

The background of the cover is a warm, autumnal illustration. It features various types of leaves in shades of brown, tan, and gold, some with detailed vein patterns. A pair of glasses with a dark frame is positioned in the lower right corner, partially overlapping the leaves. The overall texture is soft and painterly, with some areas appearing more saturated than others.

NASET
Special Educator
e-Journal
November 2019

Table of Contents

[Special Education Legal Alert. By Perry A. Zirkel](#)

[Buzz from the Hub](#)

[Book Review: Transforming School Culture: How to Overcome Staff Division. By Carolina Fonseca](#)

[Monitoring Interventions: Using Check-In/Check-Out for Students with Persistent Learning and Behavior Challenges. By Marissa Desiree Pardo](#)

[Book Review: Deliberate Excellence: 3 Fundamental Strategies that Drive Educational Leadership. By Loydeen Thomas](#)

[Provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education Throughout History: Evidence-Based Interventions and Instruction. By Marissa Desiree Pardo](#)

[Book Review: School Culture Rewired: How to Define, Assess, and Transform It. By Cailyn Lawler](#)

[A Critique of Differentiated Instruction in a Data-Based Context. By Maria Frontela](#)

[Book Review: Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. By Elizabeth Haddad](#)

[Latest Job Opportunities Posted on NASET](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

Special Education Legal Alert

By Perry A. Zirkel

© October 2019

This month's update highlights two recent federal court decisions that of general significance: (a) an unpublished trial court decision that again illustrates the varying interpretations of the need for special education, and (b) a published appellate court decision with multiple issues, including the "reasonable period" dimension of Child Find. For further case law information on all of these issues, see recent publications on my website perryzirkel.com.

In *Hoover City Board of Education v. Leventry* (2019), a federal district court in Alabama addressed the issue of IDEA eligibility for a high school student with diagnoses of post-traumatic stress disorder and conversion disorder, which resulted in severe panic attacks, convulsions, hallucinations, and frequent pseudo seizures. The eligibility team concluded that the student qualified under emotional disturbance but did not need special education, instead proposing a 504 plan that included counseling, an academic success class, and various accommodations. The parents filed for due process, and the hearing officer concluded that the district engaged in circular reasoning by focusing on what services were available rather than on securing sufficient information about the student's unique needs. The school district appealed to federal district court.

The court affirmed the hearing officer's decision, concluding that the eligibility team had not obtained sufficient information about this "unique nature and severity of her disability" and, thus, whether she needed specially designed instruction. Specifically, the eligibility team did not consult with her regularly treating therapist, who was a licensed professional counselor specializing in conditions based on abuse and trauma, or, conversely, have its own psychologist personally examine the student.

The court was careful not to generalize the fatal flaws of the eligibility team in this case, emphasizing that "conversion disorder is rare, and its implications for a student are not common knowledge among professional educators" and that no member of the student's eligibility team had specialized knowledge of the nature and severity of her disability.

Similarly, the court did not rule that the student was eligible under the IDEA, instead affirming the hearing officer's order for the eligibility team to reconsider its need-for-special-education determination after obtaining sufficient information about the nature and severity of this individual student's particular disability.

As a result, the court ruled that the student's court-appointed guardian (as the result of family abuse and neglect) was not entitled to attorneys' fees "at this point," subject to a subsequent determination as to whether the student met the remaining eligibility standard.

The bottom that (1) the need for special education is a thorny issue that warrants special care and caution and, (2) given the mental

health issues of the nation's youth, including increasing incidence of severe trauma, this relatively narrow ruling is bound to

have broader applications and variations than the peculiar contours of conversion disorder in combination with PTSD.

In *Spring Branch Independent School District v. O.W.* (2019), the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals addressed a series of issues ranging from child find to remedies for a student with a history of behavioral problems. In August 2014, upon enrolling him in the district for grade 5, his parents shared with the principal that he was transferring from a private therapeutic school and that his diagnoses included ADHD, Mood Disorder, and Oppositional Defiant Disorder. They also provided a letter from the child's psychiatrist recommending a 504 plan. School personnel collaborated with his parents to ascertain positive incentives for on-task behavior, but his acting out reached classroom interruptions on a daily basis by early October. At a meeting on October 8, the team determined that he qualified under Sec. 504 and provided him with a BIP, which incorporated MTSS Tier 2 and possible movement to Tier 3 interventions. His misconduct decreased for a few weeks, but subsequently escalated until he assaulted a staff member on January 9. On January 15, the district convened a 504 meeting that resulted in a referral for a special education evaluation under the IDEA. The evaluation resulted in a determination of eligibility as ED, an IEP that included an FBA-based BIP, and placement in an "adaptive behavior program" at another elementary school. His problematic behaviors continued at his new placement, which resulted in various in-class time-outs and, in the wake of 8 incidents of violence, restraints. In May, the parents agreed with school officials on a three-hour day. During the summer, his parents unilaterally placed him in a therapeutic school for 2015–16. In October 2015, they filed for a hearing, seeking compensatory education and tuition reimbursement for a series of alleged violations, starting with child find.

For the child find claim, the question for the Fifth Circuit was whether the 3-month interval between the un-appealed October 8 date of "reasonable suspicion" and the January 15 referral was a "reasonable period." Reasoning that the answer depends on the district's actions, the Fifth Circuit ruled that in light of the utter failure of the district's previous efforts

This new approach to the second, "reasonable period" dimension of child find warrants careful attention. In this case, the court's application of it this approach is subject to question. Rejecting rather than crediting the district for moving to a more formal, systematic step on October 8, the court appeared to negate any period at all, conflating it into the "reasonable suspicion" dimension of child find and focusing on the

“the continued use of behavioral interventions was not [the requisite] proactive step[s].”	district’s steps prior to rather than “during the relevant period.” Future cases will resolve whether this seeming incongruity is either factually idiosyncratic or more generally explainable.
For the FAPE claim, the primary issue was the implementation, not substantive, standard. The Fifth Circuit concluded that, in light of Texas law, the district’s use of time-outs, not restraints, was a failure to implement the IEP that amounted to denial of FAPE.	This ruling is largely jurisdiction-specific in two ways. First, Texas law broadly defines time-outs and, for their use, requires limits to be in the IEP, whereas it authorizes physical restraints for violence without any requirement for inclusion in the IEP. Second, the Fifth Circuit has a distinctive two-step approach for failure-to-implement denials of FAPE.
For remedies, the Fifth Circuit sent the case back for reconsideration, because (1) it reversed some of the lower court rulings, and (2) tuition reimbursement, unlike compensatory education, is limited to the period of denial of FAPE.	The problem was the lower court authorized two years of relief—reimbursement for 2016-17 as compensatory education and reimbursement for 2015-16 under tuition reimbursement—for the one-year denial of FAPE (being the child find and failure-to-implement violations in 2014-15).
This published appellate decision, which includes two other nuanced issues, illustrates the complexity and fluidity of the wide range of IDEA litigation claims and outcomes. The child find issue is probably the most practically significant one in this fertile case in light of the frequency of this issue and its seemingly new approach to the “reasonable period” dimension.	

[To top](#)

NASET SPONSOR

Earn your **fully funded** Ph.D. in Special Education at the University of Central Florida



**Paid Tuition, fees, health insurance; \$22k Stipend Annually;
Full time enrollment required – Orlando, FL**



[Click here for more information](#)

Buzz from the Hub

All articles below can be accessed through the following links:

<https://www.parentcenterhub.org/buzz-oct2019-issue1/>

<https://www.parentcenterhub.org/buzz-sept2019-issue2/>

The Student Voice

Family Guide to IEP Team Member Roles

This 2019 PowerPoint from NTACT is divided into parts by the roles that various people on the IEP team play. The first part is directed at students and lists 10 questions that a student would answer, such as “What are my responsibilities in preparing for my IEP meetings?” The same structure is used for other roles on the team: parent, teacher, related service provider, VR representative, healthcare professional, and adult disabilities service agency representative.

Implementing PBIS in High Schools: Student Voice

Incorporating student voice in a meaningful way in high schools requires creativity due to the large number of students and staff and the organizational culture of the school. Given what we know about adolescent development, allowing for student voice is critical for building stakeholder support. This 6-page brief from the PBIS Center identifies some of the effective strategies high schools have used to include student voice.

Supported Decision Making: Part 1 (Skills to Build Independence)

An important part of becoming an independent adult is being able to make decisions. This 53-minute webinar discusses steps that will help build skills and answer questions such as: What does it mean to be a supporter? How does supported decision making differ from guardianship? When can we begin skill development?

And Don't Forget Resources Already on the Hub

Just a quick reminder that there are many resources on the Hub focused on student participation and self-advocacy. Especially have a look at: (a) **Best Practices in Self-Advocacy Skill**

Building and its **webinar**; and (b) **Students Get Involved!**

Two Data Resources

Status of State-Defined Alternate Diplomas in 2018-19

Under ESSA, states may develop a “state-defined alternate diploma” for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. To count this diploma in a graduation measure for accountability, several criteria must be met. This NCEO report summarizes the status of state-defined alternate diplomas in the 50 states as of 2018-19.

OSEP's New TA&D Infographic

We've mentioned this before, but it's worth repeating (and downloading as a resource to have at your fingertips). OSEP's 2-page infographic neatly lists the network of technical assistance and dissemination (TA&D) programs it funds as part of improving outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

New from the Feds

Increasing Postsecondary Opportunities and Success for Students and Youth with Disabilities

Want to know more about postsecondary opportunities for students with disabilities, including the use of IDEA and vocational rehab funds to support a student's transition-related services? Just released, this 16-page question-and-answer guide from the Department of Education is a great place to start.

Parent Guides, Anyone?

The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) has a **shiny new website** with resources for families, grantees, and educators. Via the "Families" box on the home page, you can find several Parent Guides (linked above) to share with your families. There's one on ESSA, another on state and local report cards, and a third on school climate resources. There's even a link to CPIR!

Skills to Pay the Bills: Mastering Soft Skills for Workplace Success

This redesigned how-to training resource comes from the Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP). It's long, to be sure (142 pages!), but it's packed with exercises for youth to get them thinking about, practicing, and discussing skills important to career and personal success—soft skills. More than 100 young people provided honest (and sometimes brutal) feedback to the publication's design and content.

New for Families

Understanding and Coping with Sexual Behavior Problems in Children

Sexual exploration and play are a natural part of childhood sexual development, and help children learn about their own bodies as well as the social and cultural rules that govern sexual behavior. Some childhood sexual behaviors, however, indicate more than harmless curiosity. Find out more in this 2019 fact sheet from the National Child Traumatic Stress Network.

Parents Deserve Clear Information About Student Growth in Schools

As important partners in student and school performance, parents deserve to be empowered with information about their student's academic growth. Understanding how their student's learning is changing over time, parents are equipped to better advocate for their student. The Data Quality Campaign and the National PTA created this brief to outline what parents need to know. (A good companion resource to have is the **Parent Guide to Education Data**.)

What I Wish Parents Asked at Parent-Teacher Conferences

Teachers weigh in, sharing what they wish parents would ask at parent-teacher conferences. You may be surprised (and encouraged) by what teachers had to say.

[To top](#)

Book Review

Transforming School Culture: How to Overcome Staff Division

By Carolina Fonseca

Creating a balance between staff members in any organization can prove to be a difficult task. Differences in beliefs, opinions, race, socioeconomic background, education, etc. all play a role in the way in which individuals perform and react to certain situations, contributing to the overall culture of the organization. Often times, these differences can cause organizations to fall into negative spaces and create toxic cultures. In schools, particularly, these disconnects can not only harm the school as a whole but can negatively impact individual students as well. In his book, “Transforming School Culture: How to Overcome Staff Division”, Anthony Muhammad created a framework to help leaders understand staff division influenced by all the factors mentioned above, and to help guide schools in transforming from toxic cultures to healthy cultures. He aimed at spreading his belief that creating awareness of toxic environments and what causes them, was crucial in providing leaders with strategies to overcome them as supported by this excerpt from his book.

“I believe that if school leaders holistically understand the most important variables in unhealthy learning environments and arm themselves with strategies to uproot and replace the toxic elements, then they can be successful at creating healthy learning environments in their schools.”

(MUHAMMAD, 2018, p. 28)

After studying and observing 34 schools, Muhammad, an educational consultant with over 20 years of experience in the field of education, was able to group staff members into four distinct groups. The members of each group were fundamental in making up the school culture whether it was toxic or healthy. Each school observed had the following identifiable groups of educators within the school: the Believers, the Tweeners, the Survivors and the Fundamentalists. Each group identified had specific characteristics that helped Muhammad group them. Similar to Michael Fullan’s ideas of creating a culture of change through moral purpose, understanding change, building relationships, knowledge building and coherence making in his book “Leading in a Culture of Change”, Muhammad emphasized the importance of these same concepts as argued by the following excerpt from his book:

“Technical or structural changes can certainly aid this process, but if the human factors are not healthy, growth and transformation become very difficult. This book has made a case for understanding why schools have such a difficult time changing when members of the culture cannot accept new paradigms that do not mesh with the traditional operation of schools.” (MUHAMMAD, 2018, p. 99)

Each of these groups had a chapter dedicated to them describing their characteristics, beliefs and core values. Muhammad stated, “Of the four types of educators I observed in schools and classrooms during my study, the two with the most influence and importance to school culture are the Believers and the Fundamentalists (MUHAMMAD, 2018, p. 61) It was evident through his writing, that he placed the most importance and emphasis on these two chapters in the book. Though the information presented was insightful, it was very one-sided and came off as opinion-based. In order

to truly understand how each group influences an organization, each group should have received the same amount of information to help leaders better understand them and how to maximize each group's strengths to help build relationships and create coherence.

Muhammad did provide a fairly easy to read format that highlighted the main ideas he was trying to portray. The material was relatable as I was able to group some of my own colleagues based on my observations and personal experiences. Although his book aimed at providing strategies to overcome staff division, I believe the book focused more heavily on describing the individuals that make up the organization rather than how to work with them to create a healthier school culture.

Overall, this book was insightful and straightforward. As an educator working in a very diverse setting, it is important to continue to learn how to best work with those around me to better serve the students I teach. Anthony Muhammad did a great job emphasizing the need for understanding cultural changes to create cohesion and healthy school cultures to better meet the needs of students everywhere.

Sources

Muhammad, A. (2018). *Transforming school culture: How to overcome staff division*. Place of publication not identified: SOLUTION TREE.

[To top](#)

Monitoring Interventions: Using Check-In/Check-Out for Students with Persistent Learning and Behavior Challenges

By Marissa Desiree Pardo

Abstract

For students with disabilities (SWD), behavioral problems may often impede their academic success. Progress monitoring tools are a vital component of regulating behaviors and promoting positive academic habits as a result. This study will address the effectiveness of the Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) method, where a student self-monitors their behavior throughout the day on a daily progress report while receiving feedback and reinforcers from their parents and teachers. What the studies show is that CICO heavily emphasizes praise for replacement behaviors, which in turn increases engagement in trying to improve target behaviors. There is also some evidence that suggests this improves academic success as a result

Monitoring Interventions: Using Check-In/Check-Out for Students with Persistent Learning and Behavior Challenges **Progress Monitoring**

As of recent years, many schools in the United States have adopted and implemented a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) to emphasize the need to collect data in regards to academics and behaviors. MTSS, more commonly referred to as a response to intervention (RtI), is a three-tiered support system in which students are screened for behavioral and academic skills and deficits. The screening assessment must be universal or appropriate to the students and must be able to identify the needs of the students reasonably, meaning the test must be fair to the student's capacities and skills. For example, a child that is non-verbal may require a different evaluation than a student that is verbal, just as an English-Language Learner (ELL) may need a different test than a non-ELL student.

The data taken from the screening is then used to guide instruction and to provide interventions to at-risk or struggling students as needed. The goal of screening every student is early identification of at-risk students and the provision of appropriate behavior or academic interventions and supports. Implementing RtI requires consistent progress monitoring to measure how the student is progressing, especially if the student is receiving supports and interventions.

This data can determine the effect size of the intervention used and can guide the teacher in modifying or changing interventions that may not be appropriate for the child. The effectiveness of an intervention, lesson, scaffold, or accommodation relies very heavily on progress monitoring data that is specified in the research or within the classroom. (Miller, Patwa, & Chafouleas, pp.1-11, 2014)

Limitations to Monitoring Student Progress

Although there is a variety of academic progress monitoring tools that are used for every subject area, a standard-issue that many school personnel has expressed is that there are limited, efficient progress monitoring methods for behavioral problems. Behavior problems make up the majority of the issues that teachers and administrators have to address within the school. Although there are options that are found online, there are many that are difficult to implement. For instance, although an informal or formal behavioral plan typically addresses many areas when considering interventions for behavior, such as the antecedent, the behavior, and the desired replacement behavior, it can be easy to make mistakes. It can be challenging to implement in large settings due to how in-depth the information must be for the document, including plotting points on a graph,

anecdotes, and observation data from other interested stakeholders. If the antecedent for the behavior is not accurate or if the interventions are ineffective, the entire ten-page document needs to be redone. Teachers should always revisit their behavioral plans and modify them as needed, but the methods should be able to address all of the students in the room and should be simple to implement to reduce any error. Also, due to an absence of supervision and follow-up support about 11% of school personnel implement behavior plans with fidelity and treatment integrity (Cochrane & Laux, 2008).

As a result, many teachers and school personnel have relied on informal behavioral point sheets, daily progress reports, or behavior contracts. Although these methods are useful in identifying patterns in behavior, such as possible triggers or times of day where the response is the most prevalent, these progress monitoring tools may lack depth. A point sheet can describe how many times a student complies with a command, but it cannot say why the student did not comply with a task. This provides quantitative data about the students, but not qualitative data to describe important aspects in relation to the student's behavior. A daily progress report may have anecdotal records or use a smiley face/sad face chart to describe the student's behavior. This method has qualitative data, rather than quantitative data which can make it difficult to see the "bigger picture", or how the behavior changes within an interval of time. A behavior contract merely states what the behavioral expectations of the class are, but cannot be progress monitored without another tool to control whether the child is abiding by the contract or not. Although many progress monitoring tools are useful in serving one purpose, they may not provide adequate and explicit (quantitative and qualitative) data a teacher needs to make decisions regarding student interventions or supports straightforwardly.

Check-in/Check-Out (CICO)

CICO is an effective Tier-2 intervention meant to progress to monitor the behavior of students who exhibit pervasive behavioral problems. This progress monitoring tool is intended to teach socially appropriate school-wide or individual responses for SWD and non-disabled students who are not responding to primary behavioral interventions. Each student has a daily progress report that has individual positive behaviors that apply to them. The teacher decides what these goals are and can modify them if the student generalizes the skill or requires a different skill that better addresses the antecedent of the behaviors. Some goals that can be placed on the daily progress report include the classroom rules or school-wide rules, but typically the progress reports are individualized. Students will "check-in" with their teacher and discuss the behavioral goals for that day and how to meet those standards. They can also check-in with an interventionist or with their therapist if the student is with them at the start of the school day. This process takes no more than 5 minutes. Throughout the day, the student will receive verbal feedback and positive reinforcements for appropriate behaviors. They will track their progress on their daily progress reports throughout the day. A progress report can have an image, check boxes, or yes/no questions associated with the compliance of the goals. If the child achieved a goal for the day, they can check the box or circle a smiley face. This helps the child self-regulate their behaviors in an easy way and self-monitor their progress with their daily progress reports on hand at all times. This makes progress monitoring more simple for the teacher as well, especially if the classroom population is large. During "check out" the teacher is providing constant

reinforces, in the forms of praise or tokens, for students who meet their goals during instructional time. The teacher also takes some time to provide additional feedback in the comments section for parents to read. There is a home component that increases collaboration between home and school. The parent must provide reinforcers when their child meets daily goals and sign off on the report every day to acknowledge that they have received it. Additional reinforcers are then given upon returning to school (Boden, Ennis, & Jolivet, 2012).

What makes CICO useful is that the goal can be modified to fit the needs of the student. If a teacher wants to help students improve skills that they are teaching the students in class, CICO can help students to monitor their behaviors and what they need to improve upon to achieve their goals. Also, goals do not need to be behavioral. A teacher can have students monitor their personal Individualized Education Plan goals. Students can determine whether they met the target that day or which goals they struggle with the most so that they can properly prioritize. If a student has a functional goal, such as toilet training or self-feeding, there can be check boxes that allow them to check off what they did on their own without prompting or assistance and they can determine what they can do to improve their progress for the next day after receiving feedback and reinforcers. For academics, daily progress reports can include specific executive functions, such as organization, self-monitoring behaviors, and planning. Some examples include a student staying in their seat, placing their backpack behind their seat, taking out their materials, and starting their morning work.

CICO was further studied in a tier 3 setting to evaluate how effective the intervention was in addressing social skills and behavioral deficits. The researchers believed that CICO would reduce negative social behavior while increasing certain social engagements. The participants included five students in grades 1-5 and four general education teachers who conducted the study.

There were four girls and one boy who exhibited socially inappropriate behaviors such as classroom disruption, teasing, physical aggression, non-compliance, gossip, and disrespect towards authority figures. The students were measured using numerical scores. A 3 indicated that the student did a good job, a 2 meant that the child did an okay job, and a 1 signified that the student had a hard time. The child rated how their day went independently, then discussed it with an interventionist and their teacher at check out. To supplement CICO, 15 minutes of social skills instruction was implemented, because an intervention cannot teach the skills that the students need to achieve their daily goals. If a skill needed to be modified it was done so when appropriate, such as when a student mastered a skill, it was replaced with another one. This intervention was implemented with fidelity over the course of seven weeks. For positive social engagement, the intervention had an effect size (Tau) ranging between 0.81-1.00 or highly effective. During the last week of the study, considered the maintenance week, the students no longer needed to check-in and the students maintained positive social behavior for at least 73.83% of the time. This inadvertently increased self-monitoring skills during instruction time and increased academic engagement (Scott, Sabey, pp. 246-257, 2015).

Conclusion

CICO is a predominantly social skill-based Tier-2 intervention to address independent progress monitoring of behaviors. Inadvertently, it also discusses how behavior affects academics or vice versa. Often a student exhibits behavior to receive something or avoid a task. What CICO is so

successful at doing is providing an opportunity for students to accumulate points or checks for exhibiting positive behaviors. Reinforcements and feedback are timed and consistent and always given with the purpose. Students focus on developing positive behaviors by monitoring themselves with the daily progress report. This is a critical self-regulatory function that must transfer into adulthood for them to be able to continue succeeding in improving individual skills and attaining goals. Overall, the student can find the intrinsic motivation in being their best selves. When a student monitors how well they're doing and the areas they can improve upon, they can develop a sense of pride in their progress and continue to grow from there.

References

- Boden, L. J., Ennis, R. P., & Jolivet, K. (2012). Implementing Check In/Check Out for Students with Intellectual Disability in Self-Contained Classrooms. Retrieved June 27, 2018, from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004005991204500105
- Cochrane, W. S., & Laux, J. M. (2008). A survey investigating school psychologists' measurement of treatment integrity in school-based interventions and their beliefs about its importance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45, 499-507. Doi: 10.1002/pits.20319
- Miller, F. G., Patwa, S. S., & Chafouleas, S. M. (2014). Using direct behavior rating--single item scales to assess student behavior within multi-tiered systems of support. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 27 (2), 76-85. Retrieved from ezproxy.fiu.edu/login
- Ross, S. W., & Sabey, C. V. (2015). Check-in check-out + social skills: Enhancing the effects of check-in check-out for students with social skill deficits. *Remedial and Special Education*, 36 (4), 246-257. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.fiu.edu/docview/172064285?accountid=10901>
- [To top](#)
-

Book Review: ***Deliberate Excellence: 3 Fundamental Strategies that Drive Educational Leadership***

By Loydeen Thomas

Purpose

The book titled *Deliberate Excellence: 3 Fundamental Strategies that Drive Educational Leadership* by S. Dallas Dance is a piece of literature aimed at providing strategies in the hopes of creating and empowering successful and effective leaders when it comes to education, who will make

a difference. In addition, this book aims to assist educational leaders to progress by establishing equity, understanding change, and learning how to truly communicate.

Theme/ Thesis

The predominant theme throughout the book is that leadership is a very important part of education and it has a profound effect on the students, staff, the school, and even the community. The underlying thesis here is that there are three main principles that will lead to a successful and effective educational leadership. The author uses different arguments to support his arguments. With a background in education

Equity

The first argument is that leaders should lead for equity. The basis for the author's belief is that leadership should focus on each child, every day. In addition, it is essential to know what your values are. According to S. Dallas Dance (2018), our values essentially define who we are, what we can become, and what we believe. Dance states that "if we are to be effective as leaders, our ethics must be in alignment with the types of ideals that bring success because we lead with our values and beliefs."

Equity is a necessary component in being able to lead effectively and successfully. Equity is the art of appreciating people knowing they all matter. There are no strings attached. Age, race, socioeconomic status, or ethnicity should not be a determinant of whether people will receive equity or not. Dance firmly believes that when it comes to leadership, you need to understand and value people not for what they are worth, but as a fellow human being, before equity comes into play. When equity is taken into consideration, everyone receives what they need to not only get by, but to also be successful. "As educators, we must disrupt the system and promote equity and opportunity for all children by focusing deliberately on the needs of all students, especially students who have traditionally not performed as well as their peers" (Dance, 2018). There will be opposition and arguments when you try to uphold values as a leader. Nevertheless, as leaders, it is pivotal to build awareness of what the values are, the purpose in instilling these values, why it is necessary, and how to implement them as well as the possible effects.

Change

In addition to leading with equity, Dance argues that good leadership must lead the change through the implementation of successful initiatives. According to him, "to implement change successfully, leaders need to work with and through people" (2018). Human beings are unique, interesting, and diverse. Educational leaders, like other leaders, must acknowledge the fact that people are important, and that successful leadership cannot take place without working with such people. When it comes to initiating change, certain steps must be followed. Good leaders must seek to understand the organization's history. Leaders must show people that they care about the institution's history by obtaining knowledge and being aware of what was and currently is in effect. Leaders must learn about past leaders, successes, failures, assets, and other important background information,

especially when it comes to education. A person cannot create change without knowing what is already in place.

Also, leaders need to acknowledge the current state of the organization and show sincere interest in the current state of affairs and intended desire for change. They must develop trust by acknowledging each member and the history. Leaders have a responsibility to convince people of their goal, intent, and unite them towards their vision. As a new part of the organization, there are certain people who have been around for a while and has a voice. Leaders need to understand these key “players” within the organization. Dance senses the urgency in appreciating that each and every person in the organization has value and is important. He suggested that leaders look for and utilize people based on their perceived influential abilities. In conjunction with utilizing key “players,” leaders must be the main messenger of change but not the only one. It is the responsibility of the educational leader to recruit and get the key influencers on board their ship for change. Leaders must propose the change and give people time to make a choice, because in the end it is up to them and not everyone will support them as a new leader.

Before leaders can initiate and create a new vision, they must first ensure that people understand what change means. It is up to the leaders to define what change means and would look like in the organization. They must have an effective strategy to implement change as well. First, become observant. Leaders need assess the situation, the organization, and the environment to determine what changes need to take place or to move forward consistently with a planned strategy.

Communication

The final argument that Dance used in the book dealt with communication. He believes that good leaders should telling their own story. According to Dance, “communication can prove challenging in any organizational context, but it is a necessity for effective leadership” (2018). It may be beneficial to develop a strategy to ensure that frequent and consistent communication occurs between members of the organization. Leaders need to be the role models and must therefore communicate in an honest, open, and timely manner. As leader, one must always show respect when you communicate and leave people feeling empowered after using truthfulness in the communication process.

Across texts

Dance in his book on leadership had quite a few similarities and differences to Michael Fullan in his book on leadership titled *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Both authors expressed the need for change to take place in establishing an effective and successful leadership in an organization, specifically in education. Fullan claims that for change to occur, a good leader needs moral purpose, needs to understand change, foster good communication, and create and share knowledge. These concepts are also reflected on Dance’s book, but in diverse ways. While Fullan focused systematically on change and how to utilize it. Dance suggested change as one of the ways in which good leadership can be achieved. Nevertheless, both Dance and Fullan in their respective literature observed the need for change to take place in order for success in leadership.

Dance provides information on becoming an effective and successful leader in education. While there is a variety of examples from the author's past experiences, the text was sometimes weakened by what seems like too much recognition and boasting about one's self. Still, this book was a good read where potential and future leaders can receive suggestions and tips on necessary principles in context to ensure understanding and qualifications needed for leadership. In addition, the text provides other peoples' opinions and thoughts on the matter of leadership. Themes and principles are identified, explained, elaboration is given, and the principles are emphasized through structured repetition. Information in the book by Dance is also easy to understand, relatable, and vital to successful and effective educational leadership.

References

Dance, S. D., & Paige, R. (2018). *Deliberate excellence: Three fundamental strategies that drive educational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, a SAGE Company.

Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Hoboken: Wiley.

[To top](#)

Provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education Throughout History: Evidence- Based Interventions and Instruction

By Marissa Desiree Pardo

Abstract

FAPE, or Free Appropriate Public Education, is what defines special or exceptional student education, and it is tailored to each individual student with a disability. Since the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, FAPE has remained mostly unchanged and it provides related services at the expense and supervision of the public free of charge to the student's family. These services must meet the standards of educational agency, include appropriate grade-level education from the state, and conform to the Individualized Education Program policies and procedures.

Under IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Act) and the IEP process, each child's FAPE must be written and memorialized in their IEP, it must meet that child's individual needs in the classroom, and must be designed to benefit the child in school. The school district and the state are required to provide FAPE to each special needs child.

Best Practices: Evidence-Based Interventions and Instruction

Today, the United States has many laws and rights for students with disabilities that allow them to access their learning environment, but at some point there was a common idea that people with disabilities were incapable of learning. Up until the late 1970's, a child with disabilities could be denied access to school. In some states, there were laws that allowed students with physical and mental disabilities to be excluded from attending school, which included 1.75 million children.. Many students were reduced to attending special classes or institutions that were run by the state. Children with mild disabilities that did not severely impair their ability to access their education were sometimes able to attend regular classes, but if the disabilities were profound or made it difficult to for the child to learn in a typical setting they would normally be institutionalized. If these children attended public schools, they were often not receiving education that was suitable or appropriate to their needs. Although many private schools provided services for special needs students, most parents could not afford this option. It was considered a privilege to have the money to fund that kind of education.

Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley (1982)

Hendrick Hudson School District is located in Westchester County, New York. Amy Rowley was a kindergarten student in this district and she had a severe hearing impairment; however this did not hinder her from succeeding in school. In school, Amy had a teacher who had professional development training in sign language to be able to communicate with her, a teletype machine to communicate with her mother and father from the office, a hearing aid, three hours of speech therapy weekly, and a special tutor for an hour a day, all provided to her as related services in her IEP. This resulted in her excelling in school in an inclusion setting, while easily moving from one grade level to the next.

When she moved on to the first grade, an Individualized Education Program, or an IEP, meeting was held with both of her parents, who are both deaf. Amy Rowley's parents agreed that she was being provided with many aids and related services to create the Least Restrictive Environment for her, but they also requested a sign language interpreter to be provided for her in the school setting so that she can access her education more easily. They were concerned that she could not understand some things that were being said in the classroom and felt that she can further her academic education with this additional accommodation. The request was denied, because the school had offered Amy an interpreter for a trial period of 2 weeks and the interpreter felt that the services were not necessary. Amy's parents filed a due process hearing, a hearing in regards to fair treatment through the judicial system, but the due process hearing officer and the state review officer sided with the school district.

The Rowleys appealed this to the federal district court and U.S. Court of Appeals. On June 28, 1982 they had determined that the school district gave Amy Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), because the sign language interpreter would not have allowed Amy to have the same opportunities to excel in school that her peers had. The court stated that services being provided to Amy had to be "sufficient to confer some educational benefit upon the handicapped child" (Rowley, 1982 p. 200). The word "some" is very important in this statement, because this was common usage in most states in regards to the standard in which FAPE was held to. If "some" benefit was being provided and "minimal" or "some" progress was made from the student, then FAPE was provided. This was called the De Minimis standard.

As a result of this case, the court created two requirements to determine if the school district had provided Amy with a FAPE, including whether the state and school district had complied with FAPE and IDEA procedures, and whether the IEP that was developed for Amy would enable her to access her education. The Supreme Court had determined that the School-district had indeed provided Amy Rowley with FAPE, because they had complied with the procedures of IDEA and Amy was being provided with an appropriate education due to her ease in advancing through grade levels. The fact that Amy was progressing in her academics made it difficult for her parents to justify that she was not being provided FAPE. According to FAPE de minimis procedures, as long as Amy is progressing with her peers, then equal and appropriate education was made available to her. These two requirements were called the "Rowley Benefit Standard". This standard would be used to determine whether FAPE was being given to students in future court cases.

What Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley implied was that there would be other cases challenging FAPE in the future and that they needed to be handled individually on a case by case basis. Chief Justice Rehnquist stated that this outcome did not imply that every child with a handicap who was advancing from grade to grade was automatically receiving FAPE.. Courts were considering the question of what amount of services and benefits would be necessary to abide by FAPE. At that time, The Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley, had been the only FAPE case heard by the Supreme Court since the Education of All Handicapped Children Act was passed in 1975. Some courts felt that the school district should consider the meaningful and educational benefit of these services, while other courts felt that the degree of benefit had to be slightly more than minor to merit consideration. Although this wouldn't be the last case to be heard by the Supreme Court, it definitely raised many questions about FAPE and what should be considered when providing it to children of special needs. "What is meant by the [EAHCAs] requirement of a free appropriate public education?" (Rowley, 1982, p. 180).

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District (2017)

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District would be the only other case where a FAPE case was heard by the Supreme Court since the Education of All Handicapped Children Act was passed in 1975. Endrew, affectionately called "Drew" by his parents, was a child diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and Autism. He was a student at a school in Colorado in the Douglas

County School district. Andrew attended his school from preschool through fourth grade, but when his parents saw him significantly struggling in Fourth Grade, his parents requested an IEP meeting, in which they decided that not only was he not making enough progress in school, but that his IEP for his transition into fifth grade was too similar to the IEP he was offered in fourth grade. As a result, Andrew was to be placed in a special school for children with autism called Firefly Autism House, in which he made significant gains academically, socially, and behaviorally.

Andrew's parents felt that the Douglas County School District had not provided FAPE and therefore filed for a due process hearing to request that they are reimbursed the tuition and any expenses that were paid towards Andrew's private school. The hearing officer relied on the Rowley Benefit Standard requirements to determine whether the school had provided Andrew with FAPE. Using the Lower De Minimis standard, as long as "some" academic benefits and related services were provided to Andrew, then the court believed FAPE was provided. The parents filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court, but the courts were in agreement with the hearing officer. The court decided that if Drew had at the very least been making minimal progress academically, then the requirements under his IDEA rights were fulfilled and he was being provided with equal opportunities to accessing education.

Andrew's parents then appealed to the U.S. Appeals Court for the Tenth Circuit. Andrew's parents stated that they were not being provided with reports on how he was progressing in school, which violates his IDEA rights. The circuit understood that the school district's IEP did not include a sufficient amount of progress-monitoring data or reports, while also lacking details about Andrew that were important. Despite noting that this lack of proper progress monitoring was significant in regards to this case, it was decided that it did not hinder Andrew's progress in school, meaning FAPE was not denied despite these clear violations of IDEA. Also, Andrew exhibited many problem behaviors at school that his parents felt may have hindered his learning. Andrew's parents felt that these behaviors were not appropriately addressed, but because the school staff had considered his problem behavior and the possible use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, they were in compliance with the procedures that IDEA requires, "in the case of a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others, consider the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior" (20 U.S.C. § 1414 [d][3][B] [1]). Unfortunately, though Andrew's IEPs throughout his time in the school district were very similar and his parents felt that this only escalated his problem behaviors, the courts felt that Andrew had shown an adequate amount of educational progress which meant the Douglas County District was not held accountable for reimbursing tuition.

The courts had used more than de minimis to measure whether FAPE was being provided or not, which means that in this case if Andrew had made minimal progress under the related services being provided under IDEA, then the Douglas County District had indeed provided FAPE. Andrew's parents asked, "What is the level of educational benefit school districts must confer on children with disabilities to provide them with a free appropriate public education guaranteed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act?" (SCOTUSblog, 2017). This case would then be taken to the Supreme Court.

In March 22, 2017, the court decided that the “de minimis” standard was not sufficient, because it was not a part of IDEA, which left courts open to come up with their own standard for whether “some progress” or “some benefit” was enough to determine that a school district has provided FAPE. The Supreme court felt that under IDEA a clear standard needed to be created. The standard needed to offer an IEP that would “enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances” (Endrew, 2017, p. 15). The case was sent back to be reviewed by the Tenth Circuit Court under this new standard from the Supreme Court.

This court case emphasized that parents had a central and important role in the creation and development of their child’s IEP. Although school personnel exhibited an important expertise when working with students, parental input must be taken into consideration as well. Parent(s) and the school must collaborate when writing the child’s IEP and that judicial deference will depend on the parents feelings in regards to the level progress that is being pursued in the child’s IEP. This means that the most basic requirement of an IEP that the court agreed upon is that the student’s parent, along with the school staff, must be part of the IEP team and fully and equally participate in the development of a child’s IEP. The de minimis standard was no longer embraced as the standard, because it was considered the bare minimum for students with disabilities. The court did not agree with Endrew’s parents’ higher standards, because to provide an education that would make students with disabilities able to attain self-sufficiency that is equal to the opportunities given to those without disabilities, is an unworkable standard to attain. The courts also rejected the “Rowley Benefit Standard”.

There are many implications as a result of this court case. The de minimis standard was no longer the standard used to measure a child’s success. It was instead replaced by a standard that required an IEP to have measurable standards/benchmarks that are created for each individual child to measure appropriate educational progress. The court also rejected the Rowley Benefit standard, stating that children should be educated in a way that allows them to progress despite their disabilities. The Rowley 2-part test to determine whether FAPE was being given became the Rowley/Endrew test, which meant (1) The school had to comply with the procedures of IDEA and the IEP goals had to be created in a way that would allow a child to make progress in light of their disabilities. Also, each state had to change the way in which their courts ruled over FAPE issues, especially those that strongly embraced de minimis standards. The Rowley/Endrew test will better specify if a school district is writing appropriate IEPs. Finally, the inclusion of parents in the IEP was strongly enforced. Although Endrew’s parents did not get what they wanted out of these court battles, they surely changed the way FAPE was being provided to special needs children in the U.S. and how involved a parent was in the IEP writing process.

Jana K. v. Annville Cleona School District (2014)

Jana K. was a student in the Annville-Cleona School District, beginning from Kindergarten all the way through eighth grade. Throughout her time in the school district, Jana began exhibiting troublesome behavior, including self-injurious behavior, many unscheduled trips to the nurse’s office

due to anxiety or for “moral support” (Jana K., p. 1), a poor relationship with her peers in school, and an abundance of unexcused absences. Her academic performance also saw a significant drop in achievement including low and often failing grades.

Beginning in seventh grade, these behaviors were beginning to manifest themselves through changes in her sleeping/eating patterns and unsatisfactory grades. Overall, Jana visited the school nurse about 54 times, but the nurse concluded in her logs that hunger was the main issue in Jana’s case. Jana’s parents were not made aware of the frequency of these visits, but they did refer her to a psychiatrist who diagnosed her with depression. Jana began receiving wraparound services as a result of her depression. Her mobility therapist was often included in meetings regarding Jana, alongside her father and the guidance counselor.

In eighth grade, she began to visit the school nurse and the school guidance counselor more frequently as a result of increased isolation and bullying in school. She had approximately 113 unscheduled visits to the school nurse. She had begun to cut herself and once had swallowed an object that she was using for self-harm. The nurse also cited that Jana had cuts on her body, some that were recent and others that were already in the later stages of healing. The nurse wrapped them in a gauze, but did not consider Jana for possible special education services at this time, despite the growing problems that were stemming from her behavior, including failing grades, cutting herself, and expressing suicidal thoughts. The nurse felt that because Jana was not intellectually or physically impaired, she did not need special education services.

To address this, the district held meetings with Jana and the students involved in her bullying, but it is alleged that this did not do very much to help Jana. She was admitted to a hospital where she was given a psychiatric evaluation. At a hearing in regards to this case, the school blamed a teen novel that involved cutting and considered this self-injurious behavior to be an epidemic among her classmates due to the addictive nature of the behavior. They held several group sessions in regards to this behavior, but it wasn’t further addressed. Jana expressed a desire to commit suicide on January 13, 2011. As a result her father removed her from the school district and placed her in a virtual charter school called Commonwealth Connections Academy. He filed for a due process hearing, because he felt that the school had failed to provide FAPE to Jana on the basis that the school district did not evaluate Jana for special education services as a result of her behavior. The school failed to evaluate Jana through her seventh and eighth grade year, which was long after these behaviors began. The court felt that Jana’s father should not have had to bring it to the school district’s attention that Jana was exhibiting problem and potentially fatal behavior. This means that because the school district was aware of Jana’s behavior, they should have acted appropriately to address it, rather than be put on notice by the courts and Jana’s father. Although Jana was exhibiting red flags of an emotional disturbance, the school did not act and evaluate her for special education services, including not taking her social and emotional behavior into account when her grades began to falter. The courts initially dismissed the case as untimely, but eventually sided with Jana’s father, citing that the school had ample evidence that Jana was exhibiting symptoms of a child that had an Emotional Disturbance, but the school had failed to act between her seventh and eighth grade year. “As a remedy, the Hearing Officer awarded Jana thirty minutes of compensatory education for each week

that school was in session between February 24, 2010 and the end of the 2010-2011 school year.”
(*Id.* pp. 15-16 of 17.)

There are a few implications that arose from this court case. The school personnel and the district should have not only been aware of these behaviors that Jana was exhibiting at school, but they should have seen this as an indicator to have her formally assessed to determine whether Jana had a disability and whether specialized services were necessary for her to access her school environment. According to Child Find procedures and IDEA procedures, if a school district has reason to believe a child may have a disability or may require special needs services, they need to be evaluated immediately so that the school can accurately provide them with an education that will allow them to progress in school. The school did not provide Jana with FAPE, because she was not evaluated for Special Education services when her problem behaviors have reached dangerous and persistent levels. Had they evaluated her, she would have possibly been able to access her education with ease rather than needing to be placed in virtual school due to a lack of action from the school district.

Regional School District No. 9 Board of Education v. Mr. and Mrs. M. (2009)

Much like *Jana K. v. Annville Cleona School District* (2014), in this court case the school district had violated the Child Find procedures for a failure to assess and evaluate a student who was suspected to have mental-health related disabilities. According to the United States Court of Appeals, the parents claimed that the school district did not provide FAPE to a child who suffered from an Emotional Disturbance. The school district was also accused of providing inadequate IEP's for more than two consecutive academic school years and offering another IEP that the parents found to be lacking for a third school year in a row. The child's parents claimed that the IEP and the failure to evaluate the child for special education services was in violation of the child's IDEA rights, because it did not provide FAPE to the child.

In December, the student, called M.M. by the courts, was a Sophomore at Hall High School in Hartford, Connecticut. At this time M.M. began to experience suicidal thoughts and homicidal thoughts, eventually being diagnosed with High Functioning Autism Spectrum Disorder or Asperger's Syndrome., Psychotic disorder, bulimia, and processing disorder. As a result, M.M. was given counseling services and was given accommodations under section 504. The school felt that the child did not need special education and related services.

After a suicide attempt M.M. was placed short-term therapeutic educational environment for a few days. The parents requested that M.M. be evaluated for special education services, but the school never assessed her, despite knowing about her suicidal tendencies. The parents filed for a Due Process Hearing, in which the courts decided that there was a large violation of Child Find and IDEA procedures. The school overlooked signs of an apparent disability that stemmed from emotional issues. Also, they never provided a reason to the parents as to why the child was not evaluated, despite the request. Due to the nature and the length of this child's emotional state, the courts also found that they did not evaluate the child within a reasonable time-frame, citing that a clear

disability does not have to be present for a very long time to require an evaluation. If the child's behavior was put on notice in the school, the school was obligated to assess M.M. within a reasonable time frame. Much like Jana K. the courts felt that the school needed to take social and emotional behaviors into account when evaluating children for special education services.

Child Find requirements are triggered when a student begins to exhibit red flags or emotional problem behaviors. A school is mandated to evaluate children on this behavioral criteria, not only on the basis of academic struggles. This case and the case of Jana K. highlight that there is a responsibility that the school personnel must adhere to when a child may be suspected of having a disability. This includes children that suffer from social-emotional behavior, rather than children who suffer from intellectual disabilities. Jana K. and M.M. were exhibiting problem behaviors, including suicidal thoughts and tendencies and self-injurious behavior. They both have also been institutionalized or referred to therapeutic settings. The school was aware of all of this, however they failed to act, because they believed that M.M and Jana K. did not need special education or related services on the basis of emotional disturbances. This meant that despite court rulings, they were responsible for the denial of FAPE for these students.

Moore v. Hamilton Southeastern School District (2013)

In a school district in Indiana, a student named Jamarcus Bell was diagnosed with depression and exhibiting a multitude of problem behaviors that had caused him to accumulate many disciplinary referrals. He claimed that he was unsure as to why he kept behaving in this way and that he lacked impulse control. At one point, he attempted suicide inside of a closet in his school. Concerned for his well-being, his mother had him referred for an evaluation for special education services.

Although academic and behavioral evaluations were completed for Jamarcus, the school staff had never actually observed him in a classroom setting for the assessment. A school-based team had decided that Jamarcus did not qualify for special education services, because he only had one of five different criteria for a child with an emotional disturbance. This criteria stated that Jamarcus exhibited problem behaviors in a normal classroom setting under normal circumstances. They also felt that his passing academic grades also prohibited him from receiving special needs services, because he was not academically hindered as a result of his behaviors.

Due to his tragic circumstances, Jamarcus ended his life. He wrote in a suicide note, "Skool [sic] is getting harder. . . It's really hard to tell you I am killing myself but stuff has just built up to [sic] much for me to handle" (Moore v. Hamilton, 2013, p. 13). As a result, Jamarcus' parents filed a lawsuit against the school, stating that their reliance on Jamarcus' academic performance, and not on his social-emotional behavior, was in violation of his IDEA rights. They believed that this should not have been determining factor for whether he would be receiving special needs services. The courts agreed that Jamarcus was denied FAPE, because the school failed to classify Jamarcus as emotionally disturbed, which in turn affected his access to educational opportunities. The court stated, "The school had ample evidence of Jamarcus's behavioral problems, and at least some basis for an inference that his emotional symptoms were dampening his classroom ability as well; on those

grounds, their decision not to classify as disabled a student who admittedly otherwise qualified—solely on the basis of his supposedly satisfactory grades—seems unreasonable”. (Moore v. Hamilton, 2013, p. 14)

The implications of this case is that the school district failed to see how these behaviors affected Jamarcus in non-academic areas, including socializing with peers and his quality of daily life. The school limited his qualification for special needs services solely on his academic performance, which the court system found completely inexcusable. When deciding if a student is eligible for special needs services, the school needed to take into consideration academic and non-academic factors, including communication, socialization, behavior.

Personal Evaluations and the Effectiveness of Each Intervention

FAB/BIP: In my first year of teaching, I had come across a student that was diagnosed with Autism in my classroom. He exhibited increasingly aggressive behavior that not only impeded his learning and that of others, but also posed a danger to others and himself. His behaviors included biting, hitting, flipping over tables, kicking, throwing spit, and laughing when being scolded. I noted that this behavior was intentional, because when asked yes or no questions, such as “Did you bite ?” he would answer by nodding or shaking his head. He would also sign “Sorry” after misbehaving, but would laugh anyway. After about five months of dealing with this persistent behavior, this student was being threatened to be placed in another school by the administration due to his problem behaviors increasing in frequency and intensity. After I realized that time out and contacting his mother was not effective, I sat down with his mother, the guidance counselor, and the administration to have a FAB/BIP put in place. Initially, I felt that this was just as ineffective, because I spent every single day monitoring and documenting behavior and finding little change when I would try to implement consequences, such as cool down time, no recess, or parental intervention. After many meetings and months of data collecting, I had finally found the motivation for his behavior. He misbehaved in school and, more recently, in out of school therapies so that he can go home, where he has access to a tablet and a phone. He also did not have to complete classwork or any arduous tasks at home, which increased motivation for his problem behavior. Previously, I would call home to have him taken from school when he would become aggressive. We decided that despite all negative behavior, the student would spend the entire day at school and his full two hours in therapy, so that he understood that his problem behavior will not give him what he wants. I saw a slight decrease in problem behaviors when he realized he would not be going home just because he was not being compliant in the classroom.

Although the changes were not immediate or extremely apparent, any positive change in his behavior felt like a victory for his mother, the administration, and myself. He was less aggressive towards peers and spent less time in the cool down corner or excluded from fun activities. He also completed classwork at a higher frequency. Although initially I felt that the FAB/BIP was ineffective, I realized that this progress monitoring put me in compliance with the student’s IDEA rights, while also helping me see a pattern in his behavior that allowed me to effectively put interventions in place to reduce his problem behaviors. In regards to the cases of Endrew and Jana, they could have benefited

from a FAB/BIP when their problem behaviors began to impede their learning, ultimately causing their grades to drop. This would have required the school to have a mandatory meeting with the parents to discuss progress and behavior monitoring findings every nine weeks. The school would have also been mandated to increase interventions that would have helped Endrew and Jana shift from problem behaviors to replacement behaviors. Ultimately, the parents and the school would have collaborated more effectively to change the way Endrew and Jana were receiving FAPE and how the two students behaved in school. At the very least, some interventions would have been put in place to help these students progress to some extent.

Inclusion and Mainstreaming/Evaluation for Special Needs Services: I currently have 2 students who have recently been diagnosed with a mild intellectual disability. Although these students have been struggling academically for years in the full-time general education setting, they needed specialized instruction in core academic subjects. They were assessed for special needs services as a result of the students struggling in MTSS tiers 1 and 2 for years in the general education setting. Their teachers and the IEP team felt as if a tier 3 setting would benefit them greatly, because they would be receiving the specialized instruction and accommodations to classwork and testing that they needed to be provided with FAPE. While their teachers wanted them to be in a self-contained InD (Intellectual Disabilities) setting, I felt that the lack of companionship with their peers from their general education setting would cause them to feel isolated and cause them to academically move backwards, especially considering they would be spending an entire day in a classroom with children who are non-verbal and require constant daily living assistance. This could make them feel as if they are placed in a classroom for very low performing students, which can increase feelings of insecurity. I currently teach the self-contained SPED classroom, and for children to qualify for full-time SPED services and classes, it has to be determined that they cannot succeed in a general education setting for a variety of reasons, including distractibility, impairments that require specialized instruction, and severe intellectual disabilities. For these two students, the least restrictive environment would be in a mostly general education setting due to the fact they were only mildly intellectually disabled, but they still needed the extra help to be able to achieve grade level standards. I made it a point at the IEP meetings of these two children that they would benefit from being in my classroom for core academic subjects, including reading and mathematics, but would also benefit being taught in grade level general education classrooms to be able to socialize with their peers and learn at their grade-level. I made these determinations as a result of their evaluation for special needs services in comparison to those of my students who had severe intellectual disabilities. For children who have mild intellectual disabilities, this inclusion setting is important because only 1% of students are mildly InD, which means there is no setting just for this group of students. In inclusion, they get the help they need in reading and mathematics on a modified curriculum, but they can be assured that they can learn in their Least Restrictive Environment alongside their non-disabled peers. For Endrew, this could've been an appropriate setting. His grades began to drop in the fourth grade, possibly showing that he needed to be assessed for special education services. He would benefit from being in a general education to work alongside his non-disabled peers as he'd been doing up until his grade began to drop, but would also benefit working in core subjects on a modified curriculum, receiving special needs services to also address his behavior. I feel as if this setting has really allowed my students to blossom and change the way

they felt about themselves in comparison to other students. It's easy to see that Endrew could have been placed in a setting like this to receive the help he needed at that time.

“Bypass” Interventions: Bypass intervention is a method used in which a teacher ignores a child's academic weaknesses and uses their strengths as a way to measure progress. As a SPED teacher, I use these interventions constantly, because every child is different and has to be assessed in a way that reflects their strengths rather than their shortcomings. For example, I have students that cannot use their body to physically write, hold objects, or perform daily living activities that are appropriate for their age. When assessing these students, I take into account that they use eye gaze or their expressions to answer questions.

When grading or assessing them, I take into account their strengths and use those strengths to teach them, including the use of eye gaze as a participatory response tool. For students that are non-verbal, I take into account that many are learning to sign or they can point to visual task cards to actively respond to questions. This can span from yes or no questions to comprehension questions from a story. They can also use manipulatives or counters to exhibit their knowledge of topics. In *Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley* (1982), Amy was given related services that allowed her to succeed despite her hearing impairment including a teletype machine to communicate with her mother and father from the office, a hearing aid, three hours of speech therapy weekly, and a special tutor for an hour a day. They ignored her “weakness” of a lack of hearing and gave her opportunities to access her learning environment, allowing her to go from kindergarten to first grade with excellent grades.

Evaluation for AT/Assistive Technology: In my department, every child benefits from the use of assistive technology. Assistive technology assists a student with a disability. It must also be considered as part of the IEP when a child is deemed eligible for Special Needs services. AT is meant to help a student perform a task with more ease and create the Least Restrictive Environment for the student. To receive access to assistive technology from the district, a child must first be evaluated for Assistive Technology services. How does a child go about their day without AT services? Would AT allow a student to perform better academically? To begin, the teacher gives information about the child and their needs and why AT was considered by the IEP team. The child will be given a trial of AT that would benefit them in the classroom. If it is determined that a child requires AT, it will be implemented in the IEP and in their goals. For children with visual impairments, large task cards with visuals or accessibility tools on a computer can give them an equal opportunity to learn. For children that are non-verbal a voice output device is useful, especially one that comes with many pre-recorded words on a tablet. For children that lack fine motor skills, a keyboard or adaptive writing/eating utensils will further their participation in the classroom. There are many forms of assistive technology and for children in a special needs classroom, the use of this technology is critical to their learning. In *Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley* (1982), Amy was given a teletype machine to communicate with her mother and father from the office and a hearing aid. These are not only logical, but completely necessary for Amy to succeed and perform as well as she does academically. In my classroom, it is crucial to the learning of my

students that AT be provided, even if it's not specifically outlined in their IEP. All of my self-contained students are nonverbal and struggle with fine motor skills.

Although many of them have regularly scheduled therapy, they still struggle academically. All of them use adaptable utensils when eating and writing to correct the way they hold these utensils, between the thumb and pointer, while resting on the three remaining fingers. Also, the students regularly use a voice output device, be it a traditional machine where I include my own printed picture cards on top of buttons or an through apps with pre-recorded words on a tablet. As previously stated, this technology is often recommended and necessary, and usually recorded in an IEP to measure progress with the use of the assistive technology. This accommodation is the most frequently used form of intervention within my classroom.

Progress Monitoring Charts/Plans: For almost every case listed on this research, I felt that progress monitoring charts or behavior plans could have assisted the school personnel in determining that the children needed special education services. Most of the children listed, including M.M., Jana K., Jamarcus Bell, and Endrew, began exhibiting problem behaviors for extended periods of time. Some of these behaviors even reached dangerous levels where suicidal tendencies and self-harm occurred. According to Child Find procedures, a disability or problem behaviors do not need to be present for an extended amount of time to prompt an evaluation of special needs or related services. Although many of these schools were put on notice for these behaviors, I feel that having written progress and behavior monitoring charts would have given school personnel the insight they needed to conclude that these children needed to be evaluated for special needs services. I noticed that a common complaint I saw in most of these cases is that each child's IEP did not have adequate progress monitoring goals, which was in clear violation of each child's IDEA rights. This may have limited the way the school saw the severity of these cases, because the students were not being properly and extensively monitored. Had the school implemented behavior and progress monitoring charts/plans, the school would have had more insight in regards to each case, especially considering the biggest complaint across the board was that the parents felt excluded from the IEP process and decision-making in each child's education. The parents of Jana K. were not fully aware of her behavior in school and the frequency to which she attended the nurse's office. Endrew's parents felt that his IEP lacked progress monitoring goals considering his increase in unruly behavior, which they believe led to an escalation in the behavior. M.M.'s parents had asked for her to be evaluated AFTER progress monitoring psychiatric/psychological evaluations were completed. Had there been regular documenting of these behaviors, the parents and the school would have more likely felt the need for special needs services or related services from an IEP. They would have had an abundance of data to consider the social-emotional factors that contributed to each child's need for special education services.

References

"Briefing: The Public Interest Disclosure Act Came into Force Earlier ..." *How Children with Disabilities Came to Be Accepted in Public Schools*, vol. 319, no. 7204, 29 Nov. 2015, doi:10.1136/bmj.319.7204.3a.

Figure 3a from: Ruete A (2015) Displaying bias in sampling effort of data accessed from biodiversity databases using ignorance maps. *Biodiversity Data Journal* 3:

E5361. <https://doi.org/10.3897/BDJ.3.e5361>. (2014). *JANA K. v. ANNVILLE-CLEONA SCHOOL DIST.* doi:10.3897/bdj.3.e5361.figure3a

Hammel, A. M. (2018). Amy and drew: Two children who helped determine what free appropriate public education means. *General Music Today*, 31(2), 29-32. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.fiu.edu/docview/201263721?accountid=10901>

Katsiyannis, A., Counts, J., Popham, M., Ryan, J., & Butzer, M. (2016). Litigation and students with disabilities: An overview of cases from 2015. *NASSP Bulletin*, 100(1), 26-46. Retrieved from ezproxy.fiu.edu/login

Overview of Early Intervention. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.parentcenterhub.org/ei-overview/>

Stiefel, L., Shiferaw, M., Schwartz, A. E., & Gottfried, M. (2018). Who feels included in school? examining feelings of inclusion among students with disabilities. *Educational Researcher*, 47(2), 105-120. Retrieved from ezproxy.fiu.edu/login

Torres, T., & Barber, C. R. (2017). *Case studies in special education: A social justice perspective* Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 2600 South First Street, Springfield, IL 62704. Retrieved From <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.fiu.edu/docview/194341115?accountid=10901>

Yell, M. L., & Bateman, D. F. (2017). "Endrew F. v. douglas county school district" (2017). FAPE and the U.S. supreme court. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 50(1), 7-15. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.fiu.edu/docview/200558546?accountid=10901>

Yell, M., Smith, C., Katsiyannis, A., & Losinski, M. (2018). Mental health services, free appropriate public education, and students with disabilities: Legal considerations in identifying, evaluating, and providing services. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 20(2), 67-77. Retrieved From <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.fiu.edu/docview/203476674?ccountid=10901>

Book Review

School Culture Rewired: How to Define, Assess, and Transform It

By Cailyn Lawler

Implementing a culture change requires thoughtful planning, a current understanding of the underlying mentality, and a conscious effort to exude positivity. In *School Culture Rewired: How to Define, Assess, and Transform It*, authors Gruenert and Whitaker identify specific steps to identify, assess and change school culture. They state in the introduction that, “For schools to be effective, educators need to understand the organizational cultures in which they work and be able to modify them if necessary.” In the following chapters the authors dive into the subtext of defining, assessing, and transforming school culture.

Defining school culture is addressed in chapters one through four. School cultures are examined, culture versus climate is reviewed, and the elements of school culture are identified. Assessing school culture is the focus in chapters five and six. The authors provide straightforward and user-friendly activities school leaders and personnel can use in order to assess the culture in one's own school. Transforming school culture is confronted in remaining chapters seven through 14 highlighting that, "culture conveys to its members what they ought to celebrate, ignore, or anticipate." The authors prepare you that it is not a quick fix or a one-size-fits-all; rather, transforming school culture is specific to the current culture of the school and a time-consuming process that, "...its only after a few years that these concepts will be entrenched".

The self and school assessments are some of the most promising to help change the culture in one's school. The book delves into what each of the scores mean and thoughtfully identifies ways in which to improve upon these scores. The results identify areas of school culture that can be addressed. Compiling the scores of each teacher or school staff member will give a big picture look into the culture of the school from the inside. The text is straightforward and reads as if the authors were speaking directly to the reader.

This book on school leadership delves deeper into changing school culture than Michael Fullan's *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Fullan's text identifies broader, system wide steps for change whereas Gruenert and Whittaker focus on the individual school culture to make the change. Both texts offer definitive steps schools can take to improve school culture and point out that it is not something that can be changed quickly. While Fullan focuses on steps principals and leaders can take, *School Culture Rewired* focuses on the individual staff member and the school as a whole. Together, change can be seen comprehensively.

This text identifies topics many may see as common knowledge in transforming school culture. However, the authors are straightforward and direct in identifying tools and tips to change school culture.

A Critique of Differentiated Instruction in a Data-Based Context

By Maria Frontela

Abstract

In this critique, the author will analyze and interpret information found in a research study conducted by Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018). The previous study focused on the impact of differentiated instruction skills of teachers and student achievement as evidenced by standardized scores. The researchers wanted to fill the knowledge gap regarding the correlation between differentiated instruction in the classroom of elementary school children. In this critique, the author will discuss strengths and weaknesses of previous study and contributions to modify the study for further in-depth research.

Research Problem

Differentiated instruction has been a rising topic in the field of education. Differentiated Instruction (D.I.) has been loosely described in various texts. Overall, D.I. is systematic and data-based instruction given to a student apart from the whole-group regular instruction. In fact, Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018) had conducted a study of D.I. in a data-based context. The purpose of this research is to analyze and critique the study conducted by Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018).

The study clearly stated the research problem as the lack of knowledge on how D.I. in a data-based decision-making (DBDM) affects student achievement. Because it is lacking, the authors justify their study and determine their purpose: to contribute to filling the knowledge gap between how DBDM through D.I. affects student achievement. The authors did provide a theoretical framework in which they believe D.I. must be done through a DBDM process. The author's cited Tomlinson et al. (2013) work has a basis of how they will use data to make educational decisions. The authors discussed how executing D.I. strategies in the classroom is the key to student achievement. Throughout this qualitative research, the authors hypothesized: (1) student outcomes will be higher in classrooms of teachers who demonstrate observable D.I., (2) student outcomes will be higher in classrooms where D.I. is pre-planned, and students from different-ability groups do not benefit to the same degree. The theoretical framework and the hypothesis are interconnected in the sense that the authors are looking to understand the relationship of executing D.I. in the classroom and how it impacts students' achievement. If the teacher presents D.I. frequently and observably, pre-plans their D.I., and creates appropriate groups, then student achievement will be higher according to the hypotheses.

Measurement

Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018) began this study to contribute to the knowledge gap of D.I. and student achievement. In order to measure their study, the author's independent variable is the amount of pre-planned D.I. is provided in the classroom. Dependent variables in the study were the grouping of the students, the students' achievement on the International Comparative Analysis of Learning and Teaching (ICALT). Another standardized test used to measure student achievement is the Cito standardized mathematics test. The Cito is given to the students to complete twice a year. The authors were able to provide reliable and valid measures from the standardized assessment as they are commonly and widely used in the country and recognized globally. To measure the D.I. that was implemented in the classroom, the researchers created a checklist that consisted of 43 items to target the following topics: instruction, learning goals, and evaluation.

Research Design and Sampling

The quantitative design study focuses on student achievement on the ICALT assessment. In order to measure the degree of impact from D.I. to student achievement, the researchers wanted to target elementary Dutch schools. Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018) contacted and visited several schools. When visiting the school, interventionist completed classroom observations and rated the schools into three categories: weak, average, and strong. Schools were rated with an average of their scores, and invitations to participate in the study were sent out. The goal was to select 10 schools from each category, however, not all schools decided to participate. For the study, 26 schools participated which created the group of 7 weak schools, 9 average schools, and 10 strong schools.

In each of the schools, only second and fifth grade classrooms were asked to participate in the study. The author's decision to do this would provide insight to the range of early elementary and late elementary students and their achievement in relation to planned D.I. As a result, the final sample included 26 primary schools, 51 teachers, and 953 students (Faber, Glas, and Visscher, 2018). Although the researchers did a great job at looking at the whole view and narrowing it down to a good population, the researchers failed to look at the structure of the individual classrooms. For example, the study did not indicate number of students with disabilities which may have a significant impact on student achievement.

The study implemented D.I. has an intervention to understand the independent variable change amongst dependent variables. The dependent variables were academic outcomes on the ICALT (standardized testing) and on pre and posttests.

Data Collection

The three data collection forms used throughout the study consists of standardized assessment, pre and posttest, and a checklist. The first two forms of data collection were used to understand student outcomes and achievement on measureable tools. The checklist was created to observe and measure the D.I. students receive in the classrooms.

The ICALT standardized assessment was used to portray a final achievement score. The Cito mathematics tests was used to measure pre and posttest data. The researchers failed to provide in-depth understanding of the two assessments used to collect data. It is unclear to the reader what the assessments are measuring for. It could be more specific and provide detailed information on topics covered in the assessments. Additionally, due to the fact that the sample selection is based only on two grade levels, the reader could benefit from knowing what will be expected in the assessment. For example, considering it is a mathematics-based assessment, the reader may like to know if it targets Numbers and Operations, or Geometry. If the researchers had provided this information, readers may become more interested in this study.

The advantages of the standardized assessments are that they were already to be implemented in the classroom. Since it was already integrated into the classroom expectations and community, it was not an additional task to complete for the researchers. However, a disadvantage is that the standardized assessments provide an overall score. It fails to show progress in the whole student. To reiterate an earlier point, the researchers could have provided more detailed information on the assessments and what they measure. Although the checklist may have been easy and quick to use, the person filling it out may have not completed it with integrity and honesty which could dramatically change the results of this study.

Data Analysis

The authors of the research used a multilevel model to test the relationship between student achievement scores and teacher D.I. skills. The researchers used the OpenBUGS (Version 3.2.3. rev. 2012) to create a model that would create multi-levels to better understand the variances amongst the groups (Faber, Glas, and Visscher, 2018). The researchers included extensive information when analyzing data collection. In the text, the authors provided a table that presents variance

components. The information collected during this part of the research would be used to compute the teacher reliability using a generalization model used in OpenBUGS. Throughout the data analysis, the researchers went through great efforts to compare models of the participants. The researchers included tables from the data that provided the reader with variance amongst the models.

From the teacher's skills to implement D.I. in the classroom, the model created was used to interpret the variances among teacher skills. The results indicate that 12.72% of the variance is due to teachers and time moments. It could be further analyzed and explained if the researchers were able to record exact dates and times of the observations. In another table, the authors analyzed the correlations of D.I. versus pre-planned D.I. and student scores. The results indicated that D.I. has significant positive correlations with pretest and posttest scores. On the other hand, the pre-planned D.I. showed to have negative and significant impact on student achievement scores.

The final table provided by the researchers included a multi-level analysis. In the multilevel model, the table provides 5 models. The first model focused on the covariates. Recalling that the sample used included students in second and fifth grade, the first model combines the scores of both grade levels. When comparing the model with the subsequent models, the first model attributes the variances largely to the two grade levels.

The second model brings in the student scores in standardized testing. This model was primarily used to answer the questions: what is the relation of the students' scores on standardized tests and planned D.I.? Whereas, model 3 targets the research question: what is the relation between teachers who differentiated instruction more observably? Both models did not provide any significant positive effects. In the third model, the D.I. observation scores were included as well to accurately measure.

The fourth and fifth models used in the multi-level analysis was used to determine the interaction effects in model 4 and 5. The fourth model shows the students who were grouped in the lower-ability groups had significantly lower-achievement scores than those in average-ability groups, and those in higher-ability groups demonstrated even higher achievement scores than the other groups. However, in the fifth model ability grouping was used to understand the relationship between D.I. and grouping. The results indicate that students in higher-ability groups who are paired with teachers who received a high D.I. score will result in higher posttest scores. The students who were in the low-ability group scores significantly less than those in the high-ability group.

Results

Overall, the study used the models to answer their research questions. The first research question presented asked: Does observable D.I. result in higher student outcomes/achievement? Based on the results, there is no significant positive effects of student outcomes due to observable D.I. Which leads to the second research questions: does pre-planning D.I. result in higher student outcome? Based on the results of the study, there were no significant positive effects. The final question sparks off with how does ability-grouping impact student outcomes? According to the research, only students in high-ability grouping have a positive effect from D.I. as compared to the low- and average-ability

grouping (Faber, Glas, and Visscher, 2018). Faber, Glas, and Visscher created and studied how D.I. in the classroom can impact student outcome.

From this study, a teacher may consider their classroom structure if they use ability grouping. Using this study as an example, teachers can base their classroom grouping on something that proves to be better for all students, not just the student who fall into the high-ability category. It is important for teachers to further research and develop a better understand of the impact of differentiated instruction to student, and much more to students with disabilities who need all the support they can get to master objectives and goals. Although Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018) attempted to further develop the understanding and science behind D.I., there is still much more that needs to be developed and further researched to truly understand the impact on student outcomes.

Implications of the Findings

Based on the results of the research, my personal teaching practices will change in the classroom. In my personal experience, I've worked with many teachers and administration staff that believe D.I. creates the best results by having pre-planned and observable D.I. in the classroom. According to Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018), these components do not have a positive or significant effect on student outcomes. Going forward, I will plan my time differently. Additionally, I think this research supports my personal philosophy that "spontaneous" D.I. is welcomed in the classroom and should be addressed if the opportunities present itself. Lastly, in the classroom, I will re-analyze groups that I have assigned. This research indicated how ability-grouping was really only beneficial towards high-ability students. By keeping this in mind, I will ensure that my classroom groups will not be determined by abilities.

The results lead me to question what about D.I. does create higher student outcomes? Furthermore, what are signs other than failure in assessments that lead towards a need of D.I?

Student Contributions

Faber, Glas, and Visscher (2018) conducted this study to better understand the relationship between differentiated instruction and student outcomes. The study did not provide clear-cut answers but did provide insight to how D.I. can impact students. This study had its strengths and weaknesses that could be addressed to create a stronger research.

What I Would Keep

One of the strengths of this study was the research. The authors research seminal work that contributed effectively for this study. In the research, the authors were able to pick and choose what they believed is differentiated instruction since there has been little work on the definition and explanation of the D.I. process. The authors also did a great job at analyzing results. A worry thought was how to measure the amount of D.I. that the teachers would provide. However, by creating a

checklist on a Likert-scale, this provided the observing researchers to look for exact or key details that need to be implemented in the classroom.

What I would Change

The study could have been improved by further research towards ability-grouping. Going forward, this research may be used to further study ability grouping. The researchers could have asked half of the teachers to group their classrooms by ability, and the other half of the teachers to group students in mixed-abilities to see the variance between the two groups. Regarding differentiated instruction, the research may be stronger if observing researchers had stayed in the classroom all day long to record times of D.I. in the classroom. Further investigation of what D.I. is and how it can appear in the classroom could have made the research stronger. The research at hand failed to provide details on how the D.I. is presented in the classroom which would be more useful for teachers who want to learn how to use D.I. in their own classroom. The research also did not provide any details regarding the classroom populations. The study did not mention any needs of the students or background information which may have impacted student achievement. Students with disabilities need to be considered when researching. Students with disabilities can be found in classrooms that require standardized testing. It is important to research and further develop how students with disabilities react to differentiated instruction.

The study could have been stronger with additional research on grouping students in the classroom, students with disabilities, and additional details. Due to the lack of these qualities, the research presented proved to be informative. Further research can be done to better improve this study. Including students with disabilities in the population and sample size would provide a better insight on how student outcomes can be impacted from differentiated instruction. As D.I. is a delicate topic that needs further research on how it could look in the classroom, it is important for the researchers to have a clear and distinct form of displaying D.I. so that it could be measured accurately. Additionally, the study failed to provide a detailed overview on how the students scored on their standardized testing and pre and posttests. It could be a reason to look further into formative and summative measures through D.I. The study could also benefit from a change of scenery. The study was conducted in Dutch schools, and it could be interesting how this would impact American students found in inclusion classrooms which include students with disabilities.

Conclusion

To conclude, the study was well-versed in research and data analysis. The research was clear and proved to be significant. The research determined that students in high-ability groups benefit from ability-grouping along with D.I. Whereas, students grouped in low- and average-groups demonstrated no positive effects from grouping with D.I. The study also suggested there was no significant positive effects of planned D.I. versus unplanned.

Clearly, differentiated instruction is a young topic that needs to be further researched and developed. Students may benefit highly from D.I. if it was researched thoroughly. This study opened doors towards D.I., but more need to be knocked down. The need for the study is evident through

struggling students sitting in whole-group instruction. This study has created a stepping stone for future research.

References

Janke M. Faber, Cees A.W. Glas & Adrie J. Visscher (2018) Differentiated instruction in a data-based decision-making context, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 29:1 43-63

Tomlinson, C.A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C.M., Moon, T.R., Brimijoin, K., ...Reynolds, T. (2003) *Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of the literature*. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27, 119-145.

[To top](#)

NASET SPONSOR



Earn your **fully funded** Ph.D. in Special Education at the University of Central Florida

 **Paid Tuition, fees, health insurance; \$22k Stipend Annually;
Full time enrollment required – Orlando, FL** 

[Click here for more information](#)

Book Review: *Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development*

By Elizabeth Haddad

The purpose of the book *Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the social change model of leadership development* by Susan R. Komives, Wendy Wagner and associates is to describe and explain the aspects that come together to focus on social change and making responsible actions and choices to change for the good of everyone. Another important focus of this book is The Social Change Model of Leadership Development, this is defined as leadership that is purposeful, people working together, and the importance of values that makes social change a positive experience. As described in the book, The Social Change Model has two main goals to make students participation experience better: Self-Knowledge and Leadership competence. The book describes self-knowledge as understanding important components that make each person who they are: values, talents and interests. This guides them to the type of leader they will be and what values they will have as a leader. Leadership competence is described as the ability to organize and prepare others and themselves to work together towards a mutual goal or purpose (Komives, Wagner & et al, 2017).

The main themes of this book begin with Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, this includes Transitions and Transformations in Leadership and the development of the Social Change model of Leadership. The basis of the Transitions and Transformations in Leadership focuses deeper into the history and changes that have been over years. It also brings up the importance of The Social Change Model and its implementation into leadership over the years. A key quote from this part of the book is “You will explore new ideas, engage in critical thinking, compare your ideas and approaches with peers, and ultimately attempt to create an approach that makes sense to you plus relates in a meaningful way to the views and actions of others”. This quotes helps to guide understanding of The Social Change Model for the rest of the book and further understand of the upcoming themes. This and the themes of the book *Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the social change model of leadership development* by Komives, Wagner & et al. (2017) are comparable to the chapter three *Understanding Change in Leading in a Culture of Change* by Fullan (2001). Fullan (2001) describes understanding change as knowing that desired goal is not to innovate and change the most, it does not matter that you have the best ideas, clearly defining resistance, working with the implementation/ learning dip, looking for new ideas and practices, and working with the complexities of leadership.

The second part of the first theme is the development of The Social Change Model, this includes the three areas of development and seven core values. The three areas are Group Values, Individual Values, and Society / community values. A key quote from this theme is “Growth in one value increases the capacity for growth in the others”. The seven core values work within the three areas; the values are called the seven C’s. They consist of Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common purpose, Controversy with Civility, Citizenship, and Change. The following major themes of this book consist of these seven C’s and are categorized into subgroups.

The next theme/ category focuses on Individual Values, the values associated with this theme are Consciousness of Self, Congruence, and Commitment. Consciousness of Self is described as the following from the book “Self-awareness is essential for a collaborative approach to leadership. In order to build authentic relationships within a group or a community, leaders must to be aware of not only their skills but also their values, beliefs, and motivations”. Congruence related to individual

values is described at the next step of Conciseness of Self because it requires for the individual to follow their beliefs and match it to their actions values.

Commitment is described in this book as “the final individual C, pulls together the concepts of Consciousness of Self and Congruence and the anchors of group effort. Commitment serves as the focal point for change, around which all of the other Cs are integrated”. Fullan (2001) included the importance of commitment in the Framework for Leadership figure, commitment is emphasized for members internal and external. Commitment from members determines the results and the same goes for commitment as the focal point for change in Leadership for a better world (Komives, Wagner & et al, 2017).

The next major theme in Leadership for a better world is Group Values, this consists of the following areas: Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility. I think that these values of Group collaboration, purpose and being civil are very similar to the chapter Relationships, Relationships, Relationships in Leading In a culture of change by Fullan (2001). This chapter focuses on the importance of making successful relationships as a leader. Looking further into what Fullan (2001) describes “investing only in like-minded innovators is not necessarily a good thing”. I can understand that when collaborating, finding common purpose and civility, groups that are more diverse and have different opinions work better because they are not thinking exactly the same. Fullan (2001) explains that “Like minded innovators become more like minded and more like the rest of the organization while missing valuable new clues about the future”.

The next theme is Society and Community Values and it consists of direct information on Citizenship. Citizenship is described as members of a community participating actively and feeling responsible to their community (Komvies, Wagner & et al, 2017). Looking at citizenship in the context of Social Change Model of Leadership development is for members of the community to be informed and feel responsible for the people who live in the community. As described by Komives, Wagner and et al. (2017), citizenship within Social Change Model and the history of citizenship in the United States, community involvement, and encouraging involvement in the community. I think the theme Society and Community Values is an important part of Leadership and Social change, because communities and societies are the heart of a lot of change and interest and help in this is crucial. I think this part of the book was informational for any leader but specifically a leader of a large group like a mayor, or government official.

The last three themes in the book are not specific aspects of change, they consist of Change in general, Social Change, and Applying Social Change. General change chapter covered some important examples of change in different levels reflecting from the Social Change Model such as, Individual- Level Development, Group- level Development, and Community-Level Development (Komvies, Wagner & et al, 2017). The subtopic Applying the Social Change Model starts off by explaining the importance of Social Justice and bringing justice when making decisions. For me this was relatable to The Chapter Moral Purpose from Leading in a Culture of Change by Fullan (2001). The chapter Moral Purpose focuses on the importance of Moral Purpose for leaders to implement in their processes, although they are different Social Justice and Moral Purpose go hand in hand and making decisions with both topics in mind is important as a leader.

Overall, I think the theme Group Values in the book *Leadership for a Better World* by Komives, Wagner & et al (2017) is a major strong point in the book. Collaboration, Common Purpose, and Controversy with Civility are significantly important for Leaders to Lead positively and for positive impact in change. Although some find this helpful and more informative, I could say one of the week points of the book *Leadership for a Better World* would be the extensive description and information about each topic and subtopic. I was able to pick up a lot of important points I tended to focus on concrete examples and more to the point definitions.

References

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S. R. (2017). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. New York: Jossey-Bass.

[To top](#)

NASET SPONSOR



LEARN | WEBINAR TRAINING
Strategies to Increase Beginner Classroom Participation Skills
Special Learning, Inc.

REGISTER NOW

Latest Employment Opportunities Posted on NASET

* **Special Education Teacher** - School Steps, an Invo Company, is hiring a Special Education Teacher in San Diego, CA. The qualified Special Education Teacher will teach elementary and/or

secondary school subjects including social and prevocational skills to special education students with a variety of neurological, learning, and social/emotional disabilities. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher** - The Pinnacle School, a private, special education day school for college-bound students in grades 2 through 12, seeks a Lower and Middle School Special Education Teacher for a full-time, school-based position (10 months). The Special Education Teacher will provide high quality, data-driven instruction to students aligned with the school's mission and philosophy. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher** - Eastern Illinois Area of Special Education (Charleston, IL). Spec. Ed. Teacher. Develop materials for indiv. programs, goals/objectives for students, and evaluate acad/therapeutic/social growth for Spec. Ed students (K – age 21). Keep records and progress reports. Give standardized tests, other evaluative materials, maintain IEPs. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Teacher** - Under general supervision, plans and implements academic lessons, activities and plans for students in an assigned program. Assesses student's academic abilities and educational needs; develops goals and objectives for the academic portion of the student's IEPs. Develops, plans and implements lesson plans that meet identified goals and which incorporate student behavioral characteristics and communication abilities. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Ed Teacher-Certified** - The Home for Little Wanderers Southeast Campus seeks a SPED Teacher for their Plymouth-based program. Under the direction of the Principal, the Teacher leads development and implementation of curricula to multiple small-ratio, therapeutic classrooms of special education students primarily presenting with emotional impairments and performing at varying academic levels. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Ed Teacher** - The Home at Walpole seeks a Special Education Teacher for their Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education School, Clifford Academy. Clifford Academy provides a year-round engaging and comprehensive program focused on education, career development, recreation/fitness, and an individualized therapeutic approach. To Learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher - Surprise, AZ** - The Invo-Progressus Team has incredible opportunities for Special Education Teachers...or, as we like to call them, Superheroes. If you use your super powers to help ensure that children have access to the best education possible in the least restrictive environment, we would love for you to join the Invo-Progressus team! To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher - Philadelphia, PA** - The Invo-Progressus Team has incredible opportunities for Special Education Teachers...or, as we like to call them, Superheroes. We are currently seeking full-time Special Education Teachers in Philadelphia, PA for the 2019-2020 School Year. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher - Bartow, FL** - The Invo-Progressus Team has incredible opportunities for Special Education Teachers...or, as we like to call them, Superheroes. We are currently seeking a full-time Special Education Teacher in Bartow, FL to provide services in a K-12 school program. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Intervention Specialist** - The Intervention Specialist is responsible for maintaining compliance of student special needs records including IEPs and ETRs; monitoring and reporting student progress for caseload students as well as in classes taught; and providing instructional resources to students per IEP specifications. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Chief Clinical Officer** - Criterion Child Enrichment is conducting a search for a Chief Clinical Officer (CCO). Founded in 1985 as a not-for-profit organization, Criterion has served families for over 30 years and is a leading provider of early childhood education and early intervention services in Massachusetts. Each year the agency serves over 7000 families with a staff of over 400 through a program network that extends throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. To learn more - [Click here](#)

* **Special Education Teacher** - Wake up every morning knowing you have the power and the tools to change lives. EBS is the employer of choice for special education teachers who truly want to help children learn, evolve, and grow. Join us, and we'll give you everything you need to fuel your passion as a special education teacher. To learn more - [Click here](#)
[To top](#)

Acknowledgements

Portions of this or previous month's *NASET's Special Educator e-Journal* were excerpted from:

- Center for Parent Information and Resources
- Committee on Education and the Workforce
- FirstGov.gov-The Official U.S. Government Web Portal
- Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals (JAASEP)
- National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth
- National Institute of Health
- National Organization on Disability
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

- U.S. Department of Education
- U.S. Department of Education-The Achiever
- U.S. Department of Education-The Education Innovator
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- U.S. Department of Labor
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration
- U.S. Office of Special Education

The **National Association of Special Education Teachers** (NASET) thanks all of the above for the information provided for this or prior editions of the Special Educator e-Journal

[To top](#)