Pre-service teacher training and special educational needs in England 1970-2008: is government learning the lessons of the past or is it experiencing a groundhog day?

Personal Details
Dr. Alan Hodkinson
Faculty of Education, Community and Leisure
Liverpool John Moores University
I.M. Marsh Campus
Barkhill Road
Liverpool 17 6JD
A.J.Hodkinson@ljmu.ac.uk

.

Title

Pre-service teacher training and special educational needs in England 1970-2008: is government learning the lessons of the past or is it experiencing a groundhog day?

Abstract
The paper outlines the findings from a literature review of the English's government's response to the issue of training pre-service teachers in the delivery of effective special educational needs support. The Review's findings detail that although educational practice in mainstream classrooms has changed considerably since the 1970s the training of pre-service teachers with regards to special educational needs has seemingly changed very little. The paper argues that the government needs to radically re-think its policy of inclusion to ensure that a coherent plan is formulated which enables Higher Education Institutions' initial teacher training programmes to train students who are competent and confident in their abilities to work with children with special educational needs and/ or disabilities.
Key words

ITT, teacher training, inclusion, integration, SEN, disability

Introduction and background

Special Education in England has during the past thirty years been subject to rapid change not least in respect to the evolution of inclusive educational practice (Hodkinson 2008). Inclusive education, in England though should not be viewed as a new phenomenon as its origins may be traced back over one hundred years to the early welfare pioneers who believed in non-segregated systems of education (O'Brien 2002). In its current form, however, inclusion evolved in England in the 1960's when the policies of educational segregation became subject to debate and ultimately to question. More recently, New Labour swept into government, in 1997, on a tidal wave of educational rhetoric and a commitment to reform the manner in which children with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities were to be educated within England (Hodkinson 2005). The new government's inclusion strategy made it clear that all teachers would be required to identify and meet the needs of pupils with SEN within mainstream schools (Barber & Turner 2007). Indeed, in 2001, this requirement was formalised within a Code of Practice (DfES 2001) when government placed the ball for meeting the needs of children with SEN in the court of mainstream teachers (Ellins and Porter 2005). Over the last decade this inclusion strategy has led, in terms of learners, to classrooms in England becoming more heterogeneous and this has brought considerable challenges for teachers trying to operate within this regime. In 2006, the Education and Skills Select Committee of the House of Commons stated that this regime was not fit for purpose especially as it related to teachers' abilities to operate effectively within these inclusive environments. Their criticism was that...

> "It is unrealistic to expect teachers and other members of the workforce to be able to meet the needs of children with SEN, if they have not received the appropriate training." (77)

It was somewhat surprising therefore that on the 11th of October 2006, some eight years after the implementation of New Labour's policy of inclusion, the secretary of state for education announced that training for the teaching of children with SEN and disabilities needed to become a national priority. In respects to England's inclusion strategy generally, but more specifically for teacher training in SEN, it did seem that government had rather "put the cart before the horse". Whilst one might accept that government had made a mistake in its level of commitment to teacher training, this acceptance proves more difficult if one is cognisant of the litany of research findings that dominate this area. Extant research makes plain that in terms of SEN and training the government was experiencing a "groundhog day" (Basingstoke 2008, col. 601).

The research detailed here provides a more comprehensive review of the literature than that detailed previously (eg., Hodkinson 2005). The paper is specifically contextualised within a critical review of the historical development of the government's policy in respect to the training of pre-service teachers in SEN. The paper employs a number of broad temporal periods to synthesise the evidence gained from a review of government policy with research into how such policy altered the practice of pre-service teacher training in England.

The Context of Special Educational Needs in England

The literature base is replete with papers and articles that provide a comprehensive overview of the historical development and current operation of SEN policy in England and throughout the United Kingdom (see Norwich, 2008, Kay et. al., 2006, Pumpfrey 2008, GB. House of Commons 2006) it is not intended here, therefore, to provide a detailed analysis of such. In essence, though, the publication of the Warnock Report (DES 1978) and the subsequent Education Act of 1981 (DES 1981) observed the establishment of the umbrella concept of SEN (Pumpfrey 2008). This concept replaced the existing medical categories of disabilities and substituted them with one that reflected children's educational and social needs. In 1994, the government established a *Code of Practice in the identification and assessment of special educational needs* (DFEE, 1994). The Code placed a specific duty upon all local education authorities, schools and other professionals to ensure that educational provision matched children's individual needs (Pumpfrey 2008). Subsequent Codes of Practice have, in theory, refined educational practice and so currently when a child is identified as having needs which are additional to their peers (Truss 2008) they enter a three stage process which ultimately seeks to identify, assess and meet their specific SEN. Two school-based levels, those of School Action and School Action Plus, observe teachers firstly working together to meet a child's SEN before involving local authority support services. The third stage requires the local authority to carry out a multi-disciplinary assessment of a child's need after which they decide whether the need is severe or complex enough to warrant the formulation of a Statement of SEN (Norwich 2008). The Statement, which has a legal status, seeks to define a child's SEN and details the additional provision from teachers, speech therapists, occupational health workers etc. that will be needed to address these needs. Currently, government data (DfES 2007) indicates that 16.4 per cent of all pupils have a SEN which represents some 1,293,000 children and that 2.8 per cent, some 229,100 children, have a learning difficulty that is so severe that they require the provision of a Statement of SEN.

Pre-service teacher training: the English Context

The training of pre-service teachers has been a significant part of educational policy in England since the mid 1940s (Bell 1999). From 1984, though, initial teacher training (ITT) has been subject to a series of radical changes (Hargreaves 2000). Historically, the content and organisation of these training courses had been almost entirely under the control of universities (Hargreaves 2000). However, from the mid 1980s a succession of interventions ensured that control of the process of teacher education became rested with the central government's Department for Education (Mentor et. al. 2006). In addition, from this period onwards ITT became more school-based and stronger and clearer partnerships were developed between universities and schools. In 1998, the New Labour government established a national curriculum for ITT and imposed a series of standards which pre-service teachers had to achieve if they were to gain qualified teacher status (QTS) (Mentor et. al. 2006).

Currently, in England ITT is delivered through two distinct routes. First, there are school- or employment-based training schemes such as the graduate teacher or registered teacher programmes which provide "on-the-job" training within local schools. Second, and the more traditional route to achieve QTS, are undergraduate programmes such as the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) or a one year, or equivalent, Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE). The Review, detailed below, concentrates on the historical developments of SEN training programmes that are provided by universities themselves and not those experienced by pre-service teachers within school-based settings.

Method

For the purposes of the Review the literature base was initially mapped by a research question that focussed upon the historical development of teacher training in SEN and disabilities. Following this mapping exercise, data from the literature base was filtered by the employment of the key words of SEN, special needs, disability, inclusion, integration and teacher training. This process was aided by the employment of the search engine Meta Lib and by the manual searching of national and international journals. This primary search revealed that the area for review was extensive and it was conceived that no single paper, such as this, could satisfactorily synthesise and so bring clarity to such a database. A secondary filter question was therefore employed which contextualised the research within relation the historical development of pre-service teacher training in SEN delivered by Higher Educational Institutions (HEI). This secondary filter meant that English language peer-reviewed papers which pertained, in the main, to pre-service training in the England, government documents as well as disability interest group websites were searched. The

search uncovered some 276 items that were of initial interest to the study. A further, and more detailed, search of this material revealed that some 82 items fitted the inclusion criteria and so became subject to review. The Review, then, draws upon data from a body of material published between 1970 and 2008 which relates to the issues of SEN, disability, inclusion and the training of teachers within England. The paper specifically contextualises the findings of the research in relation to the training of pre-service teachers in England. A second forthcoming paper will analyse the historical development of SEN training within in-service and continuing professional development courses.

Pre-service teachers and SEN training: an historical overview

The Warnock Report and the 1970s

The lack of adequate training for teaching staff in SEN is an issue that dates back to the creation of state educational provision in England in 1870 (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). In the modern era, though, SEN and teacher training came to prominence after the implementation of the Education (Handicapped Children) Act (DoH 1970) which transferred the responsibility for children with severe and complex disabilities from the Department of Health to Education. From this time forward HEIs ITT programmes introduced significant, although mainly optional, SEN elements into their programmes (DES 1978). Problematically, the variable quality as well as the sporadic availability of such courses meant that newly qualified teachers (NQTs) often felt ill pre-pared to teach children with SEN and/ or disabilitis. The Warnock Report of 1978 (DES 1978) recognised that a lack of training was acting as a barrier to the integration of all children within mainstream schools. The Report stated that the integration of pupils with complex needs had placed "extensive demands" on teachers and increasing the knowledge base of teachers was of the "upmost importance" (DES 1978, 121). The Warnock Report recommended, therefore, that

> "those responsible for validating teacher training courses should make inclusion of a special education element a condition of their approval of all initial teacher training courses" (DES 1978, 241).

Warnock made several other recommendations regarding what HEIs should include in their programmes. The Report advocated that all teachers should be trained in how to recognise the early signs of SEN. Warnock also believed that students should develop their knowledge of what special education was, how segregated education operated and to familiarise themselves with the work of the specialist advisory services. The Report further stated that ITT should enable students to develop skills, understanding and appreciation of,

- “how children’s home circumstances could give rise to difficulties in schools;
- developmental difficulties such as physical, sensory, emotional, behavioural or learning;
- the practical steps that would be necessary for meeting a child’s needs; and,
- the abilities to develop the attitudes needed for dealing with SEN and the need to modify the school, or classroom and the curriculum” (DES 1978, 3).

Interestingly, despite these wide ranging recommendations Warnock stated that it would not be appropriate for students to engage in, the in-depth study of disabilities and that ITT should not equip students with the abilities to provide children with the specialist help themselves. Warnock though was under no illusion of the immensity of the task of equipping teachers with the skills necessary to work with children with SEN and disabilities, stating that,

> “Some 40 years will need to elapse from that time that the proposed special education element is introduced before it can be assured that all teachers have undertaken such an element in their course of initial training” (DES 1978, 244).

The words of the secretary of state, detailed earlier, suggest that Warnock underestimated the scale of the issue and had no conception of how successive governments’ lack of commitment to this issue would conspire to stall the development of effective training during the next three decades.

ITT and SEN in the 1980s and early 1990s: a postcode lottery of provision

The recommendations of the Warnock Report were adopted in DES Circular 3/84; this specified criteria that students needed to achieve if they were to gain QTS (Mittler 1992). In addition, the specialist training of students in aspects such as hearing impairment or severe learning difficulties were now phased out of most ITT programmes (Jones 2006a).Whilst the Review is specifically located within pre-service training it is interesting to note here that this period also witnessed the government shifting the focus of the provision of SEN. This shift served to reallocate the majority of training in SEN away from ITT and place it in the realms of continuing professional development courses. This period, then, saw the establishment of a number of Masters degrees in special education and a realisation that ITT could only prepare teachers to enter the profession. Specifically, though, within ITT the 1980s saw the reorganisation of undergraduate programmes in England and students were tasked to develop competencies which enabled them to teach children with SEN and/or disabilities within mainstream environments. From the earliest implementation of these criteria, though, researchers argued that the new regime did not go far enough (Blair 1985).

With the advent of a state curriculum for schools in 1989, ITT again came under scrutiny in terms of how programmes of SEN training were delivered. DES circular 24/89 stated that courses,

> "…should prepare students for teaching the full range of pupils, and for the diversity of abilities behaviour, social background and ethnic and cultural origin they are likely to encounter among pupils in mainstreams schools." (cited in Mittler 1992, 4)

Of interest, is that during this period although HEIs were told that they had to include knowledge of SEN issues within their programmes they were not offered advice as to how they might profitably include such issues. The lack of a governmental steer meant that ITT programmes of the late 1980s and early 1990s grew organically within their own geographical locale. As such, courses were often grounded upon the expertise, and ideologies of the staff working in individual HEIs. During this period, then, like the policy of integration of school pupils itself, training in SEN also became subject to a postcode lottery of provision.

In 1990, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools (HMI 1990) investigated the nature of SEN provision offered within ITT. Their report found wide variety in how SEN programmes were delivered, what they included and how much curriculum space was devoted to SEN issues. HMI detailed that the provision of SEN in ITT was, in the main, inadequately preparing students for their future employment. HMI investigations revealed that three approaches to delivering training in SEN and disabilities existed; those of a permeation, focussed elements or the optional module approach (Mittler 1992).

For some institutions, then, training was organised by offering students specific elements in a B.Ed. or PGCE programme which focussed upon SEN and disability issues. These elements were covered within lead lectures offered to year cohorts of students and often were delivered by staff that had expertise in this area. Thomas (1993), though, details that the amount of time devoted to these elements was at best minimal. Thomas reveals that only one third of students received six or more lectures on such elements during their programme and for 36 per cent of students training was limited to only two or more lectures. Furthermore, eighty per cent of the students in Thomas' research complained that SEN had been poorly covered in the subject based and general education lectures that they had attended. Thomas (1993, 113) suggests that focussed approaches to training did nothing more lead to "ghettoizing special needs into strict cabined timetable slots" which served only to marginalise the importance of SEN issues.

A second form of approach adopted by HEIs was that of the free standing SEN module that interested students could subscribed to. Thomas's suggests, though, this training was limited in that only 15 per cent of HEIs offered such modules. By far the most common approach found by HMI was one which they named permeation. Within this approach every element of the programme included reference to SEN and as such all tutors took responsibility for training students in such issues (Garner 1996; Mittler 1992). HMI concluded that programmes organised in this manner were of variable quality and depended heavily upon individual tutor's experience (Garner 1996). The report of HMI criticised those HEIs who pursued this form of training detailing that programmes employing such approaches lacked foundation in terms of course content (Garner 1996).

Despite the criticism of HMI, many HEIs in England continued to teach students using the established methodologies. Thomas (1993) relates this period in history witnessed neither a coherent pattern nor application of training and in reality SEN issues often became no more than a Cinderella dimension within ITT. Other researches, from this period, concur with Thomas detailing the impoverished nature of the SEN training experienced by students (e.g., Robertson 1999; Special Educational Needs Training Consortium 1991). In addition, research notes that students continued to express apprehension (Winter 2006) about their level of competence in working with children with SEN within mainstream schools (e.g., Budge 1996; Cains & Brown 1999; Dwyfor -Davies and Garner 1997; Garner 1996; Thomas 1993; Wedell 1995). Garner (1996) concludes that this period bore testament to HEIs growing uncertainty as to what SEN training should include and how it should be delivered.

New Labour: the metrification of ITT

The succession of New Labour in 1997 marked the beginning of a period of "sustained and increasingly radical reform of ITT" as government "progressively increased prescription and control of teacher training" (Mc Namara et al. 2008, 1). New Labour were elected upon a commitment, amongst others, to reform the manner in which children with SEN and disabilities were to be educated. The DFEE (1998a) paper, Excellence for All and the Programme of Action (DFEE 1998b) introduced their policy of education, a policy that "promoted concepts of inclusion and practices of collaboration" (Crese et al. 2000, 307). The Green Paper advocated that all children, where possible, should be educated within mainstream schools regardless of nature of their SEN or disability (Hodkinson 2005). These documents detailed that students should gain more practical experiences of working with children with SEN and disabilities and that government would provide a greater emphasis upon such issues within ITT (Vickerman 2007). So, some two decades after the publication

of the Warnock Report a government's clarion call once again became one which correlated successful inclusion with teacher training in SEN (Hodkinson 2005).

1998 also brought a radical restructure of ITT and for the first time in the post war era the government, through the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), took sole control of the content of pre-service training. From this time forward, all trainees, as they were now designated, would have to meet a set of standards if they were to gain qualified teacher status (Golder et al. 2005). Within this regime all trainees had to gain an understanding of,

- how pupils' learning is affected by their physical, intellectual, emotional and social development;
- how to identify pupils who had specific learning difficulties, are very able, or do not have fluent English; and,
- use and implement relevant parts of the Code of Practice for Special Needs (cited in Barber & Turner 2002).

The statement, attributed to Petronius Arbiter a Roman general, would appear to sum up the government's response to SEN training at this time,

> "…we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing; and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency, and demoralization."

The standards however were not welcomed by HEIs nor by education professionals in general (Reynolds, 2001; Barber & Turner 2001). Reynolds comments the standards did nothing more than promote practical competence with little consideration being given to the foundations that underpin practice. Reynolds (2001, 471) argues the standards were there for accreditation purposes and therefore they did not include the development of evaluative skills, nor, the values that underpin practice in working with children with SEN. Allan (2003, 171) believes that the standards were an "official scrip" which was "determinant and restrictive and which emphasised the discipline and control of children" not the support of children with complex and severe disabilities.

It would appear, then, that whilst government had reorganised the HEI legions by specifying what trainees should be taught it had failed to dictate how the knowledge, skills and understanding of SEN should be organised and delivered. Rather than progressing training in SEN the government had in fact reduced its scope and depth. As such it had missed an opportunity to construct the system of coherent training that had so eluded HEIs during the late 1980s and early 1990s. The government, then, during the late 1990s failed to heed the warnings of the past choosing instead to continue along the path of minimising the influence of SEN within ITT.

SEN training in the 21st Century

The late 1990s and the beginning of the 21st Century observed further reductions in the time allocated to SEN within ITT as the government's focus turned to the promotion of National Strategies for Numeracy and Literacy. In 2002, the TTA introduced a new set of standards for qualified teacher status of which three standards related directly to SEN. Trainees, needed to demonstrate,

- that they understood their responsibilities under the SEN Code of Practice, and how to seek advice from specialist on less common types of SEN;
- they could differentiate their teaching to meet the needs of pupils including those of SEN; and,
- that they were able to identify and support pupils who experienced behavioural, emotional and learning difficulties (DFES 2004).

While some writers welcomed the introduction of these standards others criticised the strong focus on procedural knowledge and compliance at the expense of gaining knowledge of "the underlying and practical aspects of pedagogy that trainees teachers both want and need to know" (Golder et al. 2005, 93). Through these standards, and under the watchful eyes of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), training in SEN was conceptualised in terms of minimalistic, technical standards of compliance. Basingstoke (2008, col. 601) recently commented in the Houses of Parliament that government's lack of action on the issue of training had enveloped its policy within a "Groundhog day". The Review evidences that the 2002 standards bear a remarkable resemblance to those laid out in the Warnock Report of 1978. It would appear, then, that successive governments had done nothing to enhance the nature of training in respects to SEN issues but in reality had only kept the legions of HEI trainers marking time. To support this contention one need only examine the comment of Ofsted (2003, 24) which reiterated the well worn critique of Warnock and HMI (DES, 1978; HMI,1990) stating that teachers "were being asked to lead children with significant learning needs and manage difficult situations without enough learning". With, what might be perceived as, a somewhat wearisome cry the government in 2004 again confirmed its commitment to including children with SEN and/or disabilities in mainstream classrooms. They stated

> "we will work with the Teacher Training Agency and higher education institutions to ensure that initial teacher training … programmes provide a good grounding in core skills and knowledge of SEN…" (DfES 2004, 57).

The 2004 inclusion policy document, like many before it, made clear that the government expected every teacher to be a teacher of children with SEN and that they should be equipped with the "skills to do so effectively" (Lambe, 2007, 361). Somewhat like a scratched record, then, the government once again promoted training as the panacea to all the ills

schools faced in overcoming the barriers which were stalling the implementation of the policy of inclusion. The literature, though, makes plain that "despite continuous and widespread requests from HEIs, researchers, disability interests groups, and with the passage of nearly thirty years of research "in the pedagogy of inclusion" there remained a common feeling amongst professionals that the level of training in SEN offered to pre-service teachers and moreover the governments' commitment to providing such training was still inadequate (Hodkinson 2005,20).

SEN Training: the current position

The literature published during the past few years suggests that while "much has changed in our classrooms in relation to inclusion" (Winter 2006, 2) that "little has really changed in the ways student teachers are prepared" (Moran 2007,121) in relation to SEN (e.g., Barber and Turner 2007; Forlin and Hopewell 2006; Jones 2006b; Moran 2007; Winter 2006; Vickerman 2007). Currently, then most HEIs in England continue to develop their programmes in an "ad hoc manner" (Moran 2007, 124) and it is apparent that training continues to be grounded upon "the philosophy of particular institutions rather than on student teachers' entitlement" (Jones, 2006b: 105). Despite some evidence of students' positive experiences of SEN during teaching practice (Lambe 2007) the weight of evidence suggests that HEIs are still addressing training demands by the employment of the methodologies of permeation and focussed modular provision. For example, Vickerman (2007,396) details that only 29 per cent of HEIs in England offered trainees mandatory modules in SEN with a similar number choosing to "holistically embed" such issues within their programmes. Of further interest is that Vickerman notes that only 42 per cent of HEIs offered optional modules and that some 50 per cent of all programmes developed knowledge of SEN in a purely theoretical manner. Combing this data with that of Winter (2006), which indicates that trainees can receive as little as 10 hours of training on SEN issues, it appears that mandatory and discrete training in SEN and inclusion is seemingly not favoured as an approach to the training of pre-service teachers within England.

In 2007, the Teacher Development Agency [TDA] (the successor of the TTA) responded to the training issues that had been outlined within the government's 2004 inclusion road map (DfES 2004). The TDA again sounded the government's clarion call of training, stating that "by improving (trainees') knowledge, and skills we can help them deliver a more inclusive and personalised learning experience for pupils" (TDA 2008,1). Unusually, though, in terms of the history of SEN training, on this occasion something new actually did happen. In 2007 the TDA commenced a project within some HEIs which involved the delivery of three training modules that focussed upon SEN and disability. Further work with the University of London,

witnessed the creation of a four week special school placement which was to be piloted in 20 HEIs (TDA 2008). According to the TDA this training specifically sought to "improve early identification and intervention in SEN and to ensure trainees undertook placements in special education" (LDC 2008, 1). According to the Learning Development Community (LDC) (2008) the response from trainees and HEIs towards this initiative has been very positive. However, despite a request the TDA has promulgated no corroborating data to support the LDC's view. Most recently, members of parliament in a debate on SEN questioned the significance of these initiatives. Miller (2008, col. 601) stated that despite her investigations and requests for information she "could find no official statistics of the number of trainees... who had received specialist training". Within the same debate, Basingstoke (2008, col.602) suggested, that in reality nothing had changed and he urged the government to "restart negotiations with the TDA to ensure that SEN training became a compulsory part of all ITT training programmes".

In 2007 the TDA also introduced new standards for teachers of which three related to SEN

> "Q18 – understand how children and young people develop and that the progress and well-being of learners are affected by a range of developmental, social, religious, ethnic, cultural and linguistic influences
>
> Q19 – know how to make effective personalised provision for those they teach including those for whom English is an additional language or who have special educational needs or disabilities, and how to take practical account of diversity and promote equality and inclusion in their teaching
>
> Q20 – know and understand the role of colleagues with specific responsibility including those with responsibility for learners with SEN and disabilities and other individual learning needs" (TDA 2007a, 2)

While the government firmly believed these new standards were an important vehicle for the development of trainees' knowledge of SEN and disability issues (Adonis 2007) one cannot help but question whether these standards will actually lead to NQTs feeling more confident and being more competent in their ability to identify and address the personalised learning needs of all pupils. The evidence from the Review does not support the premise that they will. To be specific, these standards still promote a "technicist approach" (Pearson 2007, 26) of auditable competencies rather than the values of the pedagogical principles that underpin effective SEN practice. Furthermore, the standards are not a radical departure from those that have been detailed previously. Moreover, one might argue these standards serve only to further restrict the development of knowledge of SEN and disabilities at the expense of promoting the government's agenda of personalised learning. Evidence from the NQT survey (TDA 2007b) suggests that although there has been a small increase in trainees'

preparedness to teach children with SEN some 48 per cent still do not feel prepared to do so. Moran's (2007) research corroborates this data detailing that head teachers believe that the trainees they are receiving are ill-prepared to deal with the issues of SEN and disability within mainstream classrooms.

Of more concern, is that other researches, which asked more detailed questions of trainees, than those of the NQT survey, paint a pessimistic picture of trainees' preparedness to teach in inclusive environments. These studies indicate that anywhere up to 89 per cent of trainees feel they do not have the confidence to teach children with SEN and/ or disabilities. Furthermore, in 2008, Ofsted (Ofsted 2008) completed research which analysed the quality of pre-service and induction training with respects to SEN and disability in 16 HEIs. Its findings evidence that ITT programmes were providing training that was at least adequate in 15 HEIs. Ofsted's also revealed that there were considerable variations in practice not least in PGCE programmes where they believed that time constraints were undermining the quality of provision. Ofsted were also critical of HEIs who placed too much reliance on schools to provide the majority of their SEN training. They commented that programmes organised in this manner often work to the detriment of trainees. Indeed, Ofsted's findings detail that trainees often feel ill prepared to teach children with SEN and/or disabilities within inclusive classrooms. In light of their findings Ofsted have recommended that the TDA should specify exactly what ITT programmes should cover with respects to learning difficulties and disabilities. Additionally, and of interest here, is that Ofsted also recommended that ITT programmes should be based upon the permeation approach, an approach that as we observed earlier was roundly criticised by HMI in the 1990s.

It light of the findings detailed above it would seem it is still the case that trainees continue to have early development needs in relation to SEN. (see, Forlin and Hopewell 2006; Hodkinson 2005, 2006; Lambe 2007; Moran 2007; Morely et al. 2005; Ofsted, 2007; Winter 2006). It would appear, then, that in 2008, despite 30 years of governmental clarion calls that

> "much remains to be addressed during initial teacher education, if inclusive practices are to be fostered and embedded in teacher education"
> (Moran 2007,125).

Conclusions

The Review has identified that SEN and teacher training within England is in many respects a Cinderella dimension in many HEIs programmes. Whilst inclusive practice within mainstream classrooms has evolved it would appear that despite government rhetoric little has actually changed in relation to SEN training since the Warnock Report of 1978. Whilst

we should applaud the current TDA initiatives the review of the literature suggests that “preparation for inclusion cannot be left to chance” (Moran 2007,126) if ITT is to effectively develop trainees who are fully prepared to work with children with SEN and/ or disabilities. The Review suggests, therefore, that if government is to escape the groundhog day of SEN and training there is an imperative for them and HEIs in England to provide coordinated learning programmes which ensure trainees continuously develop knowledge and understanding of, and experience and interact with, a diverse range of pupils that society has traditionally excluded.

References

Adonis, A. 2007. Speech made by Lord Adonis at the launch of the Inclusion Development Programme.http://www.communicationmatters.org.uk/downloads/news/2007_adonis_idp.pdf

Allan, J. 2003. Productive pedagogies and the challenges of inclusion. *British Journal of Special Education* 30, no.4: 175-181.

Barber, N. Turner, M. 2007. Even while they teach, newly-qualified teachers learn. *British Journal of Special Education*, 34, no.1:33-39.

Basingstoke,M. 2008. *Hansard* – Col. 589-600.

Budge, D. 1996. Qualified for the job but not prepared. *Times Educational Supplement*. Issue 4167, 13.

Bell, L. 1999. Chronicles of wasted time? Initial Teacher Education in England 1960-1999. Australian Journal of Education. 43 available at:
http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Chronicles+of+wasted+time%3F+Initial+teacher+education+in+England:+...-a060004525

Blair, C. 1983. Classroom teachers' perceptions of pre-service education related to teaching the handicapped. *Journal of Teacher Education* 34:52-54.

Cains, R. & Brown, C. 1996. Newly qualified primary teachers: A comparative analysis of perceptions held by B.Ed. and PGCE trained students teachers of their training routes. *Educational Psychology* 16, no.3: 257-270.

Creese, A., Norwich, B., Daniels, H. 2000. Evaluating Teacher Support Teams in Secondary Schools: Supporting teachers for SEN and other needs. *Research Papers in Education* 15, no.3:307-324.

Department for Education and Employment [DFEE] (1994) Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs, HMSO: London.

Department for Education and Employment [DFEE]. 1998a. *Excellence for All Children, Meeting Special Educational Needs*. London: DFEE.

Department for Education and Employment [DFEE]. 1998b. *The Programme of Action: Meeting Special Educational Needs*. London: DFEE.

Department of Education and Science [DES]. 1978. *Special Educational needs. Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People*. London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science [DES]. 1984. *Initial Teacher Training – Approval of Course*, Circular 3/84 . London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Science [DFES]. 2001. *Special Educational Needs Code of Practice*. http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/_doc/3724/SENCodeOfPractice.pdf

Department for Education and Skills [DFES]. 2004. *Removing barriers to achievement: the government's strategy for SEN*. Nottingham: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills [DFES] (2007), Statistics of Education: Special Educational Needs in England January 2004, London:HMSO.

Department of Health [DoH]. 1970. *Education (Handicapped Children) Act*. London: DoH.

Dwyfor-Davies, J. & Garner, P. 1997. The views of newly qualified teachers concerning SEN provision in ITE course. In eds *At the crossroads: Special Educational Needs and Teacher Education.* J. Dwyfor-Davies and P. Garner., 6-18. London: David Fulton.

Education and Skills Committee.2006. *Third Report*.
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmeduski/478/47802.htm

Ellins, J. & Porter, J. 2005. Departmental differences in attitudes to special educational needs in secondary schools *British Journal of Educational Studies.* 32, no.4:188-195.

Forlin, C. & Hopewell, T. 2006. Inclusion – the heart of the matter: trainee teachers' perceptions of a parent's journey. *British Journal of Special Education*. 33, no.2:55-61.

Garner, P. 1996. A special education? The experiences of newly qualified teachers during initial teacher training. *British Educational Research Journal*. 22, no.2:155-165.

Golder, G., Norwich, B. & Bayliss, P. 2005. Preparing teachers to teach pupils' with special educational needs in more inclusive schools evaluating a PGCE development. *British Journal of Special Education.* 32, no2: 92-99.

Hargreaves, D.H. 2000. How to design and implement a revolution in teacher education and training: some lessons from England. Key note address Teacher Education policies in the European Union Conference. Algarve, 22-23rd May 2000.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate [HMI].1990. *Special Educational Needs in Initial Teacher Training*. London: DES.

Hodkinson, A.J. 2005. Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education: a critical examination of final year teacher trainees' knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *International Journal of Research in Education*. 73: 15-29.
Hodkinson, A.J. 2006. Conceptions and Misconceptions of Inclusive Education: One Year On; a Critical Examination of NQT's Knowledge and Understanding of Inclusion. *International Journal of Research in Education*, 76: 43-55.
Hodkinson, A.J. 2008 (forthcoming) Inclusive and Special Education in the English Educational System: historical perspectives, recent developments and future challenges. British Journal of Special Education. 38.
Hodkinson, A.J. and Vickerman, P. 2009. forthcoming. *Education Studies Essential Issues: Special Needs and Inclusion*. London:Sage.
House of Commons, Parliament, Great Britain. 2006. *Special Educational Needs. Third Report of Sessions 2005-6. Vol.1*. London: The Stationary Office.
Jones, G. 2006a. Department for Education and Skills/ Department of Health, Good Practice Guidance on the education of children with autistic spectrum disorder. *Child Care Health and Development.* 32:543-552.
Jones, P. 2006b. They are not like us and neither should they be: issues of teacher identity for teachers of pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties. *Disability & Society*. 19. no.2:159-169.
Kay, E., Tisdall, M. & Riddell, S. 2006. *Policies on special needs education: competing strategies and discourses*. European Journal of Special Needs Education. 21, no.4: 363-379.
Lambe, J. 2007. Student teachers special educational needs and inclusion education: reviewing the potential for problem-based e-learning pedagogy to student practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 33, no.3:259-377.
Learning Development Community [LDC]. Available at:http://www.theldc.org.uk/content.asp?did=29257&backto=u_search3.asp&curpage=&search=SEN.
McNamara, O, Webb, R. & Brundrett, M. 2008. *Primary Teachers: Initial Teacher Education, Continuing Professional Development and School Leadership Development*. Primary Review – Research Briefings.
Mentor, I., Brisard,E. & Smith, I. 2006. Making Teachers in Britain: Professional Knowledge for initial teacher education in England and Scotland. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 38, no.3: 269-289.
Miller, J. 2008. *Hansard.* Col 601.
Mittler, P. 1992. Preparing all initial teacher training students to teach children with special educational needs: a case study from England. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 7, no.1:1-10.
Moran, A. 2007. Embracing inclusive teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education.* 30, no.2:119-134.
Morley, D., Bailey, R., Tan, J. & Cooke, B. 2006.Inclusive Physical Education: teacher's views of including pupils with Special Educational Needs and/ or disabilities in Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review*. 11, no.1: 84-107.
Norwich, B. 2008. Dilemmas of difference, inclusion and disability: international perspectives in placement. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 23, no.4: 287-307.
O'Brien, T. (ed) (2002) *Enabling Inclusion. Blue skies…Dark Clouds*. London: Optimus.
Office for Standards in Education [OFSTED]. 2003. *Special Educational Needs in the Mainstream*. London: HMSO.
Office for Standards in Education [OFSTED]. 2008 How well new teachers are prepared to teach pupils with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. London: HMSO.
Pearson, S. 2005. SEN- a politically correct phrase to replace terms such as disabled? A study of the view of students entering a secondary PGCE course. *Support for Learning*. 20, no.1: 17-23.
Pearson, S. 2007. Exploring inclusive education: early steps for prospective secondary school teachers. *British Journal of Special Education*. 34, no.1:25-32.
Petronius Arbiter (undated). http://www.dtc.umn.edu/~reedsj/petronius.html
Pumfrey, P.D. 2008. Moving towards inclusion? The first-degree results of students with and without disabilities in higher education in the UK: 1998-2005. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 23, no.1:31-46.
Reynolds, M. 2001. Education for Inclusion, Teacher Education and the Teacher Training Agency Standards. *Journal of In-Service Education*. 27, no.3:465-476.

Robertson, C. 1999. Early Intervention: The education of Young Children with Developmental Co-ordination Disorder. In*Young Children's Learning.* ed, T. David.London, Paul Chapman.
Special Educational Needs Training Consortium.1996. *Professional Development to Meet Special Educational Needs: Report to the Department for Education*. Stafford, SENTC: Flash Ley Reource Centre.
Teacher Training Agency [TTA]. 1999.*National Special Educational Needs Standards*.London: TTA.
Teacher Development Agency [TDA]. 2007a. Qualified Teacher Status Standards. http://www.tda.gov.uk/partners/ittstandards.aspx?keywords=qts+standards
Teacher Development Agency [TDA]. 2007b. The newly qualified teachers survey 2007. http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/n/nqt_survey_2007.pdf
Teacher Development Agency [TDA] .2008. www.tda.gove.uk/teachers/sen/support_teachers_and_trainers.aspx.
Thomas, D. 1993. Gritty, sensible and utilitarian- the only model? Special educational needs, initial teacher training and professional development. In *Rethinking Special Needs in Mainstream Schools* eds, A. Dyson & C.Gains. London: David Fulton
Truss, C. 2008. Peter's story: reconceptualising the UK SEN system. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 23, no.4:365-377.
Vickerman, P. 2007. Training physical education teachers to include children with special educational needs: Perspectives from physical education initial teacher training providers. *European Physical Education Review*. 13, no.3:385-407.
Winter, E.C. 2006. Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classrooms. *Support for Learning.* 21, no.2: 85-91.
Wedell, K. 1995. Making inclusive education ordinary. *British Journal of Special Education*. 22, no.3: 100-104.