A 1913 version of Webster’s dictionary defines transformation as “a change in disposition, heart, character, or the like” in which heart is meant as “the seat of the affections or sensibilities . . . the better or lovelier part of our nature; the spring of all our actions and purposes; the seat of moral life and character” (Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary). This chapter is about the inclusion facilitator’s role in helping to transform others’ beliefs about inclusive education and students with significant disabilities. Changing people’s core values and beliefs about inclusion is essential, as “a teacher’s self-knowledge of what he or she stands for is the most important gyroscope a professional educator has to maintain a steady course through the bumpy shoals of life in school” (Garmston & Wellman, 1999, p. 25). The chapter focuses on “the ‘human face’ which embraces the emotion, feelings, needs and perceptions of teachers and leaders as well as their roles and beliefs and/or pedagogical assumptions” (Norman, 2001, p. 1). It is grounded in the professional literature on general and special education reform and high-quality professional development, but, above all, it reflects the 20 years of experience the author of this chapter has educating preservice teachers, providing student-specific consultation, and working with numerous school districts on inclusive education systems change projects.

This chapter is also about changing beliefs. It is about changing the beliefs of paraprofessionals who support students so that these paraprofessionals see their role as learning and social facilitators rather than as helpers who hover over students every minute of the
day (Giangreco, Cloninger, & Iverson, 2000). It is about changing
general education teachers’ beliefs so that they hold the least dan-
gerous assumption about students’ capabilities and have high ex-
pectations for student achievement (Donnellan, 1984). It is about
changing related-services professionals’ understanding of their pri-
mary contribution to students’ teams from that of providing direct
service to supporting students’ communication, behavior, and move-
ment within typical routines and lessons. Finally, it is about help-
ing parents recapture their lost dreams so that they believe once
again that their children deserve an enviable future as a respected
member of the community.

Chapter Organization

The chapter is organized in four parts, which can be read consecu-
tively or by particular sections in order to fill the gaps in current
understanding and experience. First, the notion of change agentry is
introduced. Second, three characteristics of an effective change
agent (i.e., guiding principles, a belief in personal efficacy, specific
intervention skills) are elaborated. Third, a perspective is described
through which inclusion facilitators can understand the personal
identities or traits of their colleagues that influence their behaviors.
These identities include bottom-line values, concerns about inclu-
sion, and personality types. The fourth and final section presents a
detailed case study of an inclusion facilitator’s experience with a
school struggling with the philosophy and practice of inclusion.

CHANGING INDIVIDUALS

If you pick up any book about education that has been written since
1980, the focal point for reform is the group and the system (and in
particular, the culture of the system) rather than the individual. The
author of this chapter acknowledges the critical need for systems
thinking within educational reform efforts (see required reading
such as Fullan, 2001; Garmston & Wellman, 1999; Jorgensen, 1998;
Sarason, 1996; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994; Sizer,
1992; Villa & Thousand, 2000), but she has chosen to focus this
chapter on the often neglected topic of changing the individuals
who comprise the educational systems, who must have their own
self-interests resolved before they can truly show concern for the
organization (Hall & Loucks, 1978). The author’s decision to focus
on changing individuals acknowledges that there are many special
education teachers who work in very traditional (or dysfunctional) school systems but are committed nonetheless to including their students and want to know how they can begin the process of inclusion in the absence of a reform-minded culture.

This chapter describes the characteristics of and strategies used by inclusion facilitators who want to be effective change agents. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is presented, which can help an inclusion facilitator answer the following questions about each person (e.g., paraprofessional, general education teacher, related-services professional, parent) that he or she deals with and then use the answers to plan strategies for transforming that person’s beliefs and practices:

1. What does this person value?
2. What are this person’s concerns about inclusion?
3. How might this person’s personality type affect the best way to communicate and work with him or her?

Limitations of This Model

This model is not without its limitations. First, no one paradigm explains everything about human behavior. Organizations and change are complex. Many theories of motivation, individual behavior, group behavior, and systems theory have been postulated to explain why educators do one thing versus another.

A second limitation is that the elements of the model described in this chapter are not mutually exclusive. The theoretical underpinnings of research on personality types, concerns, and value systems have many common ancestors in the fields of philosophy and psychology. Thus, the inclusion facilitator should not consider the strategies described in this chapter as part of a cookbook recipe, but rather, as an interesting lens through which to view the challenge of transforming people’s core beliefs and related actions.

Third, change agents themselves are as varied as the individuals or systems they wish to change. Some are charismatic; others have modest personalities. Some are new to the profession; others have many years of experience. Some start with quiet grassroots efforts; others give eloquent speeches that rally thousands to action. One does not need to become a Martin Luther King, Jr., or a Mother Teresa in order to be an effective inclusion facilitator change agent, although learning from the histories of these leaders can help to enhance anyone’s effectiveness.
Finally, although each element of the model described herein has research supporting its effectiveness in specific situations, no body of research has demonstrated the efficacy of using the described strategies in the way that they are organized together in this chapter. The usefulness of this paradigm will be judged through the experiences of those who try it in their own schools and then reflect on their experiences with professional colleagues from other schools, each with their own unique histories and personalities. The authors of this book welcome this friendly criticism and believe that this kind of professional dialogue rooted in real-life practice will move us all forward in our quest for understanding what creates and sustains an inclusive school.

CHANGE AGENTRY

In Jan Nisbet’s introduction to this book, she cites a variety of terms that have been used to describe people who see themselves as change agents, including linker (Havelock, 1971), community organizer, and bridge-builder (McKnight, 1995). A change agent is anyone, in any position or at any level, who is focused on the continual, constructive, reinvention of a system. He or she is always scanning for ideas, potential applications, needs, synergies, or emerging markets and is ready to move on anything promising. The change agent is nimble and strives to build flexibility in the surrounding system. He or she works the system, pulling in others and creating a movement around his or her mission. Change agents possess a clear understanding of themselves and their role (Center for Critical Impact, n.d.).

Teachers as Change Agents

In schools, the role of change agent has traditionally been assigned to the principal, the superintendent, or an outside consultant hired by the district to work on its long-range plan. Fullan recommended that teachers become agents of change because “to have any chance of making teaching a noble and effective profession . . . teachers must combine the mantle of moral purpose with the skills of change agentry” (1993, p. 12). Although having a moral purpose keeps teachers focused on the needs of their students, “change agentry causes them to develop better strategies for accomplishing their moral goals” (p. 13). Fullan described a “new conception of teacher professionalism that integrates moral purpose with change agentry,
one that works simultaneously on individual and institutional development” (p. 13). To the extent that inclusion facilitators are charged with the moral purpose of creating classroom and school communities in which diversity is celebrated, Fullan’s call speaks directly to them.

**Characteristics of Effective Inclusion Facilitators/Change Agents**

Inclusion facilitators who are effective as change agents are guided by strong principles related to working with others, are confident about their own efficacy, and possess a broad repertoire of skills for working with diverse individuals in a variety of situations.

**Principles** To be effective change agents, inclusion facilitators must embody many important working principles, but the three that will serve them particularly well in their efforts to change others’ hearts and minds about students with disabilities are their commitment to inclusiveness, their presumption of positive intentions, and their ability to balance inquiry and advocacy (Garmston & Wellman, 1999). Ironically, some advocates of inclusive education have not shown respect for opinions other than their own, leading to accusations that they are zealots who care more about their cause than about the feelings or concerns of others (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). When the cause is the inclusion of diverse students within the classroom and school community, an inclusion facilitator’s attitude of “my way or the highway” can destroy credibility and hurt the very cause being promoted. Thus, the hallmark of an effective inclusion facilitator is the ability to be clear about one’s values yet able to acknowledge the rights of others to disagree without making moral judgments.

How many of us have left a difficult meeting saying, “I don’t trust Ms. X! She clearly has a hidden agenda—she probably doesn’t even like kids with disabilities and unless we uncover her ulterior motives, we won’t be able to gain control of this situation.” Garmston and Wellman suggested that presuming positive intentions is a more effective way to approach individuals with whom we disagree or have conflict.

Assuming that others’ intentions are positive encourages honest conversations about important matters. . . . Positive presuppositions reduce the possibility of the listener perceiving threats or challenges in a paraphrase or a question. . . . [When people presume positive intentions in one another] the emotional processors in the brain hear the
positive intention and open up access to higher level thinking [which can lead to more effective and inclusive solutions]. (1999, pp. 45–46)

The third working principle of effective inclusion facilitators is the commitment to balancing advocacy and inquiry. As an inclusion facilitator who may feel that inclusion is a moral imperative, it is tempting to see one’s role as advocate and, therefore, perceive that articulating and arguing for inclusion is the right thing to do. Achieving a balance between articulating one’s opinions and inquiring into the beliefs of others results in “more creative and insightful realizations that occur when people combine multiple perspectives” (Ross & Roberts, 1994, p. 253). The Skills section presents specific scripts that illustrate how to achieve this balance between advocacy and inquiry.

**Self-Efficacy** Self-efficacy is the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the sources of action required to manage prospective situations. In plain language, “perceived self-efficacy is concerned not with the number of skills that you have, but with what you believe you can do with what you have under a variety of circumstances” (Bandura, 1997, p. 37). Inclusion facilitators come to believe in their ability to make a difference through personal experiences and identification with others who have accomplished similar efforts. Inclusion facilitators with a well-developed sense of efficacy

- Approach tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than situations to avoid
- Set challenging goals for themselves
- Maintain their commitment to those goals even after experiencing failure
- Attribute any lack of success to insufficient or ineffective effort on their part rather than to uncontrollable outside influences

These individuals persevere in the face of rejection, manage their stress in difficult situations, and use self-talk productively rather than in ways that hinder their continued effort.

**Skills** Effective inclusion facilitators have a repertoire of skills and strategies that helps them influence the beliefs and actions of others in one-to-one or group situations. They know how to 1) maintain a healthy balance between advocacy and inquiry, 2) teach adult learners, 3) mediate individuals’ learning over time, 4) negotiate “win-win” or “both/and” solutions, and 5) monitor and incorporate evidence into decisions about future actions.
Balancing Inquiry and Advocacy  An inclusion facilitator with well-developed advocacy and inquiry skills can begin to change educational practices for students with significant disabilities by approaching individual teachers or parents, by working with groups such as students' individualized education program (IEP) teams, or through broader systems-focused efforts such as curriculum committees or a strategic planning task force. Practitioners who support inclusive education are often more skilled in advocating than in using inquiry as a means of engaging with others who do not share their values or experiences. Although expanding one's skills in inquiry does not mean abandoning the right to share one's strongly held viewpoint, such expansion can also broaden one's repertoire of dialogue that can be adapted to particular situations or individuals.

Dialogue is distinguished from discussion or debate by a focus on "reflective learning . . . in which group members seek to understand each other's viewpoints and deeply held assumptions" (Garmston & Wellman, 1999, p. 55). When individuals or groups enter into dialogue with one another, they deepen their understanding of one another's perspectives, are more likely to examine and alter their beliefs, and strengthen their relationships.

According to Sparks (2004), dialogue is characterized by a "suspension of judgment, release of needs for specific outcomes, an inquiry into and examination of underlying assumptions, authenticity, a slower pace with silence between speakers, and listening deeply to self, others, and for collective meaning." The following example demonstrates how an inclusion facilitator can balance advocacy with dialogue and inquiry.

Marie Thibideaux (pseudonym) is an inclusion facilitator who provides support to 20 students with significant disabilities who attend six schools in a large rural school district. Each week, she spends about 2 hours in each school, attending team meetings or meeting with the students' general education teachers and administrators. Marie has learned how to balance advocacy with inquiry and has positive relationships with each member of the student's team, even though they don't always agree on every issue. Recently, a student named Cameron moved from a small elementary school to a larger middle school, and Marie was involved in planning his transition. At the first meeting of Cameron's sixth-grade team, the math teacher made the following comment:

To be honest, I don't think that this student is appropriate for my math class. We are already starting to get into algebra,
and from what I have read in his records, he has an IQ score of only 40. Wouldn’t he be better off if he spent time learning the functional uses of money and time?

Marie could have responded with traditional advocacy statements, such as

- “IQ scores aren’t a reliable measure of a student’s intelligence. We need to have the highest expectations for Cameron despite what his test results say.”
- “Cameron’s IEP specifies that he will be in a general education math class. We don’t really have a choice here.”
- “I have known many students like Cameron who have surprised us with their knowledge once we gave them a chance in general classes.”

The math teacher might then have made some retort such as, “I don’t really think that we should be doing something for our students just based on unfounded ‘hope’ that they will benefit. I need evidence.”

Marie’s initial response has set up a she said, he said debate, in which both sides provide increasingly vehement arguments for their point of view, with no likelihood that any resolution will ever be found. Perhaps if Marie tried an advocacy or inquiry approach, using different language to respond to her colleague’s comments, her efforts would have been more successful.

Advocacy: “I can understand your concern. I have worked with Cameron since he was in preschool. Would you be interested in hearing about some of the strategies teachers have used to successfully include him in challenging academic classes?”

Inquiry: “Could you give me a little background on the experiences you’ve had with students like Cameron?”

Advocacy: “My experience, particularly with students with significant disabilities like Cameron’s, is that IQ scores have little relationship to what they can actually learn in classes. Is that your experience, or do you have a different take on this?”

Inquiry: “I wonder if you could share your thinking behind your recommendation that Cameron should learn money skills and time management as opposed to algebra?”
If Marie takes this revised approach, she shows that she has an open mind about the teacher’s viewpoints, she models the behavior of questioning assumptions, and she will find out more information about the math curriculum and the teacher’s approach to instruction. In addition, she has preserved her relationship with the teacher whom Cameron will have for an entire academic year.

In *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook* (Senge et al., 1994), Ross and Roberts shared protocols for improved advocacy and inquiry. They recommended that individuals practice using sample statements that serve the following purposes:

- To make one’s thinking process visible
- To test one’s conclusions and assumptions
- To ask others to make their thinking visible
- To compare one’s assumptions to theirs
- To deal with someone who disagrees with one’s point of view
- To cope with an impasse that seems to have stalled discussion

Many conversations about inclusion seem to present as an impasse right from the start. The natural reaction is for people to continue to articulate their beliefs, raise their voices with each successive volley, agree to disagree, or finally, call for an administrator to make the decision.

Ross and Roberts offered other options that can lead people away from the perceived impasse to a point in which they can calmly consider alternative options or enter into a data-gathering phase of the problem-solving process. They suggested that change agents or facilitators use phrases such as

- What do we know for a fact?
- What do we agree on, and what do we disagree on?
- Perhaps we might state the assumptions behind our opinions.
- It seems as if we aren’t going to reach a mutually agreeable decision today. What might we each do before we come back to the table to continue this discussion?

Rather than inflaming the participants’ emotions, these statements serve to diffuse the situation, asking each person to use a different part of his or her brain to explore possibilities while showing a commitment to working out a win-win solution.
Teaching Adults  Acting in the role of change agent, an inclusion facilitator has many opportunities to teach others about students with significant disabilities and inclusive education. Most general education teachers have never had a student with significant disabilities in their class before, and it is unlikely that they had any preparation during college to address the needs of students who use augmentative communication, experience significant physical challenges, or have sensory differences such as blindness or deafness. Teaching other adults can take many forms, but these methods should not include lecturing or simply presenting people with facts.

Some adults may be open to listening to stories about other students that illustrate broad concepts that can be applied to a new student. Inclusion facilitators typically have strong skills in this area because they themselves were probably deeply moved by the personal stories of students and their families. The skilled inclusion facilitator walks a fine line between proselytizing and telling stories from which larger values or lessons can be learned. Other individuals may want to read about inclusive education first and then have a one-to-one discussion over coffee about the implications for their classrooms. Still others may need to see a teaching strategy demonstrated, try it themselves, and then talk about the outcome with a valued colleague.

This last teaching and learning method—giving teachers the opportunity to learn by doing and then reflect on their experience—is supported by research on innovation diffusion, reflective practice, and professional development (Hole & McEntee, 1999). Pfeffer and Sutton (2000) coined the term the knowing–doing problem to describe the gap between what teachers know how to do and what they actually do. They suggested that the most effective way to bridge the knowing–doing gap is to emphasize teacher learning within the context of teaching actual lessons rather than focusing on more formal, didactic training programs. Thus, inclusion facilitators should focus on coaching others to try out new practices in their classrooms and then spend time with them reflecting on the process and outcomes, rather than relying on presenting a workshop on the theoretical rationale for inclusive education. Table 3.1 depicts the many opportunities that inclusion facilitators have to teach others about best practices, utilizing effective professional development and change techniques.

Mediating  Inclusion facilitators have a powerful tool for effecting changes in beliefs and attitudes through their roles as medi-
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Table 3.1. Opportunities for inclusion facilitators to teach others about inclusive education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based rationale for inclusion</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Staff development workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readings distributed in mailboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of diversity</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Classroom/hallway bulletin boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Assemblies that feature panels of people with disabilities and their parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Personal stories shared with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC)</td>
<td>Speech-language pathologists</td>
<td>Team meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational therapists</td>
<td>Staff development workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>After-school demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities within the classroom with a specific student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC conferences or workshops attended with other staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models that support inclusive education</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>School improvement committee/task force meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings between administrators from different schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum adaptations and modifications</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Staff development workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related-services staff</td>
<td>State teachers’ conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized education program team meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional planning meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for helping to support students without hovering</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Before- or after-school workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities in the classroom when modeling is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum creation based on principles of universal design</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Study circles, reflective practice groups, or graduate classes held at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom and behavioral support strategies</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Opportunities in the classroom when modeling is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Collaborative planning time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ators or coaches who shine a “judgment-free flashlight, illuminating internal or external data, the examination of which may lead to self-directed learning” (Garmston & Wellman, 1999, p. 177). As a form of coaching, mediating incorporates all of the skills of good group facilitation such as paraphrasing, probing for specificity or understanding, inquiring, and presuming positive intentions (Garmston & Wellman, 1999). Inclusion facilitators who enter into
long-term professional relationships with other teachers in a school go beyond fulfilling their own roles as teachers. Over time, they will mediate the other teachers’ growing understandings about inclusive education by comparing and contrasting the teachers’ past and present experiences, positing new norms and testing them against traditional ones, sharing research-based information about inclusion, and addressing the teachers’ practical concerns about how inclusion will affect day-to-day life in the classroom or school.

Negotiating

In the ideal world, every teacher and related-services provider along with every parent, teacher, school board member, administrator, and public policy maker would enthusiastically support the goals of inclusive education and fund schools adequately. The inclusion facilitator could wave a magic wand, and doubters would become believers, resisters would cast aside their objections, and fiscal and structural barriers would be considered mere nuisances instead of roadblocks to innovation. In the real world, however, inclusion facilitators must be skilled negotiators at the same time that they are building others’ support for inclusion.

Negotiation with respect to inclusion can be a tricky business. Saying, “If you agree to have this student in your class, I will bake you brownies every Friday” does not reflect the valued place that we think students with disabilities should have in general education. However, asking, “What support would you need in order for Jim to be successful in your social studies class?” acknowledges the teacher’s concerns, does not forsake the idea that Jim has the right to be in a social studies class, and still underscores the collaborative nature of supports for inclusion.

Here is another effective negotiation that respects a teacher’s concerns:

I know that you have some concerns about whether this will work for you. Would it work for you to identify your concerns about Jim being in your class so that we can address as many as we can right now? Then, perhaps we can try it out for a few weeks and come back together after that to talk about what’s been working and what still needs to be done to support Jim’s success in your classroom.

The goal of all negotiation should be to craft win-win solutions. Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1991) called this principled negotiation, in which the interests of conflicting parties are taken into consideration to craft solutions that are acceptable to both sides—in effect...
both/and rather than either/or solutions. Chapter 4 provides additional strategies to help inclusion facilitators deal with conflict within teams; these same strategies work equally well when the conflict is between individuals.

**Monitoring** The last intervention strategy is for inclusion facilitators to serve as the monitors of their students’ progress and thereby help teachers or other educators make new decisions based on sound data as well as values and beliefs (Garmston & Wellman, 1999). Particularly in the current atmosphere that values evidence-based practice (e.g., Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 [PL 108-446]), inclusion facilitators must be able to gather and help interpret outcome data in a way that is meaningful to classroom teachers, parents, and administrators. In other words, when a teacher shares a belief or concern that the student “won’t learn anything in my class,” it is a call to an inclusion facilitator to work with the rest of the team to provide consistent and accurate supports for the student and to collect data on student learning.

**DISCOVERING IDENTITIES TO PLAN INTERVENTION STRATEGIES**

So what strategies should an inclusion facilitator use to influence a given individual in a given situation? The authors of this book suggest that inclusion facilitators discover what comprises each person’s identity with respect to inclusion across three dimensions

- Bottom-line values
- Concerns about inclusive education
- Personality type

**Bottom-Line Values**

It is likely that some individuals with whom inclusion facilitators may work will value the students’ development of self-esteem or self-actualization above everything else. These teachers would probably support constructivist, experiential teaching. Some teachers may believe that the central role of education is passing down time-honored knowledge, focusing on covering the breadth of the curriculum rather than exploring a few ideas in depth. Others feel that the role of school is to teach students how to learn, given the