



March 2026

NASET Special Educator e-Journal

Exceptional Teachers Teaching Exceptional Children

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Special Education Legal Alert | 3 |
| Buzz from the Hub | 5 |
| Update from the U.S. Department of Education | 7 |
| Supporting Families of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Literature Review | 12 |
| Push-in Support, a Help or a Hinder to Student with Disabilities | 18 |
| Acknowledgements | 26 |

Special Education Legal Alert

Perry A. Zirkel
March 2026

This month’s update identifies two recent decisions of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which covers Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, under the IDEA and Section 504, respectively. For related publications and special supplements, see perryzirkel.com

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>On February 19, 2026, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued an officially published decision in C.B. v. Henry School District, primarily addressing the least restrictive environment (LRE) claims of the parents of a fourth grader with Down syndrome. The IEP placed the student in general education classes for art, music, and physical education; general education classes with paraprofessional support for science and social studies; and a resource class for language arts and math. The resource class was a small-group instructional setting for students with disabilities. A special education teacher taught the class, which included no nondisabled students. During the second semester, the IEP team met to develop the IEP for fifth grade. At the meeting, the special education teacher explained that the student made fluctuating progress at a first-grade level, but without reaching any of his benchmarks. She gave her opinion that the class was no longer appropriate for him in comparison to another available special education class for language arts and math, which included visual supports, assistive technology, and a curriculum more tailored to his needs although including students who were more impaired than those in the resource class. Despite objections at the meeting from the student’s parents and their attorney, the team determined that the fifth-grade IEP would include the other special education class for these two subjects. The parents filed for a due process hearing, with their primary claim being that this change violated LRE under the IDEA. After a five-day hearing, the hearing officer ruled in favor of the school district. The parents appealed to the federal district court, which affirmed the hearing officer’s decision. The parent sought reversal by the Eleventh Circuit.</p> | |
| <p>The parents argued that the resource class was the LRE for the student because it was closer to a “regular” educational environment.</p> | <p>The court rejected this argument, ruling that both the IDEA’s LRE provision and the two-step analysis adopted in that jurisdiction and the majority of other federal circuits applied only to a placement choice between a regular and special education class, not between two different special education classes.</p> |
| <p>The parents alternatively argued that the overlapping substantive standard for FAPE under Endrew F. favored the resource class.</p> | <p>Disagreeing, the court concluded that Endrew F. did not address this situation, but even if it did, the district was entitled to deference for its cogent explanation justifying the other special education class as meeting the reasonably-calculated standard for appropriate progress under the circumstances.</p> |
| <p>Although preserving for further proceedings the more limited issue of whether the district violated the IDEA in changing the student to alternative assessment for state proficiency, the Eleventh Circuit’s primary ruling on LRE illustrated the arguably increased tendency of the current federal judiciary to limit their interpretations to the letter, as opposed to the spirit, of the law.</p> | |

On February 12, 2026, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued an unofficially published decision in *Bryant v. Calvary Christian School*, which included a ruling under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. In this case, the parents enrolled their child for sixth grade in the “discovery program” of a private parochial school. The program was designed to serve students with learning differences. The parents provided the school with a clinical psychologist’s report that included a diagnosis of their child with autism and ADHD along with recommended accommodations. Although some participants in the discovery program had IEPs or 504 plans, the school provided him with a student support plan based on the psychologist’s recommended accommodations. In seventh grade, the student began to struggle despite the new teacher’s implementation of his support plan. In September, when she directed him to stop playing a game on his laptop, he slammed down the cover with noisy force. In October, he threw a pencil in the direction of classmates. The program director suspended him for three days and recommended that the parents arrange for applied behavioral analysis (ABA) therapy for him and evaluation for medication. Both he and his parents perceived racial hostility on the part of the other students and the staff of the program. Upon returning from his suspension, the student threw a school-provided calculator against the wall in the classroom. As a result, in December of grade 7 the headmaster of the school notified that the student would not be allowed to return to in-person instruction unless he completed ABA therapy at another school or in another classroom setting. His parents arranged for a behavioral analyst to provide him with ABA therapy while he attended virtual classes at her clinic. The behavioral analyst subsequently provided the parents with an evaluation report with recommendations for continued ABA therapy. In February, the parents and the behavior analyst met with the school’s headmaster, reviewed the report, and proposed the student’s return to in-person instruction with the parents’ provision of a behavioral assistant to accompany the student and provide training to his teacher(s) to implement his therapy plan. The headmaster repeated his previously stated pre-condition that the student attend a public school or other classroom setting to show he would be successful with said therapy. The parents enrolled the student at Sylvan Learning Center for the rest of grade 7, where he received good grades and no significant disciplinary violations. However, the headmaster ultimately decided not to allow the student’s reenrollment, asserting that the proposed arrangement constituted a substantial modification to its program. The parents filed suit in federal district court, including Section 504 along with racial discrimination claims that are not the focus of this update. The court granted the school’s pretrial motion for summary judgment, whereupon the parents appealed to the Eleventh Circuit.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The parents asserted that a reasonable jury could find that their child met the Section 504 definition of disability.</p> | <p>The Eleventh Circuit agreed based on the unchallenged diagnoses of autism and ADHD and their arguably substantial limitation, without mitigating measures, on one or more major life activities including concentration.</p> |
| <p>Given such disability status, the parents argued that their proposed arrangement, which was cost free to the school, was a reasonable accommodation.</p> | <p>Disagreeing and thus ultimately affirming the Section 504 ruling for the school, the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the proposed arrangement, including the shadowing ABA support assistant for an indefinite period of time, amounted instead to a "substantial modification" of the school’s program.</p> |
| <p>Although the difference between private and public schools is evident in the actions of its representatives, the interesting relevant parts of the Eleventh Circuit’s legal analysis apply as well to public schools: (1) the courts are liberal about Section 504 disability status at the pretrial stage because the allegations are accepted in the light most favorable to the plaintiff; and (2) the Eleventh Circuit relied on the limits of “reasonable accommodation” in the case law rather than the lesser obligation of private schools in the Section 504 regulations.</p> | |

Buzz from the Hub

<https://www.parentcenterhub.org/buzz-january2026/>

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: Assistive Technology Challenges and Resources in Selected School Districts and Schools

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education. Under IDEA, assistive technology must be considered for students receiving special education services. Little is known about how this requirement is implemented locally.

The US Government Accountability Office (GAO) interviewed staff from state and regional education agencies, eight school districts, and eight schools. In addition, GAO interviewed the Center for Parent Information and Resources (CPIR) and conducted a web-based survey of all 93 Parent Centers.

Following are the final reports:

- Full report: <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-26-107506>
- One-page summary: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-26-107506-highlights.pdf>

The Five Centers Focused on Very Young Children with Disabilities

Concerned about the development and well-being of a young child with disabilities, birth to 5? There are five key Early Childhood Centers funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to address the needs of, and improve results for, our very young children with disabilities.

Learn more and visit the websites of the five centers [here](#).

Supporting Families to Encourage Student Growth through Self-Determination

This brief from the RAISE Center and TransCen, Inc explains the importance of fostering self-determination in students with disabilities and offers practical strategies for family

advocates and professionals to support families in helping students build decision-making and autonomy skills. **[Read the brief here.](#)**

Healthcare Transition and Medical Self-Advocacy

When young people turn 18, a lot happens. Adult responsibilities and decisions can feel scary and confusing for the unprepared. Becoming responsible for medical care is part of growing up, and that process is so critical that there's a specific name for it: healthcare transition. **PAVE** in Washington developed a video on health care transition and self advocacy that shares perspectives of young people with disabilities.

Click **[here](#)** to watch the video.

CPIR Resource Center

Have you checked out the new **CPIR Resource Center**? The resource center is a collection of curated tools to support families, caregivers, self-advocates or educators, by providing information about rights, services, best practices, leadership development, systems navigation and more. Make it your go-to place for materials to support informed decision-making and building strong collaborative connections

[Explore the CPIR Resource Center here.](#)

Update from the U.S. Department of Education

<https://www.ed.gov/>

Birth to Grade 12 Education-Resources

<https://www.ed.gov/birth-to-grade-12-education>

Available Grants

<https://www.ed.gov/grants-and-programs/apply-grant/available-grants>

U.S. Department of Education Announces Regional Semifinal Locations for the Presidential 1776 Award

March 2, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education announced the five regional semifinal competitions for the Presidential 1776 Award will occur at Presidential Libraries across the nation.

Proclaiming February 2026 as National Career and Technical Education Month

February 27, 2026

For generations, America's strength has been shaped by innovators, builders, problem-solvers, and creators who combined skills and knowledge to power our economy and strengthen our communities.

U.S. Department of Education Receives Recommendations to Reform the Institute of Education Sciences

February 27, 2026

Today, U.S. Secretary of Education Linda McMahon received a report from U.S. Department of Education Senior Advisor Dr. Amber Northern with suggestions on how to reform the Institute for Education Sciences (IES).

U.S. Department of Education Issues Interpretive Rule to Reduce Barriers for New and Emerging Accrediting Agencies

February 26, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) issued an interpretive rule aimed at reducing existing barriers for new accrediting agencies to apply for recognition from the Secretary of Education.

Secretary McMahon Celebrates Golden Age of Education

February 24, 2026

Secretary of Education Linda McMahon released a statement on President Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address.

U.S. Department of Education Announces Additional Partnerships to Break Up the Federal Education Bureaucracy

February 23, 2026

The Department of Education announced two new interagency agreements to break up the federal education bureaucracy, ensure efficient delivery of funded programs, and continue delivering on the President's promise to return education to the states.

U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights Secures 31 Agreements with Colleges and Universities to End Partnerships with The Ph.D. Project

February 19, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights announced that it has secured thirty-one resolution agreements with institutions of higher education to cease their partnerships with The Ph.D. Project.

U.S. Department of Education Urges Institutions of Higher Education to Implement Best Practices to Reduce Default Rates

February 18, 2026

The U.S. Department of Education today issued additional guidance reminding institutions of higher education of their shared responsibility under Title IV to support borrowers throughout their federal student loan repayment process.

U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights Initiates Title VI Investigation into Portland Public Schools

February 17, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights opened an investigation into Portland Public Schools in Portland, Oregon over its Center for Black Student Excellence, which allegedly discriminates on the basis of race.

U.S. Department of Education Takes First Step to Develop the 2027–28 FAFSA Form

February 13, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) published an information collection for the 2027-28 Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA®) form, which is the first stage in the FAFSA development process.

U.S. Department of Education Probes Louisiana Board of Regents Over Alleged Race-Based Priority in Executive Budget

February 13, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights initiated a directed investigation into the Louisiana Board of Regents to determine whether its Master Plan for Higher Education violates Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

U.S. Department of Education Investigates Washington State School District Over Alleged Sexual Assault of Female Wrestler by Male Competitor

February 13, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights initiated a directed investigation into Puyallup School District in Puyallup, Washington based on reports that a female wrestler was sexually assaulted by a male competitor.

U.S. Department of Education Issues Proposed Interpretive Rule to Eliminate the Use of “Regional” by Accrediting Agencies

February 13, 2026

The Department issued a proposed interpretive rule clarifying that the “regional” label used by accrediting agencies and other entities creates inappropriate barriers and misleads students and the public.

U.S. Departments of Education, Interior, and Labor Host Tribal Consultation on Indian Education Partnership

February 11, 2026

Yesterday, the U.S. Departments of Education, Interior, and Labor hosted a consultation with elected Tribal leadership in Washington, D.C to listen, learn, and strengthen the critical partnership between the Federal government and Tribal nations.

U.S. Department of Education Releases Latest Foreign Funding Disclosures from Federally-Funded American Universities

February 11, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) released data compiled from foreign funding disclosures submitted by American colleges and universities for 2025 – documenting over 8,300 transactions worth more than \$5.2 billion.

U.S. Department of Education Highlights Flexibility in Federal Education Funding to Support Innovative Teacher Workforce Strategies in the States

February 9, 2026

The Department of Education sent guidance to states and districts, emphasizing existing flexibilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to use Title II, Part A funds to implement innovative teacher workforce strategies.

U.S. Secretary of Education Linda McMahon Visits Alabama on Returning Education to the States and 'History Rocks!' Tours

February 6, 2026

Today, U.S. Secretary of Education Linda McMahon visited Alabama in support of both the U.S. Department of Education’s national Returning Education to the States Tour and History Rocks! Trail to Independence tour.

U.S. Secretary of Education Linda McMahon Visits Illinois on Returning Education to the States and History Rocks! Tours

February 5, 2026

Today, U.S. Secretary of Education Linda McMahon visited Chicago Hope Academy in support of both the U.S. Department of Education’s national Returning Education to the States Tour and History Rocks! Trail to Independence tour.

U.S. Department of Education Takes Actions to Protect Integrity of U.S. Elections

February 5, 2026

ED Launches Two FERPA Investigations to Determine whether Student Data was Illegally Shared with Entities for the Purpose of Influencing Elections.

U.S. Department of Education Issues Guidance on Prayer and Religious Expression in Public Schools

February 5, 2026

Today, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) issued guidance on constitutionally protected prayer and religious expression in public elementary and secondary schools.

Supporting Families of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Literature Review

By Amyerim Suarez

Introduction

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder with communication, social, and behavioral challenges. The burden of ASD is not limited to the individual diagnosed but also affects the family. Parents and caregivers consistently face a unique set of emotional, financial, and social stressors as they navigate the services and interventions available for their children. For many families, these demands result in greater levels of stress, anxiety, and even burnout.

Given these realities, understanding how to support children with ASD goes hand in hand with learning how to fortify their families. Research during the past decade has increasingly focused on family-centered approaches, recognizing parents as partners in these interventions. The review below gives an overview based on evidence from recent studies regarding how family support, parent-mediated interventions, coping strategies, and community resources impact both the child and their families.

Parent Mediated Interventions

Parent-mediated interventions (PMIs) are one of the most well researched and effective strategies for families of children with ASD. In a large-scale meta-analysis, Conrad et al. (2021) found that when parents are trained to use behavior strategies, their children make gains in social communication and have fewer challenging behaviors. Parents, in turn, felt more confident and

had a greater sense of agency in their child's development. PMIs help bridge the gap between clinic and home, empowering families to use therapeutic strategies in real-life contexts.

Parenting Stress and Coping Mechanisms

Raising a child with autism can be both a joyful and emotionally exhausting experience.

Ni'matuzahroh et al. (2021) examined how several different coping mechanisms related to parents' quality of life. Positive reappraisal and problem-focused coping were associated with lower stress and satisfaction with life. Similarly, Sartor (2023) noted the importance of social supports and adaptive coping strategies in relation to parental stress. These findings support the view that stressors derive not only from a child's disability diagnosis but from how well parents are able to perceive and cope with daily challenges.

Child Behavior and Family Impact

Children's behavioral and self-regulation challenges can impact dynamics and interactions in the overall family system. Efstratopoulou et al. (2022) found that parents of children with higher levels of difficulties had higher levels of stress and lower quality of life. The study highlighted that interventions for children focused on emotional regulation can help reduce family stress. For example, visual supports and structured routines can help children to feel calmer, resulting in fewer externalizing behaviors toward family members. Greater predictability and self-management in children bolsters a feeling of harmony and reduces conflict within family systems.

Personal Perspectives and Grounded in Research

The best way to support families of children with ASD is to empower caregivers to partner in their child's interventions. Parent-mediated and family-centered approaches support better developmental outcomes for children and simultaneously improve parents' confidence and resilience. The evidence also suggests that emotional functioning and coping deserve to be a primary concern and are not secondary to other intervention goals. Interventions that respect the cultural values, lifestyle, and emotional needs of the families they serve have the greatest benefit. Such a perspective lends a framework for the growing consensus that holistic support of the family results in optimal long-term outcomes for both the child and the family.

Recommendations and Best Practices

- **Empower Parents as Co-Therapists:** Provide structured training for parents to deliver evidence-based interventions at home.
- **Directly Address Parental Stress:** Include counseling, mindfulness, and stress management training into family service offerings.
- **Use Visual and Structural Aids:** Build daily routines and visual schedules to support child independence and limit family stress.
- **Foster Community Connections:** Build peer networks and local support systems to bolster coping and reduce isolation.
- **Expand Access Through Technology:** Leverage telehealth and mobile devices to serve families who face barriers to in-person services.
- **Be culturally responsive:** Match interventions to family values, languages, and cultural norms.

Conclusion

Supporting children with ASD requires an understanding that the well-being of the family is inseparable from the child's progress. Research consistently demonstrates that when parents are empowered as active participants through parent-mediated and family-centered interventions, both the child and the caregivers experience meaningful improvements. Parents gain confidence, children develop stronger communication and self-regulation skills, and family relationships become more balanced and resilient.

Equally important is addressing the emotional and social dimensions of caregiving. Providing parents with effective coping strategies, opportunities for peer connection, and access to community and technological supports can significantly reduce stress and isolation. Tailoring these interventions to reflect cultural and contextual realities ensures that support is both inclusive and sustainable. The evidence highlights that empowering families through knowledge, collaboration, and connection is central to promoting lasting positive outcomes. By integrating behavioral, emotional, and social supports, one can help families of children with ASD not only manage daily challenges but also thrive together over time.

References

- Conrad, C. E., Rimestad, M. L., Rohde, J. F., Petersen, B. H., Korfitsen, C. B., Tarp, S., Cantio, C., Lauritsen, M. B., & Händel, M. N. (2021). Parent-Mediated Interventions for Children and Adolescents With Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.773604>
- Efstratopoulou, M., Sofologi, M., Giannoglou, S., & Bonti, E. (2022). Parental Stress and Children's Self-Regulation Problems in Families with Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). *Journal of Intelligence, 10*(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10010004>
- Miranda, A., Mira, A., Berenguer, C., Rosello, B., & Baixauli, I. (2019). Parenting Stress in Mothers of Children With Autism Without Intellectual Disability. Mediation of Behavioral Problems and Coping Strategies. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00464>
- Ni'matuzahroh, Suen, M.-W., Ningrum, V., Widayat, Yuniardi, M. S., Hasanati, N., & Wang, J.-H. (2021). The Association between Parenting Stress, Positive Reappraisal Coping, and Quality of Life in Parents with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Children: A Systematic Review. *Healthcare, 10*(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10010052>
- Pi, H. J., Kallapiran, K., Munivenkatappa, S., Kandasamy, P., Kirubakaran, R., Russell, P., & Eapen, V. (2021). Meta-Analysis of RCTs of Technology-Assisted Parent-Mediated Interventions for Children with ASD. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-021-05206-2>

Picardi, A., Gigantesco, A., Tarolla, E., Stoppioni, V., Cerbo, R., Cremonte, M., Alessandri, G., Lega, I., & Nardocci, F. (2018). Parental Burden and its Correlates in Families of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Multicentre Study with Two Comparison Groups. *Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health*, 14(1), 143–176.
<https://doi.org/10.2174/1745017901814010143>

Sartor, T., Sons, S., Kuhn, J., & Heinrich Tröster. (2023). Coping resources and stress due to demands in parents to children with autism spectrum disorder. *Frontiers in Rehabilitation Sciences*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2023.1240977>

Push-in Support, a Help or a Hinder to Student with Disabilities

By Cosett Maytin

Introduction

Push-in support has become a central feature of inclusion education efforts in the United States. This approach places special education teachers, related service providers, and/or intervention specialists directly in the general education classroom so that students with disabilities can receive support alongside their peers. Instead of travelling to a separate space for instruction, students remain in the same learning environment while still accessing targeted help. Push-in models often use co-teaching, small group differentiated instruction, or in-class intervention to deliver those supports. Understanding the importance of this topic is important for several reasons. First, many school districts across our country have adopted the push-in services modality. This has been done rapidly and many times without a clear understanding of the instructional or organizational demands involved for both student and teacher. Second, push-in support teeters between academic access and the emotional wellbeing of the student as it affects not only how the student learns but also how they see themselves and how they fit socially within the fabric of the classroom. Finally, schools are pouring in substantial resources into staffing and scheduling inclusive models, which makes it essential to look into whether push-in support actually works as intended and under what conditions has the strongest impact. Hocutt (1996) concluded that “various program models, implemented in both general and special education, can have moderately positive academic and social impacts for student with disabilities. This literature review examines research on academic performance, social and emotional outcomes and the implementation conditions that influence the success of push-in

support. It draws on peer-reviewed research on the practicalities of how effective and beneficial, or not, this modality can be for students with disabilities.

Academic Outcomes Associated with Push-In Support

Across the researched literature, academic findings were positive. Mostly, the strength of the positive effect depended on classroom practices and collaboration between teachers. Several of the researched studies pointed out that remaining in the general education classroom allowed students with disabilities to receive more consistent exposure to grade-level material. McLeskey and Waldron (2015), for example, found that students with mild to moderate disabilities made better progress in reading and mathematics when they were taught in inclusion classrooms rather than removed for separate instruction. Rea et al. (2002) similarly reported improved grades and higher scores on state assessments for students with learning disabilities participating in inclusive classrooms. On the flip side, the research also shows how easily the push-in model can fall short. Murawski (2006) observed in her research that when these push-in models fall into a pattern where one teacher instructs and the other simply circulates, academic advantages taper off. Soli et al. (2012) reached a similar conclusion, noting that push-in support all too often becomes superficial if teachers do not share equal if not substantive instructional responsibilities. Although the researchers of academic outcomes associated with push-in support ultimately agreed that it can increase academic growth, they were very adamant in stressing that factors need to be present for this model to be successful such as shared ownership of student performance, planned lessons, and a clear division of instructional responsibility because without those structures, it risks turning into fragmented help that lacks the intentionality in high quality special education.

Social and Emotional Development/Peer Relationships

The research shows that social and emotional findings are more consistent than the academic ones. A common trend of the research was that students described feeling more connected to their peers when support was provided inside the general education classroom. An increasing number of students...indicated that their experience is often marked by bullying, social isolation, and anxiety (Humphrey & Lewis, 2008). "...previous research has suggested that such pupils are at an increased risk of social exclusion" (Humphrey & Symes, 2009). Another researcher, Cole et al. (2004) found that students' sense of belonging increased when support services reduced the need for frequent pull-outs, which can make students feel conspicuous. Inclusive environments tend to foster more friendships and a greater sense of social confidence, especially when teachers normalize help-seeking and use strategies that benefit all learners. The emotional benefits also relate to how students perceive themselves. Humphrey and Lewis (2008) noted that students often view pull-out sessions as socially risky because leaving the room marks them as different. Push-in approaches avoid this disruption, which can help students with disabilities have a more stable self-concept. However, these benefits are not automatic. When support in the classroom becomes intrusive, such as constant hovering or one on one assistance in a way that draws attention, students feel embarrassed and singled out (Giangreco et al., 2010). Unclear teaching roles can also lead students to feel unsure about whom to seek help from, complicating their sense of trust or comfort. In short, push-in support shows strong potential to strengthen emotional engagement and peer relationships, but only if the model is implemented in a way that respects student autonomy and helps to preserve their social standing in the classroom environment.

Implementation Factors That Influence Effectiveness

Through the available studies, researchers stress that push-in support is not automatically effective and that there is a level of collaboration that must take place for it to run smoothly. Its impact grows or decreases depending on certain conditions. As a response to this, schools have embraced the need for true collaboration among general and special educators (Murawski & Lochner, 2011). Collaborative planning of the co-teach, for example, emerges as one of the most critical factors. This model depends on shared responsibility, and that responsibility requires dedicated time. This model simply cannot function without structured joint planning time. Scruggs et al. (2007) found that the absence of planning time was the most frequently cited barrier to successful push-in instruction. It found that when planning is rushed or nonexistent, lessons tend to rely on reactive support rather than planned differentiation. We must also take into consideration the instructional design of the model. It plays a significant part in determining how well push-in models function. Friend et al. (2010) noted that when co-teaching moves into a pattern where one teacher leads and the other assists, the special educator's expertise becomes underutilized and ultimately can cause the quality of support students receive to diminish. In addition, role clarity and teacher expertise must be taken into account because general and special education teachers bring complimentary skills. Keefe and Moore (2004) found that when roles are unclear, special educators sometimes get relegated to tasks that underuse their training, weakening the specialized instruction that students need. While we keep all of these issues on the back burner so as to provide services with fidelity, we must also add that administrative leadership and school culture further influence the success of inclusive practices. They are an integral part of fabric for support facilitation. Theoharis and Causton (2014) argue that principals who cultivate a shared vision of inclusion, provide professional development opportunities, and schedule common planning for co-teaching create an environment where push-in support can

thrive. Without such leadership, even well-intentioned teachers may struggle to maintain consistent and effective push-in routines. Overall, these factors show that push-in support is not merely just a placement decision. It is an instructional system that relies on commitment, teacher collaboration, and thoughtful planning.

Possible Future Directions for Research

Although the research continues for this fairly new support model, there remain gaps that must be addressed. From what I can gather, long range studies measuring both academic and social emotional outcomes for students with disabilities under push-in versus pull-out are few. I also think that student characteristics such as disability type, severity of need, and co-occurring condition (may benefit those with mild-moderate needs more than those needing intensive remediation) could be further studied. Also, more research is needed on conditions of effective implementation such as how often planning occurs, structures in place, and training available to teachers. Finally, future studies should include how students with disabilities experience push-in versus pull-out because their perspectives on belonging, support, and learning are underrepresented in research literature thus far.

Conclusion

The push-in support services and facilitation model offers a promising approach to supporting students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. It aligns with principles of inclusive education and has potential advantages in social participation and access to the general curriculum for students in need. High quality push-in models expand access to rigorous content, strengthen, peer connections and reduce the stigma often associated with leaving the classroom for special education instruction. However, when poorly planned or implemented without a clear

framework, the same model can fall short. Therefore, the question is not whether push-in support works, but how it is structured. The research has pointed at the importance of collaborative planning, clear teaching roles, and strong administrative backing. When these factors are in place, push-in support services can genuinely enhance both academic learning and emotional well-being for students with disabilities.

References

Cole, C.M., Waldron, N., & Majd, M. (2004). Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. *Mental Retardation*, 42(2), 136-144

- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20*(1), 9–27.
- Giangreco, M. F., Doyle, M. B., & Suter, J. C. (2010). Teachers' perceptions of educational paraprofessionals in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Special Education, 44*(3), 194–210.
- Hocutt A. M. (1996). Effectiveness of special education: is placement the critical factor? *The Future of children, 6*(1), 77–102.
- Humphrey, N., & Lewis, S. (2008). What does 'inclusion' mean for pupils on the autistic spectrum in mainstream secondary schools? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 8*(3), 132–140.
- Humphrey, N. & Symes, W. (2010). Perceptions of social support and experience of bullying among pupils with autistic spectrum disorders in mainstream secondary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 25*(1), 77-91.
- Keefe, E. B., & Moore, V. (2004). The challenge of co-teaching in inclusive classrooms at the high school level: what the teachers told us. *American Secondary Education, 32*(3), 77-88.
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2015). Effective leadership makes schools truly inclusive. *Phi Delta Kappan, 96*(5), 68–73.
- Murawski, W. W. (2006). Student outcomes in co-taught secondary English classes: How can we improve? *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 22*(3), 227–247.

- Murawski, W. W., & Lochner, W. W. (2010). Observing co-teaching: what to ask for, look for, and listen for. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 46*(3), 1-10.
- Rea, P. J., McLaughlin, V. L., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children, 68*(2), 203–222.
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children, 73*(4), 392–416.
- Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., & McCulley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundations of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*(5), 498–510.
- Theoharis, G., & Causton, J. (2014). Leading inclusive reform for students with disabilities: a school and systemic approach. *Theory Into Practice, 53*(2), 82–97.

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

Sarah S. Ayala, LSU | Associate Editor, NASET e-Journal