're talked at for hours on end I think it just becomes really irrelevant […] the content became irrelevant over time. It was their agenda."

In terms of the lack of honest faculty reflection, participants said the following:

Participant #10480: "[…] One thing that kind of bothers me is sometimes we get into the professional development and everybody's super positive, and sharing all these moments, and how this has changed them, and then later I feel like, well you hear all these grumblings, or people still aren't successful. Or, you know, students are still unsuccessful, or professors are still unhappy."

Participant #42167: "I'm not sure that we really addressed the fact that we were a dominant White faculty, and we probably really have some prejudices of our own. But I think

any time those came up, I think they were suppressed […] And so it was just kind of, we had certain thoughts and ideas of how things should be happening, and I'm not sure that we really gave ourselves an opportunity to, almost, disagree and have debates about the topics. We just kind of, people might say something and then it would just kind of get pushed aside […] It might have been healthy to have a few debates about it and to really put out on the table what we're thinking."

With regards to the structure category of the Expressed Dislikes sub-domain, participants' dislikes could be categorized further into two overall aspects of the structure of the professional development. Participants indicated that they disliked when the professional development activities were repetitive and they disliked when the professional development did not have clear, meaningful objectives.

In terms of the professional development activities being repetitive, the participants said the following:

Participant #89579: […] It (the professional development activities) got kind of repetitive […] and we had one individual who came several times and it was, I didn't see the benefit of continued experiences with him […] I didn't really see any difference and any change."

Participant #10480: "I like when it's goal-oriented, that we've actually done something and we come back to report on that […] But I feel like sometimes if we just come back and we're rehashing the same thing we rehashed the last time we were there, then it doesn't feel productive."

In terms of the professional development activities not having clear, meaningful objectives, the participants said the following:

Participant #42167: "[…] I wasn't able to put the pieces together as well as I should have on my own. But I felt like we would get together and one professor would share all these neat ideas that she was doing in her classroom, but I'm not sure that the ideas were necessarily what we had been trained on […] And when we first started, too, a lot of the BEEDE training—they showed us the posters and the videos. To be really honest, I'm not sure I got a lot out of that. I'm just still unclear of what the goal was for that training. Again, I think I got bits and pieces, but I really missed the main objective."

Participant 89579: "I think whenever a new program comes along people say, 'oh wait a minute […] what meaning does this really have for me in my life?' And so I think […] maybe again the objective and the goal weren't clear in each one of our minds."

With regards to the lack of time category of the Expressed Dislikes sub-domain, participants' dislikes were not categorized into any sub-categories. Participants indicated that they disliked feeling like they did not have enough time to attend to the professional development requirements or to integrate everything that they wanted to from the professional development.

In terms of the lack of time, participants said the following:

Participant #96301:

I: "What did you dislike about the activities and interviewing the student?"

P: […] Maybe just the fact that it was, you know, you have to make time to do those things. But it was well worth the time."

Participant #48360: "I think the only thing I really didn't like is that it was just hard to put more things into the same amount of time. We didn't get an extra day in the week to do this or anything like that."

Proposed suggestions. With regards to the content category of the Proposed Suggestions sub-domain, participants' suggestions could be categorized further into two overall aspects of the content of the professional development. Participants proposed that there be more variety in the professional development in the format of the presentation/presenters as well as in the content of the professional development activities. Faculty also suggested that they conduct more student interviews than the ones they completed for the professional development and that they conduct them when the students are in an earlier phase in the program.

In terms of the professional development activities having more variety, participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "I think that we needed a little bit more diversity in the number of presenters as we were learning about it [being culturally responsive]. […] It would have been nice to have some other folk that do more with culturally responsive education come in and address us and talk about some of the issues, etc."

Participant #10480: "[…] It seems like we often talk about the Hispanic culture, just because I think that's where most of our students come from—that background, Spanish-speaking. But we haven't talked a lot about other cultures, so that might be valuable. [Also] I feel like we've talked more about working with students at BYU, which is probably what we need to be talking about, than we have about helping our students to be aware of cultural diversity."

In terms of faculty conducting more student interviews and conducting them earlier, participants said the following:

Participant #77921: "I wish we could do those types of things [the student interviews] for all of our students."

Participant #22368: "It's just think it was too bad it was when the students were at the end of the program, rather than at the beginning, or even in the middle, because then you would know so much more about them, and about how you could help on a broader scale."

With regards to the structure category of the Proposed Suggestions sub-domain, participants' suggestions could be categorized further into four overall aspects of the structure of the professional development. Participants proposed that the professional development be more objective driven, that professional development presenters and/or facilitators demonstrate more concrete ways to apply the culturally responsive methods, that the professional development be better organized (i.e., that more support be implemented to help faculty and that more hands-on activities be implemented earlier in the professional development), and that the professional development activities promote more faculty involvement.

In terms of the professional development being more objective driven, the participants said the following:

Participant #96301: "[…] Making sure that time is well spent, that there's some structure there, and that we have a definite objective […] Staying focused […] And generally that's been the case, that it's always been a specific objective."

Participant #99562: "I would have liked a little bit more specificity on the purpose […] At times it appears to be a hodge-podge of people coming in and who had expertise in this and […] they all related to culturally linguistic diversity. But what did we really need, and can we focus on that need? […] We needed some opportunity to get together and sort of have a foundation. But I would have liked to say, 'okay, this is what we needed the faculty to come out with: X, Y, Z.'"

In terms of the professional development presenters and/or facilitators demonstrating more concrete ways to apply the learned culturally responsive methods, participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "I think that we've gone sort of through the modeling stage, but there are still some other pieces we could go back and pick up through the modeling stage […] I don't even think we're in independent practice yet. I think we're in guided practice, and we're rotating between modeling and guided practice."

Participant #48360: "I think that it would be really nice to watch other teachers who are using ESL format of a lesson plan and actually delivering instruction. I think that would be nice to see. I think that would be helpful training for me. Because we just heard about it or read things, and I like someone to actually show me how to implement the topics that we talk about."

Participant #77921: " […] With the idea that we implemented this year, the IEP's, I would like to be less on my own with it. Maybe somebody who knows more to be able to say, 'okay here's some things that I [referring to self] need to know as a teacher of teachers, so which of these things do you want to participate in?' And […] help [guide] us, because I don't feel like I've known enough. It took me a while to write my objectives because I just felt like I didn't know enough to really pinpoint anything down."

In terms of the professional development being better organized, the participants said the following:

Participant #89579: "[…] I think it would've been more clear and seemed more directed if there had been a more set goal […] It seemed more like, 'well let's do this and let's do this, and we need some more hours.' But I got the feeling that it was more directed in this last little bit. And it was probably because they had more experience under their belt of where to go."

Participant #22358:

P: "There's no system in place to catch [faculty] up on the […] things […] missed

I: "So it sounds like […] maybe implement more support for the faculty?"

P: "Or make-up sessions, make-up sessions. Or minutes from the meetings, or just some way to get caught up."

Participant #77921: "[…] We were asked to develop our own individualized education plans, for goals that we had, and so that gave us an opportunity. But I guess I would have liked to have a field trip or something where we could go into a classroom of diverse learners and participate in and see what's going on in that classroom. […] Many of us are doing that; that's one of my goals I'm doing for mine. But I would have liked some more of that along the way, or activities of actually developing materials for our classes, kind of workshoppy sort of things."

Domain II: Overall Impact of the Professional Development Domain

During the interview the primary investigator asked participants if they felt like they had changed in any way or made any changes in response to the professional development activities and/or conducting the interview with the student. The primary investigator also asked participants to explain how they had made changes or how they felt they had changed. As a result, participant responses were separated into three domains: (a) Overall Impact of the Professional Development Domain, (b) Impact of the Student Interview Domain, and (c) Impact of Collaboration Domain, of which the first is presently being discussed.

The reported overall impact of the professional development can be classified into two sub-domains: (a) Changes that Faculty Reported Occurred and (b) Goal Formulated. The Goal Formulated sub-domain describes the one common goal that participants' reported they wanted

to pursue as a result of things they had learned from the professional development activities and workshops.

Changes that faculty reported occurred. In the Changes that Faculty Reported Occurred sub-domain, the participants' responses can be classified into two categories: internal changes and external changes. The internal changes category describes changes that occurred within faculty members. These include changes in faculty's knowledge, thoughts, beliefs and feelings. The external changes category describes concrete and observable changes that the faculty made in how they approach their students and the courses they teach.

With regards to the internal changes category in the Changes sub-domain, participants' responses can be could be further categorized into five types of internal changes that faculty reported occurred. Faculty reported gaining an increased understanding about implementing culturally responsive practices, an increased understanding about the impact of culture and language in education, an increased sensitivity towards students, and learning how to balance between making accommodations and keeping high standards.

In terms of an increased understanding about implementing culturally responsive practices, participants said the following:

Participant #77921: "I think the professional development hastened them [the changes reported] along because it caused me to be more aware of it [being culturally responsive]. I think eventually, watching and seeing that, 'Oh well these…hmm, maybe I will try to micromanage these groups a little bit and do some more of this in the classroom'—I think I probably eventually would have done that. But [the professional development] helped me purposely think about it and implement it more quickly.

Participant #46573: "I've learned a lot about how to teach in different ways through this process."

Participant #99562: "I think it's [the professional development] made me more sensitive to ensure that I model those culturally responsive practices in my own teaching […] I just hope that I'm always an example to others; it's made me more conscious of my own practice."

In terms of an increased understanding about the impact of culture and language in education, participants said the following:

Participant #37570: " […] We had [presenter name] come several times. His [the presenter] culture and his personal style—he tells a story and he makes us find the principle to the story—completely opposite way of the way I function. And so it just shows me, okay, some of my other students in the program are probably that way. They probably don't understand this linear way of thinking […] But if we told them a story, they could garner the meaning from the story."

Participant #85475: "I've also realized, though, that there's another issue out there that we don't have control over that's highly impactful for kids' learning, for literacy learning […] And that's the fact that if kids come here at younger ages, they may not have become solidly literate in their first language. And the research really tells us that good literacy in the first language greatly enhances literacy acquisition in their second language. We don't really have any control over that, but, somehow, we need to be able to—in the schools—have a way to help students who don't have a good literacy in any language."

In terms of an increased sensitivity towards students, participants said the following:

Participant #10480: "I think the professional development made me think about […] how to work with [English language learners or second English language speakers] a lot differently.

[To] probably [be] more patient in looking at their culture. […] Just to be more open minded, probably, than I would have been in the past."

Participant #42167: "I feel like I've become a lot more sensitive to diverse needs […] I think this has taught me to be more individualized with my students; to honor the diversity that they have, whether that [is] diversity of being a single mom […] or it's diversity of, maybe culturally, they didn't understand the expectations."

In terms of learning how to make accommodations and keep high standards, the participants said the following:

Participant #77921: "I think another thing, too, that I've been more aware of is the final product that I want. […] Is it really as important to have all of the i's dotted and the t's crossed and all the grammar perfect, or am I more after the concept? And sometimes both are important, and sometimes they're not."

Participant #46573: "On a professional level, what that [the professional development] has caused me to do in many levels is to make a lot more accommodations within my teaching, but not to lower my expectations […] I'm definitely more open to making adjustments within my curriculum and instruction strategies."

With regards to the external changes category in the Changes sub-domain, participants' responses could be further categorized into four types of external changes that the faculty reported occurred. Faculty reported making more accommodations for students on assessments as well as in the supports they offered in their classrooms. Faculty also reported making changes in their curricula, specifically in the objectives and in the class content of their curricula. Faculty additionally reported making changes in their instructional methods.

In terms of making accommodations for students, participants said the following:

Participant #89579: "[…] I've made adaptations for them and accommodations as far as, not the quality, but how they've turned in assignments. I spend more time with them to make sure they understand the assignment. When we're doing group work I go over and clarify questions […] Accommodations as far as offering tests to be read to them […] When they can't navigate a computer system I've let them take it paper and pencil."

Participant #46573: "I'm willing to provide accommodations for readings. I'm willing to provide accommodations for testing—[…] so if somebody needs extra support for testing, like they need the questions read to them […] I've been willing to let them do a glossary to have on hand for the test. I have been more accommodating on not grading written language—so on spelling, and even just the whole structure form of the writing. I have helped them to be resourceful in finding support for their written assignments that need to get done […] An adjustment I made this year is that I made sure that I met with students in small groups after class to make sure that students were getting clarification. I do group quizzes in my class. I do a lot of group work particularly during class. I think that makes a difference in their learning experience."

Participant #10480: "[…] I co-taught a class with another professor and we would talk through issues [about] students who […] were second language speakers and [we] just talked about what we could do for them […] Group work was a good thing that helped; extending due dates was another thing that was helpful."

In terms of making curricular changes, participants said the following:

Participant #37570: "I've added a real complex question to my final exam, which is really fun. So it's a […] non-English speaker […] Someone who comes from a Hispanic background who is high-school aged—because I wasn't doing enough secondary stuff—parents

don't speak English, siblings do…so I gave this a real complex case study of someone that they [the faculty member's students] may encounter. And so what will they do given this case scenario and the goals they have for this child? So I've added one real complex question on my final exam for that class."

Participant #48360: "I feel like I have definitely made changes in my courses. […] We are including four other tests that help us to discriminate between a language difference and a disability […] I think we've focused our learning methods differently. We've had speakers with different expertise come and share things with particular groups. We focus more on vocabulary."

Participant #96301: "[…] One of our [the faculty] goals has been to look at our curriculum in each class, and to integrate [cultural responsiveness]. For instance, in our behavior class this semester, one thing that we've added as a result of the professional development [is] positive behavioral support and culture. In other words, how do you bring positive behavioral support to students who are culturally diverse? […] And then we give them assignments now, we don't just ask them to consider one behavior, per se. We ask them always to consider the cultural implications. So assignments have changed."

In terms of making instructional changes, participants said the following:

Participant #89579: "Typically when we [the faculty] have done observations [during practicum], you go in, you observe, you say, 'these are the things I'd like you to work on,' and leave it with the student. And the next time you go back it's up to the student to attend to what our feedback has been. And what I've done this last semester is I've had the students look at the feedback that has been given to them and focus on one area where they feel that they need to be strengthened. And then […] during the time of the observation I, of course, grade them on everything, but I really focus on that and then we talk about it at the end."

Participant #46573: "An adjustment I made this year is that I made sure that I met with students in small groups after class to make sure that students were getting clarification [...] I did that because I have learned that the students who English isn't their first language weren't necessarily capturing the content as quickly as they needed to [...] My fall class is very intense [...] So I just felt like they needed that support."

Goal formulated. With regards to the Goal Formulated sub-domain, participants' responses can be classified into one category. Faculty reported that they formulated a goal to "gain more knowledge" about culturally responsive practices and implementation.

In terms of the goals faculty formulated to gain more knowledge, participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "The changes that happened were that I need to know more [...] and be able to put it [being culturally responsive] into practice with my students and help them understand their role when they go out into the schools in being culturally responsive."

Participant #77921: "One of my goals I'm doing for [my IEP is] go[ing] into a classroom of diverse learners and participate [...] and see what's going on in that classroom."

Domain III: Impact of the Student Interview Domain

Many of the responses from the faculty about changes they felt they had made as a result of the professional development activities and the student interviews were particular to having occurred specifically as a result of the student interviews. The principal investigator, therefore, created a separate domain for the results that faculty reported as they pertain to the specific activity of interviewing the students in their homes.

Changes that faculty reported occurred. The results that the faculty reported occurred as consequences of conducting the student interviews can be classified into two sub-domains: (a)

Changes that the Faculty Reported Occurred and (b) Expectations Violated. In the Changes that

the Faculty Reported Occurred sub-domain, participant responses can further be categorized into

internal changes and external changes. As mentioned, the internal changes category describes

changes that occurred within faculty members. These include changes in faculty's knowledge,

thoughts, beliefs and feelings. The external changes category describes concrete and observable

changes that the faculty made in how they approach their students and the courses they teach.

With regards to the internal changes category, participant responses could further be

categorized into the three types of internal changes that faculty reported occurred. Faculty

reported having a change in their personal attitudes and/or perceptions about their students as

well as about themselves. Faculty also reported having an increased understanding for students

and their backgrounds. Finally, faculty reported recognizing the need to build relationships with

students in order to help students learn and meet their needs.

In terms of developing a change in personal attitude and/or perception about students or

themselves, the participants said the following:

Participant #96301: "The [student] interview in particular helped me recognize that

that's something I need to be aware of in myself: That I do, especially with students if I think

they're not applying themselves, I may be judgmental. I may not understand. I think initially I

was judgmental [about a student]. I just assumed. I just assumed that what I was asking them to

do was not difficult."

Participant #42167: "I was connecting [the information learned during professional

development] in a very wrong way. It was, 'Why didn't I get this opportunity? Just because I'm

White, why couldn't I have this scholarship?' But then to realize, to be able to see a perspective

of somebody else and why. When I was interviewing that woman and she was saying how she

was basically an orphan and molested and all these things—like I said, where much is given, much is expected. Well, I had been given so much by ways of education and a loving family. My family might not have had the financial means to support me, but they certainly supported me going to college […] Some of the students were saying they weren't really supported to go to college because they were a woman. And so it really made me realize what a difference it was. And it wasn't the same playing field, like I kind of thought before, thinking, 'well why did they get this, I didn't get it?' And it really made me realize the need for the individuality."

In terms of having an increased understanding for students' backgrounds and how they view the university teacher preparation program, the participants said the following:

Participant #10480: "I think one thing that was good for me about the interview is, as we were talking, I think I tended to lump everybody into one category. Everyone that [is] culturally diverse kind of will all behave this way, or have these issues. But talking to a person from that culture, [I realized] that everybody is going to be different, even within a certain culture. So I think that was kind of enlightening to me, to realize that I needed to know each of them probably individually. That they came from really different backgrounds, and not everybody was the same."

Participant #46573: "I also think the other thing the interview did for me was I realized how important it is to make sure I do continue to have high expectations in my classes. Students really value that […] What I did see in that discussion, in the interview, was that they valued, or he valued the fact that I wanted them to learn, and that I taught them things that were of practical importance."

In terms of recognizing the need to build relationships with students, the participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "It [the student interview] was just fun to sit down with students and just have a conversation and talk about the program: What they expect, how their lives fit into it, what their needs are, what their values about education are, what their families values about education were. So it was more helpful, I think, in giving me a further affirmation that we need to build relationships with our students. [We need to] sit down with them and talk with them, find out what their needs are. And they're not always that open to share that because we're passing ships! We're on the same ship for a little while, and then we get off and go to our different destinations."

Participant #46573: "One of the things that came out in the interviewing that just stood out to me the very most was that it makes such a difference if the professor cares about the student. Which, you know, if you don't know somebody cares about you, you really won't let them teach you, and you're not going to teach them. There's just not that interchange."

With regards to the external changes category, participant responses could be categorized into one type of external change that faculty reported occurred. Faculty reported changing their professional approach towards students as a result of conducting the student interview. By changing their professional approach, faculty members explained that they provided accommodations for students or interacted with them differently.

In terms of faculty changing their professional approach, the participants said the following:

Participant #89579: "I do think I approach my students differently now than I did before. [I look] at them each as individuals and what's going on in their lives."

Participant #48360: "I was probably more patient [after conducting the student interview] because I know that she has a lot of challenges with the language and she was a more

mature student. Especially, things like technology skills didn't come easily, and I probably gave her more help, more accommodations, once I understood that."

Expectations violated. With regards to the sub-domain, Expectations Violated, participants' responses could not be categorized any further. The Expectations Violated sub-domain describes expectations or assumptions that faculty members expressed adhering to before they conducted the student interview that were challenged, or violated, as a result of the information they learned from the student interview.

In terms of expectations that were violated, the participants said the following:

Participant #99562: "She [the student that was interviewed] was quite direct, which was appreciated, but also had several negative things to say about the program. And I was not expecting that, so that part was a surprise."

Participant #85475: "I was surprised by the idea that some people may not want to pass on their culture because of some particular philosophy or belief. They may feel, like in this case, the mother felt the person would be better to separate themselves from the old culture and just be American. And I don't think I was expecting that."

Participant #42167: "[During the student interview] I said, 'So what would your recommendation be for teachers?' And I thought she'd say something more like, 'well, just be sensitive to the fact that it's hard.' And she said, 'You need to be strict with us. You need to hold the standard high for us because we need to know this.' And so it kind of opened my eyes."

Domain IV: Impact of Collaboration Domain

Many of the results faculty reported occurred due to the professional development particularly applied to the collaboration that they engaged in during the professional development activities. The principal investigator, therefore, created a separate domain for

results that were reported to occur as they pertain to the specific activity of collaborating during the professional development.

With regards to the Impact of Collaboration domain, participants' responses could be categorized further into two different types of results that occurred due to collaboration. Participants indicated that they developed an increased knowledge for implementation and application and that they developed a broadened perspective and/or awareness.

Increased knowledge for implementation/application. In terms of an increased knowledge for implementation and application, the participants said the following:

Participant #99562: "I guess I could have read some books, I could have watched some video tapes, I could have […] done some things individually. But it's just not the same as getting together as a group and all experiencing the same thing together. And we did have a couple of shares where faculty shared what's working for them and that, I know for some faculty, was very enlightening."

Broadened perspective and/or awareness. In terms of a broadened perspective and/or awareness, the participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "When you do [professional development] in a collaborative setting, you're apt to see it from several different points of view that will enrich the experience. So when you have professional development, yes I can study this, but if I don't go talk about it then it won't be as meaningful. I'll only have one perspective. But if I talk about it with someone who has studied the same thing then the perspectives will be much broadened for that person as well as me […] But if you're not doing it collegially, in a collaborative setting, you don't get that opportunity."

Themes Embedded in the Interview Data

The principal investigator discovered themes embedded within the interviews that did not fit into the identified salient domains, but that nevertheless existed in the data. The principal investigator identified most ideas as themes if at least 50% (or 6) of the participants interviewed referred to the said theme or idea. One of the themes, however, was not referred to by at least 50% of the participants. The principal investigator included it as one of the themes embedded in the interview data, however, because of the strong emotion that was attached to the idea that the theme expresses by one of the participants. A total of five themes were identified, the final theme being that which did not meet the 50% response rate requirement.

Theme 1: Faculty make connections through self-reflection. Many faculty members indicated that they reflected on their own personal experiences as they pertained to cultural responsiveness, cultural awareness, discrimination, and pedagogy throughout the course of the professional development activities. Often times these reflections occurred because the faculty members were either prompted to do so by an activity facilitator or because something in a professional development activity reminded them of an experience they had. Regardless of what incited faculty members to reflect on personal experiences, they typically reported being able to connect better with the concept they were learning in the professional development as a result of referring to their own experiences that they felt related to the topic at hand. Three faculty members indicated that reflecting on times they felt discriminated in the past helped them to understand the feelings of discrimination students may feel. In other words, self-reflection promoted empathic responses from faculty.

In terms of faculty being able to make connections through self-reflection, the participants said the following:

Participant 96301: "[…] The first thing he [the presenter] had us do was examine our own belief system. And he kind of approached it with the idea that we all have our own journey, and we each have an important journey. And when have I felt that I was a minority? And what was the impact of that? […]And so he had us share that perspective as a faculty. And I think it helped us connect…"

Participant #15011: […] This topic happens to be very dear to my heart because we have a lot of the same issues in my family. So I come from a very…it comes from a very personal place. And in my own teaching practice I was heavily involved in ESL, etc. I've had poverty trainings and all of those pieces … so my background already, and that interest that was built. It's been built since I was young! So when this kind of training comes up, I'm just thirsty for more. I want to check out and verify what I know already and learn something else that I can attach."

Participant #46573: "I think what it [the professional development] helped me to see is that my background, my experiences in life, that there was a lot more alignment than I thought there was […] I've served a foreign mission in a very poor country, one of the poorest in the world. And it helped me to see that that experience had prepared me in a lot of ways for working with people with diverse backgrounds that come from societies where there's not a lot of affluence […] So I think what it helped me to see is that myself, I looked at myself as being quite different and that I perceived that they thought I was quite different and then, in the end, and I think this is something I know as a special educator, that rather than look at our differences we often can look at our similarities and see that there is overlap, and then recognize that our differences are there, which were real […] So you know when this person [student interview] talked about his different educational backgrounds, well I can identify with different educational

backgrounds from my experience on a mission […] And so I guess what I was able to do was to find a lot more commonalities. And, again, recognize that the differences weren't keeping me as far away from those people as, perhaps, I had perceived."

Theme 2: Professional development facilitating change. After faculty reported the changes they felt they had made from the professional development, the primary investigator asked faculty members if they felt these changes could have been made without having participated in the professional development. In response, almost all faculty members indicated that either the changes to be more culturally responsive could not have been made at all, or that they could not have been made to the extent that they were without the professional development. Some faculty members indicated that the professional development acted as a catalyst. In other words, the faculty reported that changes probably could not have been made or implemented as quickly as they were had it not been for the professional development.

Some faculty members reported that the professional development acted as a guide, or a map, to know how to implement culturally responsive methods in their classrooms and professions. In other words, they reported that changes would not have been as successfully implemented had it not been for the guidance offered by the professional development activities. The principal investigator failed to ask five participants if they felt the changes they reported could have been made without the professional development.

In terms of the professional development acting as a catalyst or a guide for faculty in implementing culturally responsive practices, the participants said the following:

Participant #37570: "Without it [the professional development] we wouldn't really be integrating things into our classes. We would, my sense is we would be talking superficially about things but not really being forced to change the way we practice…the way we teach."

Participant #10480: "[…] I think it's all [the professional development] made us think about things differently…look at this as instead of just an issue that you read about, something that you actually have to figure out how to do in your own classes."

Participant #96301: "[…] I think some changes would have occurred. I think there would have been some change, probably on the part of all of us, just because we want to stay abreast of best practice […] So I think some change probably would have occurred […] I don't believe, personally, in my case, it would have been as much […] It's been a richer experience and it's come more quickly."

Participant #48360: "I probably wouldn't have knowing what to do on my own. So I think they [the professional development activities] were instrumental in helping me to see where to go and what to do, especially the [student] interview. I don't think I would have noticed that or become aware on my own."

Theme 3: Time is a barrier. Almost every faculty member, with the exception of two, referred to the issue of feeling limited by time within the profession. While all faculty members referred to the professional development (particularly the student interviews) as being a positive experience, they also expressed the difficulty of having enough time to implement more things into their current practices and to build relationships with students. Faculty members also discussed their desire for the professional development to be more organized and more objective-driven. The principal investigator interpreted these comments to stem from a desire to use time wisely and efficiently since it (time) is perceived as scarce. Three participants confirmed this hypothesis indirectly as they spoke about the need to be efficient in the professional development activities due to time constraints.

In terms of time being a barrier, the participants said the following:

Participant #15011: "I think that scheduling time to do things is a very important element of getting things done […] Because we're busy getting ready for our classes, organizing a new course, observing a new course, observing students, and often times we don't put into our schedules the time we actually need to sit down and learn something new that may not really be in our field of interest at the time."

Participant #48360: "It seemed like there was a lot of rambling along and then we'd finally get to the topic or something […] It was just undesirable because we were already sacrificing time from something else, and then to not feel like it was used in the best way was disappointing."

Participant #99562: "It [the professional development] provided structure to engage in things that faculty, myself included, usually don't have the time or make the time to do."

Theme 4: Leaving campus facilitating learning. Several faculty members explained that they enjoyed having professional development activities off campus. Some faculty members commented that meeting off campus for workshops encouraged increased focus during the professional development workshop or activity. Some faculty members commented that engaging in activities related to the professional development that required them to observe or interact with others (e.g., going to observe in a dual-immersion classroom in a nearby public school) facilitated their ability to better learn about culturally responsive techniques. Both types of comments reflected the perception that faculty felt more productive when they left their offices to learn about culturally responsive methods.

In terms of leaving the office facilitating an increased learning and focus, the participants said the following:

Participant #48360: "I thought it was a good idea that we left our immediate faculty room. We typically had them in a different location, and I think that helped us to be more focused and to see that it was more of a commitment."

Participant #15011: "[…] You know, one of the things that we talked about in faculty meeting was going out and doing something…getting our hands in the pot […] Going out into the schools and actually working with, going into the classroom and working with one of our students who's working with a diverse population […] Going into the classroom and really seeing what's going on […] I think you have a better idea of what to help a student with by going out and actually seeing it."

Participant #42167: "[…] We got to choose how we would complete our final fifteen hours […] and so I chose to go to a dual-immersion school. And I just felt like that really helped me to get an idea of what was going on better […] It was really good for me to see that, and I can take that for my own paradigm […]"

Theme 5: Conflict in balancing expectations and accommodations. The final predominant theme that the primary investigator identified did not meet the afore-mentioned 50% criterion for theme inclusion. Only three participants commented on the conflict they have experienced in knowing how to balance high expectations while at the same time providing appropriate accommodations for students. Theme 5 was included in the present study, however, because of the strong emotion that accompanied one of the participant's comment. Additionally, this participant indicated a perceived need for the department to be aware of the conflict faculty experience in balancing high expectations and making accommodations, and that the department comes to a consensus about how faculty can maintain high expectations and standards and still make necessary accommodations for students.

In terms of faculty experiencing a conflict in balancing high expectations and making accommodations for students, the participants said the following:

Participant #42167: "I think a big struggle a lot of the faculty have had with all of this training has been how do you keep a standard and how are we sensitive to individual needs. And that's been difficult. That's been really tricky."

Participant #37570: "[…] I think our biggest struggle as a faculty is our expectations are up here (raises hand above head). We want them to be the very best teachers for students with disabilities as possible. And for people who come in with a really high GPA and really high ACT/SAT—it's easy to make that expectation, generally. You come to class, you do your homework, you do a good job, you proofread your work and you submit it. Then you go out on the weekends and you have a good time. It's pretty easy for those students. But for those who come from other countries, particularly international students or low income poverty situations, diverse cultures, they have much more room to meet that expectation. And given the amount of time that we have I don't, it's really, really, really hard. So that's my dilemma […] we do know there's a point that's acceptable. I want to get them to that acceptable point […]

"And of course there are some who are more relaxed about it [the standard], some who are more rigid about it, and we just need a happy medium to say, 'yes, this is what is acceptable and at that point we know they'll do a good job in the schools. Below that point they're not going to help kids in the school' […]'

Participant #46573: "I don't think we're [the department] clear on what we can and can't do. I feel like there is a level of discussion about expectations that do need to be modified […] I don't think we're clear on what the departmental expectation is in that area [keeping the standard and providing accommodations] […] I think it's pretty gray right now. And that, to me, is

unfortunate because I think we should have a standard of what students rise to in order to be effective teachers. And I think that that standard should drive what the outcomes look like. And I think that it changes from semester to semester and from student to student. And I'm not sure that I agree with that."

Faculty members' comments indicate a need for the department to either a) develop standards and accommodations that are collaboratively agreed upon by the department and deemed appropriate or b) directly instruct the entire department about what the already agreed upon standards and accommodations are for students within the department. Furthermore, the department may want to provide more training about how to address the perceived conflict between standards and accommodations and offer concrete strategies to faculty members that will alleviate the conflict they feel may exist.

DISCUSSION

In addition to the outline and themes discussed in the Results section, the primary investigator noted several other noteworthy items to highlight about the faculty interviews. Following is a discussion of the following items: the variability versus consistency in faculty responses during the interviews, a summary of the themes embedded in the interview data, points of interest (such as faculty seeing students as individuals, faculty's need for validation, and unique faculty reactions), limitations of the current study, suggestions for further research, and implications of the study.

Responses

While the primary investigator managed to create an outline depicting the type of comments that the participants made, many of the comments themselves differed from one to the other. Many participants agreed on several ideas. For example, the majority of the participants indicated that the student interview they conducted was one of the most positive experiences they had throughout the course of the professional development. Additionally, many participants reported gaining a greater understanding and appreciation for diverse students' struggles and wanting to be more sensitive to students' unique needs. The majority of the participants also commented on the organization and objectives of the professional development. While some indicated that they appreciated when the professional development was organized, others indicated that they wish it had been better organized and that it had adhered to more concrete objectives.

Variability. Participants had varying opinions on many of the ideas discussed during the interviews. For example, while some participants indicated that they wish they had had more input into the professional development, a few participants reported that they felt their

involvement in the professional development was adequate and that the grant facilitators did respond to their input. Additionally, though most participants commented about the organization and objectives aspect of the professional development, some participants reported that they felt the professional development was well organized while others reported that they felt it could have been better organized. Participants also had conflicting opinions about the presenters that came during some of the professional development workshops. Some participants reported that enjoyed the presenters' method of instruction and delivery, while others reported that they strongly disliked the presenters' method of instruction and delivery.

Furthermore, participants' responses varied in terms of the changes they reported they made as a result of the professional development. While some faculty members reported to have made more accommodations in their classrooms, others reported making changes in their instruction and their own personal professional development. Additionally, when asked how they had changed, some faculty members spoke more about the changes that have been made on a departmental level rather than an individual level.

Consistency. While many of the participants' responses varied, the comprehensive outline presents a pattern of responses from the participants that the principal investigator observed. One of the patterns is that the majority of the participants' responses regarding the Expressed Likes, Expressed Dislikes, and Proposed Suggestions domains could be classified into two different types of categories: content and structure. In other words, the majority of the participants' likes and dislikes related to the content of the professional development or the structure of the professional development. This pattern could be indicative of the fact that the participants, by nature of their profession as university education professors, have learned how to engage in comprehensive evaluations and form well-developed judgments about a topic.

The comprehensive outline displays another pattern of responses from the participants. The primary investigator observed that the majority of participants' responses regarding changes they reported to make could be classified into two different types of categories: internal and external. In other words, the majority of the participants' reported changes either had to do with internal changes they felt they had made or with external changes they felt they had made. This pattern could be indicative of change being a multi-dimensional process. For example, beliefs about an idea or principle are typically internalized before they are consciously acted upon by an individual. Additionally, a change in perception or understanding may occur long before a change in action is instituted.

The Expressed Dislikes sub-domain under the Faculty Perceptions of the Professional Development domain had fewer participant comments than the other two sub-domains; (a) Expressed Likes and (b) Proposed Suggestions. It is interesting to note that, while participants did not comment as much about their dislikes of the professional development, they commented more about the suggestions they had to improve the professional development. It is possible that participants did not feel comfortable speaking negatively about their experiences with the professional development, and thus did not directly express many of their dislikes about the professional development.

Summary of Themes

While the comprehensive outline provides rich information about the faculty members' beliefs, perceptions, and reported changes in response to the professional development, the dominant themes that emerged from the interview data also provide a wealth of knowledge about some of the prevalent reactions and attitudes amongst the faculty members.

Reflecting on personal experiences. The first theme reveals that many faculty members increased their attachment to the issue of cultural responsiveness by reflecting on their own experiences that dealt with diversity and discrimination. Some faculty members referred to personal instances when they felt they were discriminated against while others referred to previous experiences that could identify as others being discriminated against. Furthermore, faculty members expressed an ability to attach to the subject matter as a result of previous life experiences they had in which they dealt with individuals diverse from themselves.

Professional development facilitating change. The second theme reflects that faculty regarded the professional development as a useful and effective way to help them learn how to develop and implement more culturally responsive practices. While faculty members suggested changes to be made to the professional development if it were conducted again as well as aspects about the professional development that they did not like, they were also prompt to respond that they felt the professional development had successfully facilitated change. This theme also indicates that, while faculty members may have been opposed to certain content or structure aspects that were included in the professional development, they still reported an ability to learn from the professional development and make changes accordingly in their professional practice.

Time. Theme three is representative of the pervasive feeling among the faculty that their perceived lack of time is a barrier to accomplishing all that they desire to accomplish or all that they feel is needful to accomplish. Furthermore, faculty expressed feeling that their time is so valuable that it is considered a sacrifice to apportion time to professional development workshops. Some faculty members also reported that a lack of time made it difficult for faculty to build more meaningful, intimate relationships with students. Several faculty members also expressed that they more than likely would not have set aside time to focus on the issue of

cultural responsiveness without the structure of the professional development compelling them to set aside time to do so.

Leaving campus. The fourth theme is indicative of the experiential component and the exclusive focus of the professional development that faculty reported enjoying and that they felt facilitated interest and change. Some faculty members commented that having the workshops off campus (some of which were in the local public library) was beneficial because it helped faculty to focus on the professional development more than on other tasks that were unrelated to the professional development but that still demanded their attention (e.g. e-mailing, class preparations, etc). Theme four also confirms what several faculty members indicated they liked about the professional development: that they enjoyed the activities and workshops that allowed them to participate and be active in the content process of a particular activity or workshop. Several faculty members reported having meaningful learning experiences when they participated in activities or attended classrooms in which they could observe culturally responsive methods being enacted. These meaningful learning experiences were facilitated by the organization of the professional development that compelled them to leave behind other professional duties that potentially act as barriers to faculty members' engagement.

Balancing accommodations and high standards. Theme five highlights frustration and confusion that is experienced by some of the faculty members as they work to understand how to balance accommodating students while maintaining high standards for them. Two of the faculty's comments suggested that they felt the department had not yet taken a firm, consistent stance on the issue of balancing accommodations and standards. It is possible that faculty's confusion surrounding this issue may have affected their ability or desire to institute

accommodations for their diverse students, though there is no conclusive evidence to support this claim.

Points of Interests

Several points of interest were noted upon reviewing the faculty interviews. The following points did not constitute as themes within the interview data, but were still apparent commonalities amongst faculty responses. The points of interest include faculty seeing students as individuals, faculty having a need for validation during the professional development, and unique faculty reactions in response to being interviewed.

Faculty sees students as individuals. A finding of interest from the present study's data is that faculty members reported that they had learned to see students as individuals as a result of the professional development activities. While this was not verbally stated by each participant, and thus could not be characterized as a clear domain, category, or theme, it was nonetheless evident that several faculty members enjoyed and desired to get to know students as individuals, and that they recognized how much they learned about students as they did sit down with them individually. For example, in reference to one participant's reaction to the student interview, he/she commented, "I think one thing that was good for me about the [student] interview is, as we were talking, I think I tended to lump everybody into one category. Everyone that is culturally diverse kind of will behave this way or have these issues. But talking to a person from that culture, [I realized] that everybody is going to be different, even within a certain culture. So I think that was kind of enlightening to me, to realize that I needed to know each of them, probably individually—that they came from really different backgrounds and not everybody was the same."

Additionally, a participant commented, "I think this [the professional development] has taught me to be more individualized with my students…to honor the diversity that they have, whether that be diversity of a single mom […] or it's diversity of, maybe culturally they didn't understand the expectations […] I think that it's helped me to be more individualized with my teaching."

Need for validation. Another particular interest provides insight into how some of the faculty members personally reacted to the professional development workshops that discussed the importance of and how to be culturally responsive. Three participants commented about their own or other faculty members' desire and/or need for validation during the professional development. For example, one participant commented how interesting it was to him/her to note that during one particular workshop during which faculty were discussing issues of discrimination and prejudices, faculty appeared to have the need to relate their own experiences of feeling prejudiced against. Specifically, the participant stated the following:

"We had a guest speaker come […] and so he shared all these stories from his childhood and going to college, and prejudices that he's had […] And then we were all supposed to go around the table and say things that we had learned from our opportunity of working with diverse individuals and our trainings. And I thought it was so interesting because as we sat there and went around the table, almost all of the faculty, instead of saying, 'Oh this is what I've learned from the training,' or, 'this is what I learned from the student,' almost all of the faculty felt a need to share a time in their life where they have felt prejudiced against […] And so I thought it was really interesting that I felt like we had this need to talk about that [we] had been prejudiced [against] and why do [we] have to be sensitive to this culture if you're not validating the fact that it's hard to just grow up here?"

Furthermore, another faculty member commented that she liked the fact that the things she learned during the professional development seemed to validate her opinion of what good teaching techniques look like. Specifically, she commented, "I remember really thinking this at the beginning, and then I felt validated all the way through, that good teaching is good teaching. And so the good teaching that I've been trained to do and that I'm trying to teach teacher candidates is the same whether they themselves are students from diverse backgrounds or they're going to be teaching students with diverse backgrounds […] When we started this I thought, 'oh, I'm just going to learn all these new things that are going to be totally very different from anything that I've ever known before.' And they really weren't. They're new ideas and new perspectives and things to think about, but when it came down to it, the principals of teaching were the same."

Unique faculty reactions. It is worth noting a few reactions from several participants during the interview process as observed by the primary investigator. One faculty member appeared to be resistant to interview with the primary investigator. Evidence of this resistance could be seen in the faculty member's resistance in scheduling a time to meet with the primary investigator, turning down several time options and pointing out how difficult it is to schedule time to do things of this interview nature. Additionally, evidence of resistance could be seen in the faculty member's brief responses and descriptions during the interview. When asked what particular changes the faculty member made, the faculty member's initial response was that the evidence of the changes was in his/her syllabi. Additionally, whereas the majority of the faculty members spoke at length about the student interview and gave insightful detail into the things they had learned and/or enjoyed about the student interview, this particular faculty member gave brief responses that only indicated how much fun the interview was. The primary investigator

therefore perceived these reactions as resistance or frustration with having to be interviewed. It is unclear as to whether the faculty member was frustrated with having to take time out of his/her schedule or if he/she was frustrated about being questioned about his/her reaction to the professional development in general.

Another noteworthy reaction emanated from three of the participants: the grant writers and/or facilitators. While these participants did report some of their own opinions, perceptions, and changes they made as a result of the professional development, they also tended to talk more about the behaviors of other faculty members in the department more than any of the other participants. For example, when asked by the primary investigator whether or not he/she believed he/she needed more support from professional development to learn ways to implement culturally responsive practices, the faculty member replied, "If I look at where we are, in the process of being independent, as far as having the knowledge we need and being able to go out there, I think we've gone sort of through the modeling stage. But there are still some other pieces we could go back and pick up through the modeling stage." The faculty member did not respond about him/herself, but instead answered what he/she thought about the faculty as a whole. It is possible that grant writers/facilitators spoke more about other faculty members because of their unique concern that each faculty member value the professional development and subsequently make changes as a result of their training.

Overall, the faculty members expressed willingness and a desire to speak with the primary investigator about their experiences as participants in the professional development. While some faculty members appeared to be reluctant to divulge too strong of negative opinions, they still appeared to be interested in sharing their thoughts and perceptions about the professional development. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, three of the faculty members

willingly agreed to be interviewed two, and even on one occasion, three times to be interviewed again when the audio-recording device malfunctioned.

Limitations

The results of the present study must be interpreted in light of the following limitations: The richness and depth of the information obtained during the faculty interviews may have been compromised due to the fact that the primary investigator is a graduate student in the same department as participating faculty. While the primary investigator was not a graduate student within the special education/ESL program, faculty may have been hesitant to share more some things because of the graduate student's affiliation with the same department. Furthermore, richness of information may have been compromised by the fact that the primary investigator was a research assistant for the chair of the department who also was one of the grant facilitators. Participants may have again hesitated to share some information, or they may have regulated the emotion they expressed in their responses more, to avoid making remarks that may be perceived as overly negative or undue criticism. The primary investigator's position as a graduate student within the same department as the faculty also likely limited the primary investigator in conducting a more critical analysis of the interview data.

Finally, as previously alluded to, those faculty members who served as grant facilitators spoke more of their perceptions about the other faculty members' changes and reactions to the professional development than they did their own. Had the grant facilitators spoke more about their own reactions and perceptions as well as they changes they themselves made, the results may have been more meaningful as they may have had more relevance to all of the faculty members versus to those that did not serve as grant facilitators.

An additional limitation is that the audio recording device malfunctioned during four of the interviews. Two of the interviews had to be conducted a second time. One of the interviews had to be conducted a second and a third time because the audio-recording device malfunctioned on both the first and the second try. One of the interviews was cut approximately 1 minute short because of a malfunction with the audio-recording data. The primary investigator did not re-do this interview since the majority of the interview data was still audible. The three former interviews, however, had to be completely re-done because no amount of the initial interview data was audible. It is likely that comments that were made during the initial attempts of the former three interviews were not made in the final attempts. Additionally, it is likely that comments made in the final attempts of these interviews were not made in the initial attempts. Some information that was included during the initial interview attempts was thus not included in the final interview attempts. To be fair to the participants' schedules, the primary investigator gave the three faculty members whose interviews had to be re-conducted the option of e-mailing their responses to the interview questions or setting up another interview with the primary investigator. All three faculty members expressed the desire to participate in another interview. The primary investigator also found it in the best interest of the present study to re-conduct the three interviews instead of trying to recall information from the interviews or instead of using information submitted by participants via e-mail in response to the interview questions.

It is possible that the interviews that the primary investigator conducted last contained more of a wealth of information than those conducted first. This is possible because the primary investigator gained increased experience and comfort with the interview process with each interview she conducted. Additionally, the primary investigator became more skilled at using follow-up and probing questions throughout the process of conducting all of the interviews. This

learning curve was a natural occurrence since the primary investigator had never before
conducted interviews for research purposes.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research may look at what specific faculty characteristics affect faculty members'
likelihood that they will accept and incorporate culturally responsive practices. For example, two
of the faculty members interviewed played major roles in developing the grant that funded the
professional development in which faculty participated. One of these faculty members also
reported having previous experience working in a university that was already employing
culturally responsive methods.

Additionally, future research could investigate whether faculty buy-in played a role in the
number or type of changes that faculty made in response to participating in the professional
development. For example, what is the association between the number of positive remarks
faculty made about the professional development and the number of changes they made?

Future research could also compare faculty members' syllabi written before and after the
professional development to see if any changes were made that dealt with culturally responsive
practices. For example, researchers could look at each faculty's course objectives and course
assignments as means of comparing what kinds of culturally responsive practices may have been
infused into their courses. Additionally, though the purpose of the present study was to ask
faculty members open-ended questions to determine what changes and opinions faculty would
report as a result of the professional development, future research could include asking faculty
members specific changes the faculty members made as they pertained to their curriculum, their
course assignments, their mode of instruction, and so forth.

Furthermore, future research could investigate the retention and success of the diverse candidates that were interviewed and/or that were in the courses of the faculty members who participated in the professional development. The overall success of the professional development may be better measured by the success of the students who received the trickle down effects of the professional development than by the changes that faculty members reported they implemented. While having faculty members report and reflect on the changes they made as well as their perceptions of the professional development is valuable information and helps to inform the department and the literature, it is nonetheless limiting in its ability to indicate how successful diverse students were in the program.

Implications of the Study

Implications of the study have individual, local and far-reaching potential benefits. As faculty members participated in the interviews by reflecting upon and verbalizing their experiences with the culturally responsive professional development, it is possible that they became more aware of their own feelings about the issue of multicultural responsiveness. This increased awareness could aid faculty in further engaging in an honest appraisal of how they regard and approach the idea of themselves being multiculturally competent.

Participant responses can provide suggestions about how to improve future professional development activities in which the special education/ESL faculty at Brigham Young University will participate, regardless of the topic. For example, the aspects of the professional development that participants reported they liked, as well as those that they felt could be improved upon, could be incorporated into future professional development activities and workshops. These include (a) incorporating plenty of collaborative activities in which faculty have an opportunity to share and discuss their perspectives and experiences with the topic at hand, (b) using a variety of activities

that get faculty out of their offices and out of the department in order to facilitate a better focus on the topic at hand, and (c) ensuring that professional development activities and workshops have clear objectives and are well-organized so that faculty feel their time is being well-spent. When professional development activities can incorporate aspects that faculty members enjoy and learn from, it is likely that they will be more invested in the outcomes of the professional development.

Participant responses can also highlight areas in which the faculty may need to improve or the areas with which faculty may still require direct instruction, guided practice, and/or modeling. For example, participant #85475 indicated that he/she would like to visit and observe ESL and dual-immersion classrooms in order to learn how to better instruct his/her own pre-service teachers to use culturally responsive techniques commonly found in those types of classrooms. Additionally, several faculty members indicated that they wish they had the opportunity to get to know more of their students on such an intimate, individual level so that they could build better relationships as well as better know and meet the unique needs of their students. While the grant coordinators cannot change the amount of time faculty members feel they have in their daily professional schedules, it is possible that the department could perhaps find other ways to facilitate relationship-building amongst faculty and students. For example, the department may be able to schedule more casual socials that allow faculty and students to interact outside of the more formal classroom environment. Additionally, the department can encourage faculty to find ways to help students feel more comfortable to approach the faculty during their office hours.

Furthermore, teacher education programs have not yet determined what the best practices are for helping faculty become culturally responsive to the increasing number of diverse students

in teacher education programs (Ambe, 2006). Participants' responses can help to inform the literature by describing what has helped/has not helped the BYU special education/ESL faculty to become more culturally responsive. Participants' responses can also help to inform other institutions that are trying to incorporate multicultural competency into their professional development requirements. It would be helpful for these institutions to recognize that one of the most preferred activities reported by faculty members was when they had the opportunity to interview and learn about their diverse students in the students' homes. This finding could indicate that an essential aspect of professional development in emphasizing multicultural competency is the human aspect of education: Building relationships and learning about students' unique strengths and needs in order to help them be and feel successful.

Faculty members' personal responses also provide rich information for others about individuals' lives in response to learning about and trying to implement culturally responsive practices. It could be validating to know that other departments may struggle with similar issues, such as time or knowing how to balance accommodations while maintaining high standards. It could also be relieving for others to learn that the journey to achieving multicultural competency is just that—a journey. This knowledge could help to alleviate stress when individuals feel they have not "accomplished" perfect multicultural competency. Several of the faculty members reported feeling that achieving multicultural competency was actually a process; one in which they would learn new information and realize that there is only more to learn and do.

Finally, as mentioned in the Discussion section, faculty members reported enjoying building relationships with students. Faculty members also reported feeling like these relationships allowed them to know the students' unique needs, thus guiding them in how to help the students be successful in their course work. Faculty members may desire to focus on building

relationships with other students after experiencing the many benefits of doing so with the

students whom they interviewed as a part of the professional development. If faculty members

continue to develop relationships with students, the department may be more successful in

retaining and recruiting diverse students into the special education/ESL program if students are

experiencing more success.

REFERENCES

Allan, E. J. (2003). *Bringing voice to the silences of privilege: Strategies for faculty development and curricular change*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED79656)

Alliance for Excellent Education (2007). *High School Dropouts in America.* Washington, DC: Author.

Ambe, E. B. (2006). Fostering multicultural appreciation in pre-service teachers through multicultural curricular transformation. *Teacher and Teacher Educator, 22,* 690–699.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2003). *Culture, language, and student achievement: Recruiting and preparing teachers for diverse students.* Chicago: Author.

American Council on Education. (2004). *Reflections on 20 years of minorities in higher education and the ACE annual status report*. Washington DC: Author.

Arellano, A. R., & Padilla, A. M. (1996). Academic invulnerability among a select group of Latino university students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*(4), 485–507.

Artiles, A. J., Trent, S. C., Hoffman-Kipp, P., & Lopez-Torres, L. (2000). From individual acquisition to cultural-historical practices in multicultural teacher education. *Remedial and Special Education, 21*(2), 79–89.

Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(6), 627–646.

Ayalon, A. (2004). A model for recruitment and retention of minority students to teaching: Lessons from a school-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(3), 7–23.

Barnes, C. J. (2006). Preparing preservice teachers to teach in a culturally responsive way. *The Negro Educational Review, 57 (1–2),* 85–100.

Borman, G. D., & Rachuba, L. T. (2001). *Academic success among poor and minority students: An analysis of competing models of school effects.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451281)

Brisk, M. E., Barnhardt, R., Herrera, S., & Rochon, R. (2002). *Educators' preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity: A call to action*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED477737)

Caldas, S. J., & Bankston, C. (1997). Effect of school population socioeconomic status on individual academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 90*(5), 269–276.

California Tomorrow. (2002, April). *The high-quality learning conditions needed to support students of color and immigrants at California community colleges. Policy report*. San Francisco, CA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED465383)

Campbell-Whatley, G. D. (2003). Recruiting and retaining of culturally and linguistically diverse groups in special education: Defining the problem. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 26* (4), 255–263.

Case, C. W., Shive, R. J., Ingebretson, K., & Spiegel, V. M. (1988). Minority teacher education: Recruitment and retention methods. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*, 54–56.

Castellanos, J., & Jones, L. (2003). Latina/o undergraduate experiences in American higher education. In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in higher education* (pp. 1–14). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., Choi-Pearson, C., Archuleta, D. J., Phoummarath, M. J., & Landingham, A. V. (2006). University environment as a mediator of Latino ethnic identity and persistence attitudes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(2), 267–271.

Cho, G., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, D. (2005). Is ignorance bliss? Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward multicultural education. *The High School Journal, 89*(2), 24–28.

Constantine, M. G., Robinson, J. S., Wilton, L., & Caldwell, L. D. (2002). Collective self-esteem and perceived social support as predictors of cultural congruity among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(3), 307–316.

Cooper, J. E., & Chattergy, V. (1993). Developing faculty multicultural awareness: An examination of life roles and their cultural components. *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty Development 12*, 81–96.

Coutinho, M. J., & Oswald, D. P. (2000). Disproportionate representation in special education: A synthesis and recommendations. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 9*(2), 135–156.

Dieker, L., Voltz, D., & Epanchin, B. (2002). Report of the Wingspread Conference: Preparing teachers to work with diverse learners. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 25,* 1–10.

Donovan, M. S., & Cross, C. T. (2002). Minority students in special and gifted education. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(2), 225–239.

Farmer. J., Hauk, S., & Neumann, A. M. (2005, April/May). Negotiating reform: Implementing process standards in culturally responsive professional development. *The High School Journal, 88*(4), 59–71.

Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2005). In the shadow of brown: Special education and overrepresentation of students of color. *Remedial and Special Education, 26*(2), 93–100.

Fischer, K. (2006). Flagship universities short on minority and low-income students, report says. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(15), A18.

Frazier, H. (2007). A prescription for success. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 24*(7), 7.

Gallavan, N. P., Troutman, P. L., Jr., & Jones, W. P. (2001). Cultural diversity and the NCATE standards: A story in process. *Multicultural Perspectives, 3*(2), 13–18.

Garcia, E. E., & Cuellar, D. (2006). Who are these linguistically and culturally diverse students? *Teachers College Record, 108*(11), 2220–2246.

Gay, G. (1993). Building cultural bridges: A bold proposal for teacher education. *Education and Urban Society,* 25(3), 285–299.

George, P., & Aronson, R. (2003). *How do educators' cultural belief systems affect underserved students' pursuit of postsecondary education?* Honolulu, HI: Pacific Resources for Education and Learning.

Gerber, M.,, & Durgunoglu, A. Y. (2004). Reading risk intervention for young English learners: Evidence from longitudinal intervention research: Introduction to special series. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19*(4), 199–201.

Gloria, A. M., & Robinson-Kurpius, S. E. (2001). Influences of self-beliefs, social support, and comfort in the university environment on the academic nonpersistence decisions of American Indian undergraduates. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*(1), 88–102.

Gonzalez, J. M. (1997). Recruiting and training minority teachers: Student views of the preservice program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(1), 56–64.

Harrell, P. E., & Forney, W. S. (2003). Ready or not, here we come: Retaining Hispanic and

   first-generation students in postsecondary education. *Community College Journal of*

   Research and Practice, 27, 147–156.

Hasseler, S. S. (1998). *Multicultural teacher education: Problems and possibilities in small*

   college settings. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED418058)

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in educational settings*. New York: State

   University of New York.

Helm, E. G., Sedlacek, W. E., & Prieto, D. O. (1998). The relationship between attitudes toward

   diversity and overall satisfaction of university students by race. *Journal of College*

   Counseling, 1, 111–120.

Henniger, M. L. (1989). Recruiting minority students: Issues and options. *Journal of Teacher*

   Education, 40, 35–38.

Hobson-Horton, L. D., & Owens, L. (2004). From freshman to graduate: Recruiting and

   retaining minority students. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 3*(1), 86–107.

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus

   racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education,*

   70(4), 324–345.

Hurtado, S., Han, J. C., Saenz, V. B., Espinosa, L. L., Cabrera, N. L., & Cerna, O. S. (2007).

   Predicting transition and adjustment to college: Biomedical and behavioral science

   aspirants' and minority students' first year of college. *Research in Higher Education,*

   48(7), 841–887.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy (2001, February). *Getting through college: Voices of*

   low-income and minority students in New England. Washington, DC: Author.

Jones, L., Castellanos, J., & Cole, D. (2002). Examining the ethnic minority student experience at predominantly white institutions: A case study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 1*(1), 19–39.

Jordan, R. W. (2007). Diversity and the AAC&U statement on academic freedom and educational responsibility; An alignment of strategic objectives. *Liberal Education, 93*(1), 50–55.

King-Sears, M. E. (2001). Three steps for gaining access to the general education curriculum for learners with disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 37*(2), 67–76.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56,* 229–234.

Madkins, J. B., & Mitchell, C. E. (2000). Establishing a "level playing field" for minority students on predominantly Anglo university campuses. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED455747)

Malveaux, J. (2006). Minority college aid suffers from attacks. *USA Today*, 07347456, MAR 17, 2006.

Marbley, A. F., Bonner, F. A., McKisick, S., Henfield, M. S., & Watts, L. M. (2007). Interfacing culture specific pedagogy with counseling: A proposed diversity training model for preparing preservice teachers for diverse learners. *Multicultural Education, 14*(3), 8–16.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2002). The role of empathy in teaching culturally diverse students: A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(5), 433–443.

Merrell, K. W., Ervin, R. A., & Gimpel, G. A. (2006). *School psychology for the 21st century: Foundations and practices.* New York: Guilford.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2008). *Diverse*. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from

    http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diverse

Middleton, E. J., Mason, E. J., Stilwell, W. E., & Parker, W. C. (1988). *Journal of Teacher*

    Education, 39, 14–18.

Morfin, O. J., Perez, V. H., Parker, L., Lynn, M., & Arrona, J. (2006). Hiding the politically

    obvious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher

    education. *Educational Policy, 20*(1), 249–270.

Morrier, M. J., Irving, M. A., Dandy, E., Dmitriyev, G., & Ukeje, I. C. (2007). Teaching and

    learning within and across cultures: Educator requirements across the United States.

    Multicultural Education, 14(3), 32–40.

Murdock, S. H., & Hoque, M. N. (1999). Demographic factors affecting higher education in the

    United States in the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Higher Education, 108*, 5–

    13.

Murrell, P. C., Jr., & Foster, M. (2003). Teacher beliefs, performance and proficiency in

    diversity-oriented teacher preparation. In J. Raths & A. C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher*

    beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education (pp. 43–64).

    Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Table 209: Fall enrollment in degree-granting*

    institutions, by race/ethnicity of student and by state or jurisdiction: 2003. Retrieved

    March 9, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05_209.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006a). *Participation in education:*

    Elementary/secondary education. Retrieved March 10, 2007, from

    http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2006/section1/indicator05.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006b). *Table 38: Percentage distribution of enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools, by race/ethnicity and state or jurisdiction: Fall 1993 and fall 2003*. Retrieved March 9, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05_038.asp

National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education. (2003). *Enlarging the pool: How higher education partnerships are recruiting and supporting future special educators from underrepresented groups*. Arlington, VA: Author.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Retrieved October 11, 2007, from http://www.ncate.org/documents/pdsStandards.pdf

National Education Association. (2003). *Status of the American public school teacher 2000– 2001*. Retrieved March 10, 2007, from http://www.nea.org/edstats/images/status.pdf

National Science Foundation. (2006). *Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: Archived bachelor's degrees.* Retrieved August 26, 2008, from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd/archunderdegbach.htm

Nevares, C. (2001). Mexican Americans and other Latinos in postsecondary education: Institutional influences. Eric Digest (Report No. EDO-RC-01-1). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED459038)

Ntiri, D. W. (2001). Access to higher education for nontraditional students and minorities in a technology focused society. *Urban Education, 36* (1), 129–144.

Olivia, M., & Nora, A. (2004). College access and the k–6 pipeline: Connecting policy and practice for Latino student success. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 3*(2), 117–124.

Obiakor, F. E., & Utley, C. A. (1997). Rethinking preservice preparation for teachers in the learning disabilities field: Workable multicultural strategies. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 12*(2), 100–106.

Oltjenbruns, K., & Love, C. T. (1998). Infusing a multicultural perspective into higher education curricula. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 90*(1), 54–60.

Ornelles, C., & Goetz, L. (2001). Considerations for changing populations: Supporting nontraditional students in acquiring special education licensure. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 26*(3), 171–179.

Parameswaran, G. (2007). Enhancing diversity education. *Multicultural Education, 14*(3), 51–55.

Patton, J. M., Williams, B. T., Floyd, L. O., & Cobb, T. R. (2003). Recruiting and retaining culturally and linguistically diverse teachers in special education: Models for successful personnel preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 26*(4), 288–303.

Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). *Teacher inequality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

Prater, M. A. (2005). Ethnically diverse rural special educators who are highly qualified: Does NCLB make this impossible? *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 24*(1), 23–26.

Prater, M. A., Wilder, L. K., & Dyches, T. T. (2008). Shaping one traditional special educator preparation program toward cultural responsiveness. *Teaching Education, 19*, 137–151.

Quezada, R., & Louque, A. (2002). Developing diverse faculty in culturally proficient education programs. *Multicultural Education, 9*(3), 10–14.

Quiocho, A., & Rios, F. (2000). The power of their presence: minority group teachers and

    schooling. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 485–528.

Rodriguez, Y. E., & Sjostrom, B. R. (1995). Culturally responsive teacher preparation evident in

    classroom approaches to cultural diversity: A novice and an experienced teacher. *Journal*

    of Teacher Education, 46(4), 304–310.

Rothenberg, P. (2007, Winter). Half-empty or half-full? "Diversity" in higher education today.

    Liberal Education, *93*(1), 44–49.

Saenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across

    race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students.

    Research in Higher Education, 48(1), 1–38.

Salend, S. J., Whittaker, C. R., Duhaney, L. M. G., & Smith, R. M. (2003). Diversifying teacher

    education programs to recruit and graduate culturally and linguistically diverse teachers.

    Teacher Education and Special Education, 26(4), 315–327.

Scherer, M. (2007). Hot-button issue. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 7.

Schneider, C. G. (2006). Diversity, democracy, and goals for student learning. *Liberal*

    Education, 92(1), 1–2.

Scherff, L. (2005). Culturally responsive frameworks for teaching. *English Journal, 94*(4), 97–

    101.

Seidl, B. (2007). Working with communities to explore and personalize culturally relevant

    pedagogies: "Push, double images, and raced talk." *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(2),

    168–183.

Sidel, R. (1995). Battling bias: college students speak out. *Educational Record*, 45–52.

Singh, N. N. (1997). Value and address diversity. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 5*(1), 24–35.

Skiba, R., Simmons, A., Ritter, S., Kohler, K., Henderson, M., & Wu, T. (2006). The context of minority disproportionality: Practitioner perspectives on special education referral. *Teachers College Record, 108*(7), 1424–1459.

Smolen, L. A., Colville-Hall, S., Liang, X., & MacDonald, S. (2006). An empirical study of college of education faculty's perceptions, beliefs, and commitment to the teaching of diversity in teacher education programs at four urban universities. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 38*(1), 45–62.

Talbert-Johnson, C., & Tillman, B. (1999). Perspectives on color in teacher education: Prominent issues. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*(3), 200–208.

Tatto, M. T. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students: Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(2), 155–180.

Taylor, P. A. (1999). Teacher educators' role in promoting the tenets of multicultural education. *Eric database*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 436520)

Torres, V. (2003). Mi casa is not exactly like your house. *About Campus*, *8*(2), 2–7.

Tyler, N. C., Cantou-Clarke, C. D., Easterling, J., & Klepper, T. (2003). Recruitment and retention and special education teacher preparation in rural areas: Diversity, federal funding, and technical assistance considerations. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 22*(3), 3–11.

United States Census Bureau. (2000a). *Language use and English-speaking ability: 2000.* Retrieved December 9, 2008, from http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf

United States Census Bureau. (2000b). *Profiles of general demographic characteristics: 2000.* Washington, DC: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, United States Census Bureau.

United States Census Bureau. (2005). *The population profile of the United States: Dynamic version (internet release).* Washington, DC: U.S. Population Division and Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

United States Department of Education. (1996). *Digest of education statistics 1996.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

United States Department of Education. (2001). *Digest of education statistics 2001*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

United States Department of Education. (2003). *Twenty-fifth annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: Author.

United States Department of Education. (2006). *Digest of education statistics 2006.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Utah State Office of Education. (2007). *Fall enrollment by race/ethnicity, 2006–2007 school year*. Retrieved March 10, 2007, from http://www.schools.utah.gov/finance/other/AnnualReport/06ar/Statistics/STUDENTS/Fall_Enrollment_Race_2006.xls

Vasquez, M. J. T. (1982). Confronting barriers to the participation of Mexican American women in higher education. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4*(2), 147–165.

Villalpando, O. (2002). The impact of diversity and multiculturalism on all students: findings from a national study. *NASPA Journal, 40*(1), 124–144.

Voltz, D. L. (2000). A final comment on alliance project success stories. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 23*(4), 311–312.

Ward, N. L. (2006). Improving equity and access for low-income and minority youth into institutions of higher education. *Urban Education, 41*(1), 50–70.

Wikipedia. (2007). *Languages of the United States.* Retrieved August 28, 2008, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages_in_the_United_States

Wilder, L. K., & Prater, M. A. (2005). *Application for David O. McKay School of Education research funds: Ethnographies of ethnically diverse and/or bilingual students in the culturally responsive special education/esl program collected by special education faculty members during visits to teacher candidates' homes.* Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Winter, J. S., & Austin, A. (1993). *Promoting diversity in teacher education.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED373030)

Wunsch, M. A., & Chattergy, V. (1991). Managing diversity through faculty development. *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Student, Faculty, & Institutional Development, 10*, 141–150.

Zapata, J. T. (1988). Early identification and recruitment of Hispanic teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 19–23.

Zhang, D., & Benz, M. R. (2006). Enhancing self-determination of culturally diverse students with disabilities: Current status and future directions. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 38*(9), 1–12.

Zhou, Z., Bray, M. A., Kehle, T. J., Theodore, L. A., Clark, E., & Jenson, W. R. (2004).

    Achieving ethnic minority parity in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools, 41*(4),

    443–450.

APPENDIX A

Outline for Domains and Categories of Faculty Interviews

I. *Faculty Perceptions of the Professional Development Domain*
    a. *Expressed Likes*
        i. Content
            1. Informative
            2. Presenters' characteristics and approaches
            3. Student interviews
            4. Activities involving faculty
        ii. Structure
            1. When professional development was organized
            2. Collaboration aspect
            3. Individual/personal accountability aspect
            4. Meeting off campus
    b. *Expressed Dislikes*
        i. Content
            1. Certain characteristics/approaches of the presenters
            2. Lack of honest faculty reflection
        ii. Structure
            1. Repetitiveness
            2. Unclear objectives
        iii. Lack of time
    c. *Proposed Suggestions*
        i. Content
            1. Include more variety in professional development:
            2. Conduct more student interviews; conduct them earlier
            3. Integrate more reflection
        ii. Structure
            1. Be more objective driven
            2. Demonstrate more concrete ways to apply
            3. Be better organized
            4. Integrate more faculty involvement
II. *Overall Impact of the Professional Development Domain*
    a. *Changes that faculty reported occurred*
        i. Internal
            1. Increased understanding about implementing culturally responsive practices
            2. Increased understanding about impact of culture and language in education
            3. Increased sensitivity to students
            4. Learned about balancing accommodations while keeping standards
        ii. External
            1. Accommodations for students
            2. Curricular changes

        3. Instructional changes

b. Goal Formulated

        1. To gain more knowledge

III.   *Impact of the Student Interview Domain*

    a. Changes that faculty reported occurred

        i. Internal

            1. Change in attitudes/perceptions

            2. Understanding students better

            3. Recognize need for building relationships with students

        ii. External

            1. Change in professional approach

    b. Expectations violated

IV. *Impact of Collaboration Domain*

    a. Increased knowledge for implementation/application

    b. Broadened perspective and/or awareness