

Research Support for Inclusive Education and SWIFT

Introduction

Thirty years of research shows us that when students with varied learning and support needs learn together, they experience better academic and behavioral outcomes, social relationships, high school graduation rates, and post-school success. Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) is a whole school model, driven by multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) for *all* students. This approach to inclusion creates schools where *all* students, including those with extensive needs, are fully valued, welcomed, well supported, and meaningfully engaged in learning. This brief highlights several studies of inclusive education, MTSS, and four supporting domains of the SWIFT framework.

Benefits of Inclusive Education for ALL Students

Academic Benefits

Schools implementing a schoolwide model of equity-based inclusive education demonstrated larger student growth on annual state reading and math assessments relative to students attending comparable schools (Choi, Meisenheimer, McCart, & Sailor, 2016).

Students without disabilities made significantly greater progress in reading and math when educated in inclusive classrooms (Cole, Waldron, & Majd, 2004). Likewise, engagement in the general education curriculum strongly and positively correlated with math and reading achievement for students with disabilities (Cole, et al., 2004; Cosier, Causton-Theoharis, & Theoharis, 2013; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2010; Sermier Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012).

The inclusion of students with disabilities in general education produced either positive or neutral effects on outcomes for their non-disabled classmates (Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson, & Kaplan, 2007; Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009; Ruijs, Van der Veen, & Peetsma, 2010; Sermier Dessemontet & Bless, 2013).

Behavioral & Social Benefits

Students with autism who were academically and socially included at school experienced more positive developmental trajectories that extended into adulthood, engaging in fewer antisocial behaviors and demonstrating improved independent daily living skills (Woodman, Smith, Greenberg, & Mailick, 2016). Students with

extensive support needs who spent more time integrated among their general education peers demonstrated improved metacognitive and interpersonal abilities, and established more substantive networks of relationships (Copeland & Cosbey, 2009; Jackson, Ryndak, & Wehmeyer, 2009; Wehmeyer, 2006).

Postsecondary & Employment Benefits

Students with disabilities, including those with extensive support needs, who were educated in inclusive settings experienced greater post-school success than did their segregated peers, attaining meaningful social outcomes within core life domains of education, employment, and independent living (Haber et al., 2016; Ryndak, Ward, Alper, Montgomery, & Storch, 2010; Test, Mazzotti, Mustian, Fowler, Kortering, & Kohler, 2009; White & Weiner, 2004).

Students with disabilities who were included in general education classrooms were twice as likely to enroll and persist in postsecondary education relative to their more segregated peers (Rojewski, Lee, & Gregg, 2015).

Multi-Tiered System of Support

MTSS is a continuum of research-based, systemwide practices of using data to match evidence-based instruction and support to the academic and behavior needs of all students (Sailor, 2016; Wakeman, Browder, & Flowers, 2011). SWIFT MTSS integrates academic and behavior systems (McIntosh & Goodman, 2016; Sugai & Horner, 2009), whereas previous research tended to address the two dimensions separately.

Inclusive Academic Instruction

Multi-tiered, schoolwide approaches to instructional delivery support improved student outcomes. In one district, first grade reading success more than doubled, the proportion of students identified as having reading disabilities was cut in half, and the percentage of students passing the state reading assessment dramatically increased in 4 years (Harn, Chard, & Kame'enui, 2011). A multi-tiered system of support for reading is associated with significantly improved outcomes across all grade levels in an effect size analysis of five elementary schools (Mellard, Frey, & Woods, 2012).

Students with and without disabilities benefit from Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and differentiation practices—two essential features of MTSS (Kennedy et al., 2014; Subban, 2006; Tomlinson, 2005).

Inclusive Behavior Instruction

Implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) is associated with higher mathematics achievement, reading achievement, and lower truancy (Madigan, Cross, Smolkowski, & Strycker, 2016; Pas & Bradshaw, 2012).

PBIS implementation is associated with reduction of behavior problems for all students (Sugai & Horner 2009), helping students with higher needs through function-based interventions (Steege & Watson, 2009) and positive effects when using an individual student wraparound process (Suter & Bruns, 2009).

Schoolwide PBIS (SWPBIS) led to significant reductions in office discipline referrals and student suspensions (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010), as well as reduced racial disparity in the use of exclusionary discipline (Vincent, Sprague, Pavel, Tobin, & Gau, 2015). Relationship-building and social-emotional learning (SEL) strategies implemented within a SWPBIS framework reduced the frequency of school disciplinary practices overall, while also reducing racial disparities in the application of school discipline, ultimately promoting more positive and safe learning environments (Skiba & Losen, 2015).

Administrative Leadership

Strong & Engaged Site Leadership

The presence of strong and engaged site leadership predicts improved academic achievement (Di Paola & Walther-Thomas, 2003; Fullan, 2004; Klingner, Arguelles, Hughes, & Vaughn, 2001; McLeskey, Waldron, Spooner, & Algozzine, 2014), and is critical to developing and sustaining inclusive school practices (Ainscow & Sandhill, 2010; Waldron & McLeskey, 2010).

Collaborative teaming structures both necessitated and reinforced a schoolwide culture of trust, facilitating more efficient resource usage while also positively impacting student achievement (Di Paola, Tschannen-Moran, & Walther-Thomas, 2004).

Distributed leadership among teacher leaders is a contributing factor to school success (Hoppey & McLeskey, 2013; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Waldron & McLeskey, 2010).

Strong Educator Support System

Leaders of effective inclusive schools coupled high staff expectations with responsive professional support, purposefully cultivating individual and collective capacity through targeted training and strengths-based coaching (Shogren, Gross, et

al., 2015). In addition, teaming structures facilitated mutually supportive engagement around student data and instruction (Kozleski, Satter, Francis, & Haines, 2015; Lyon, Blue-Banning, & McCart, 2014).

Comprehensive and continuous educator support systems led to improved instruction, increasingly positive and safe school climates in which teachers could engage students in sensitive discourse surrounding human difference and diversity, and greater sustainability of schoolwide inclusive practices (Francis, Blue-Banning, Turnbull, Hill, Haines, & Gross, 2016; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002; Skiba & Losen, 2015).

Instructional coaching greatly enhances the possibility of teachers making desired changes to their habituated behaviors (Knight, 2007). Access to coaching support significantly enhanced the long-term sustainability of SWPBIS (Mathews, McIntosh, Frank, & May, 2014). Targeted training and coaching of paraprofessionals significantly improved their facilitation of social interactions within inclusive settings among students with autism and their peers (Feldman & Matos, 2012; Kretzmann, Shih, & Kasari, 2015).

Positive educator attitudes regarding inclusive practices were associated with increased instructional adaptability in meeting all students' needs, with increased prevalence of such attitudes tending to promote further collegial diffusion through collaboration and mutually supportive development (Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008). Prior training on teaching students with disabilities was generally associated with more positive teacher attitudes toward inclusive education (Vaz et al., 2015).

Leaders of effective inclusive schools cared for and invested in teachers, providing opportunities for distributed leadership while protecting teachers from the pressures of high-stakes accountability (Hoppey & McLeskey, 2010).

Educators in inclusive schools benefit from the presence of a schoolwide professional learning plan that is ongoing, comprehensive, and contextually relevant (Leko & Roberts 2014).

Integrated Educational Framework

Fully Integrated Organizational Structure

A case study of a highly effective inclusive school suggested the significance of establishing a unified schoolwide system of instructional delivery and support. By eliminating segregated classrooms and duplicative practices, special educators and paraprofessionals were able to help general education classrooms facilitate differentiated universal instruction (McLeskey, Waldron, & Redd, 2014).

Integration of organizational structures can extend the reach of typically segregated resources, removing artificial limitations on who may benefit and enabling all students' access to needed support (Sailor, 2009).

Effective inclusive schools ensured adequate time and attention was dedicated to scheduling and resource allocation (Kozleski et al., 2015; Giangreco, 2013), processes that can be more logistically complex in inclusive schools (Lyon et al., 2014).

Deploying paraprofessionals to support classrooms rather than individual students has allowed inclusive schools to better address all student needs while affording students with disabilities greater space to engage with their peers (Giangreco, Suter, Hurley, 2011).

Increased support personnel (e.g. paraprofessionals, specialized staff) within general education classrooms aided the development of all students (Kurth, Lyon, & Shogren, 2015), and helped foster greater acceptance of diversity and difference (Francis, Blue-Banning, et al., 2016b; Shogren, McCart, Lyon & Sailor, 2015).

Peer-mediated instruction has facilitated positive academic and social benefits for students with extensive support needs within inclusive settings (Carter, Asmus, & Moss, 2014; Watkins et al., 2015; Ryndak, Jackson, & White, 2013), potentially improving outcomes for their non-disabled peers as well (Schaefer, Cannella-Malone, & Carter, 2016; Cushing & Kennedy, 1997).

Cooperative learning and peer tutoring arrangements have successfully promoted improved social acceptance of students with disabilities among their non-disabled peers (Garrote, Dessemontet, & Opitz, 2017).

Students who provided peer supports for students with disabilities in inclusive general education classrooms demonstrated positive academic outcomes, such as increased academic achievement, assignment completion, and classroom participation (Cushing & Kennedy, 1997).

Strong & Positive School Culture

Effective inclusive schools facilitated meaningful participation and a sense of belonging for all students (Lyon et al., 2014). Students both with and without disabilities said the positive cultures they experienced were related to high expectations, supportive environments in which they could be successful, and feelings of connection to educators and peers within their school communities. This

suggests the need for teachers to strike an appropriate balance of high expectations, encouragement, patience, and support (Shogren, Gross, et al., 2015).

Students with disabilities who attended schools that employed greater use of co-teaching practices expressed a stronger sense of belonging and connection within their school communities, and were more self-efficacious in engaging new experiences (Rivera, McMahon, & Keys, 2014).

Students who received culturally responsive instruction reported feeling safer, experiencing fewer instances of victimization and discrimination, and attaining higher levels of academic achievement (Skiba & Losen, 2015) than those who did not receive culturally responsive instruction.

Reflections by students with extensive support needs who had been successfully included in school and had attained regular high school diplomas indicated the importance of individualized services and supports being implemented within the context of a schoolwide inclusive culture that holds high expectations for all students (Orlando, Klinepeter, & Foster, 2016).

Inclusive Policy Structure & Practice

Strong LEA/School Relationship

A strong and supportive relationship between individual schools and their districts is critical for growing and sustaining the success of school reform initiatives (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2003).

A qualitative study indicated that schoolwide inclusive reform efforts benefit from a school district that allows for flexible use of funds and personnel deployment, making those resources available to address the local needs of the school community (Lyon et al., 2014).

Strong district buy-in and support for schools' inclusive practices enabled conflicting policies to be resolved and resources used more efficiently (Shogren, McCart, Lyon, Sailor, 2015).

LEA Policy Framework

A policy framework must exist at the school, district, state, and federal levels that is fully aligned with inclusive reform initiatives and removes barriers to successful implementation (Kozleski & Smith, 2009).

Family & Community Engagement

Trusting Family Partnerships

Establishment of trusting family partnerships promotes improved academic achievement among students across all grade levels (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Tarter, 1997).

Trusting family partnerships form when families and school personnel trust and rely upon one another as they pursue common goals, and families have multiple opportunities for meaningful participation in their children’s education and in the life of the school (Haines, McCart, & Turnbull, 2013).

Parent focus groups often attributed positive and inclusive school cultures to principal leadership (Francis, Blue-Banning, et al., 2016). When visiting the school, parents experienced positive, informal interaction with principals, which promoted parents’ comfort and sense of belonging (Francis, Gross, Blue-Banning, Haines, & Turnbull, 2016; Francis, Blue-Banning, et al., 2016).

Trusting Community Partnerships

“Research indicates that when a collective group of school, family, and community stakeholders work together, achievement gaps decrease.” (Bryan & Henry, 2012, p. 408). These stakeholders may include community organizations, such as universities, businesses, local municipalities, nonprofit organizations, and social service agencies (Gross et al., 2015).

Principals of effective inclusive schools expressed a strong sense of commitment to local community successes and interests, formed social connections, and actively engaged beyond professional role boundaries (Gross et al., 2015). School-community partnerships motivated many stakeholders to engage with and contribute to the life of the school (Gross et al., 2015; Haines, Gross, Blue-Banning, Francis, & Turnbull, 2015).

Suggested Citation

SWIFT Center. (2017). *Research Support for Inclusive Education and SWIFT*. Lawrence, KS: Author.

References

- Ainscow, M., & Sandhill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(4), 401-416.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of school wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*(3), 133-148.
- Bryan, J., & Henry, L. (2012). A model for building school-family-community partnerships: Principles and process. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 90*(4), 408-420.
- Carter, E. W., Asmus, J., Moss, C. K., ... & Weir, K. (2016). Randomized evaluation of peer support arrangements to support the inclusion of high school students with severe disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 82*(2), 209-233. doi: 10.1177/0014402915598780
- Choi, J. H., Meisenheimer, J. M., McCart, A. B., & Sailor, W. (2016). Improving learning for all students through equity-based inclusive reform practices: Effectiveness of a fully integrated schoolwide model on student reading and math achievement. *Remedial and Special Education*, online. doi: 10.1177/0741932516644054.
- Cole, C. M., Waldron, N., & Majd, M. (2004). Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. *Mental Retardation, 42*(2), 136-144.
- Copeland, S. R., & Cosbey, J. (2008/09). Making progress in the general curriculum: Rethinking effective instructional practices. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 34*(1), 214-227.
- Cosier, M., Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G. (2013). Does access matter? Time in general education and achievement for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 34*(6), 323-332.
- Cushing, L. S., & Kennedy, C. H. (1997). Academic effects of providing peer support in general education classrooms on students without disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 30*(1), 139-151.
- Di Paola, M., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2004). School principals and special education: Creating the context for academic success. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 37*(1), 1-10.
- Di Paola, M. F., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2003). *Principals and special education: The critical role of school leaders* (COPSSE Document No. IB-7E). Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education.
- Feldman, E. K., & Matos, R. (2012). Training paraprofessionals to facilitate social interactions between children with autism and their typically developing peers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 15*(3), 169-179. doi:

- 10.1177/1098300712457421.
- Francis, G. L., Gross, J. M. S., Blue-Banning, M., Haines, S. J., & Turnbull, A. P. (2016). Principals and parents achieving optimal outcomes: Lessons learned from six American schools implementing inclusive practices. *Revista Latinoamericana de Inclusión Educativa*, *10*(1), 61-77.
- Francis, G. L., Blue-Banning, M., Turnbull, A. P., Hill, C., Haines, S. J., & Gross, J. M. S. (2016). Culture in inclusive schools: Parental perspectives on trusting family-professional partnerships. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, *51*(6), 281-293.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Garrote, A., Dessemontet, R. S., & Opitz, E. M. (2017). Facilitating the social participation of pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools: A review of school-based interventions. *Educational Research Review*, *20*, 12-23.
- Giangreco, M. F. (2013). Teacher assistant supports in inclusive schools: Research, practices and alternatives. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, *37*, 93-106. doi:10.1017/jse.2013.1
- Giangreco, M. F., Suter, J. S., Hurley, S. M. (2011). Revisiting personnel utilization in inclusion-oriented schools. *Journal of Special Education*, *47*, 121-132. doi:10.1177/0022466911419015.
- Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *102*(1), 3-17.
- Gross, J. M. S., Haines, S. J., Hill, C., Francis, G. L., Blue-Banning, M., & Turnbull, A. P. (2015). Strong school-community partnerships in inclusive schools are “part of the fabric of the school....we count on them.” *School Community Journal*, *25*(2), 9-34.
- Haber, M. G., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Rowe, D. A., Bartholomew, A. L., Test, D. W., & Fowler, C. H. (2016). What works, when, for whom, and with whom: A meta-analytic review of predictors of postsecondary success for students with disabilities. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(1), 123-162. doi: 10.3102/0034654315583135
- Haines, S. J., Gross, J. M. S., Blue-Banning, M., Francis, G. L., & Turnbull, A. P. (2015). Fostering family-school and community-school partnerships in inclusive schools: Using practice as a guide. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, *40*(3), 227-239. doi: 10.1177/1540796915594141.
- Haines, S. J., McCart, A., & Turnbull, A. P. (2013). Family engagement within early childhood response to intervention. *Handbook on response to intervention (RTI) in early childhood*, 313-324.
- Harn, B. A., Chard, D. J., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2011). Meeting societies' increased expectations through responsive instruction: The power and potential of

- systemwide approaches. *Preventing School Failure*, 55(4), 232-239. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2010.548416
- Hoppey, D., & McLeskey, J. (2010). A case study of principal leadership in an effective inclusive school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 46(4), 245-256.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Jackson, L. B., Ryndak, D. L., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (2008/09). The dynamic relationship between context, curriculum, and student learning: A case for inclusive education as a research-based practice. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 34(1), 175-195. doi: 10.2511/rpsd.33.4.175
- Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P., Dyson, A., & Kaplan, I. (2007). The impact of placing pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools on the achievement of their peers. *Educational Research*, 49(4), 365-382.
- Kennedy, M. J., Thomas, C. N., Meyer, J. P., Alves, K. D., & Lloyd, J. W. (2014). Using Evidence-Based Multimedia to Improve Vocabulary Performance of Adolescents With LD A UDL Approach. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 37(2), 71-86.
- Klingner, J. D., Arguelles, M. E., Hughes, M. T., & Vaughn, S. (2001). Examining the school-wide "spread" of research-based practices. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 24, 221-234. doi:10.2307/1511112
- Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kozleski, E. B., Yu, T., Satter, A. L., Francis, G. L., & Haines, S. J. (2015). A never ending journey: Inclusive education is a principle of practice, not an end game. *Research and Practice for Students with Disabilities*, 40(3), 211-226.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Smith, A. (2009). The complexities of systems change in creating equity for students with disabilities in urban schools. *Urban Education*, 44, 427-451. Recognized: (1) American Education Research Association, Special Interest Group, Systems Change: Best scholar-practitioner article on systemic change. (2) Sage Publications: Urban Education Editor's Choice Publication.
- Kretzmann, M., Shih, W., & Kasari, C. (2015). Improving peer engagement of children with autism on the school playground: A randomized controlled trial. *Behavior Therapy*, 46(1), 20-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2014.03.006>.
- Kurth, J. A., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2010). Academic and cognitive profiles of students with autism: Implications for classroom practice and placement. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(2), 8-14.
- Kurth, J. A., Lyon, K. J., & Shogren, K. A. (2015). Supporting students with severe disabilities in inclusive schools: A descriptive account from schools implementing inclusive practices. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40(4), 261-274. doi: 10.1177/1540796915594160.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School leadership and management*, 28(1), 27-42.

- Leko, M. M., & Roberts, C. A. (2014). How does professional development improve teacher practice in inclusive schools? In J. McLeskey, N. L. Waldron, F. Spooner, & B. Algozzine (Eds.), *Handbook of effective inclusive schools* (pp. 43-54). New York: Routledge.
- Lyon, K. J., Blue-Banning, M., & McCart, A. B. (2014). *Lessons from the field*. Lawrence, KS: National Center on Schoolwide Inclusive School Reform: The SWIFT Center.
- Madigan, K., Cross, R. W., Smolkowski, K., & Strycker, L. A. (2016). Association between schoolwide positive behavioural interventions and supports and academic achievement: A 9-year evaluation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 1-20.
- Mathews, S., McIntosh, K., Frank, J. L., & May, S. L. (2014). Critical features predicting sustained implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 16(3), 168-178.
- McIntosh, K. & Goodman, S. (2016). *Integrated multi-tiered systems of support: Blending RTI and PBIS*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- McLaughlin, M., & Talbert, J. (2003). *Reforming districts: How districts support school reform*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2002). Professional development and inclusive schools: Reflections on effective practice. *The Teacher Educator*, 37, 159-172. doi:10.1080/08878730209555291.
- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L. & Redd, L. (2014). A case study of a highly effective, inclusive elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 48(1), 59-70. DOI: 10.1177/0022466912440455
- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., Spooner, F. & Algozzine, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of effective inclusive schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Mellard, D. F., Frey, B. B., & Woods, K. L. (2012). School-wide student outcomes of response to intervention frameworks. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 10(2), 17-32.
- Orlando, A., Klinepeter, E., & Foster, M. (2016). Retrospectives on factors influencing inclusive opportunities for college students with extensive support needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(12), 1239-1251. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1159255.
- Pas, E.T. & Bradshaw, C.P. (2012). Examining the Association Between Implementation and Outcomes. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research* 39: 417. doi:10.1007/s11414-012-9290-2
- Rivera, E. A., McMahan, S. D., & Keys, C. B. (2014). Collaborative teaching: School implementation and connections with outcomes among students with disabilities. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 42(1), 72-85.

- Rojewski, J. W., Lee, I. H., & Gregg, N. (2013). Causal effects of inclusion on postsecondary education outcomes of individuals with high-incidence disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 25*(4), 210-219.
- Ruijs, N. M., & Peetsma, T. T. D. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. *Educational Research Review, 4*(2), 67-79. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.002>
- Ruijs, N. M., Van der Veen, I., & Peetsma, T. T. (2010). Inclusive education and students without special educational needs. *Educational Research, 52*(4), 351-390.
- Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P., Dyson, A., & Kaplan, I. (2007). The impact of placing pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools on the achievement of their peers. *Educational Research, 49*(4), 365-382.
- Ryndak, D. L., Jackson, L. B., & White, J. M. (2013). Involvement and progress in the general curriculum for students with extensive support needs: K-12 inclusive-education research and implications for the future. *Inclusion, 1*(1), 28-49. doi: 10.1352/2326-6988-1.1.028.
- Ryndak, D. L., Ward, T., Alper, S., Montgomery, J., & Storch, J. F. (2010). Long-term outcomes of services for two persons with significant disabilities with differing educational experiences: A qualitative consideration of the impact of educational experiences. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 45*, 323-338.
- Sailor, W. (2009). Access to the general curriculum: Systems change or tinker some more? *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 33*(4), 249-257.
- Sailor, W. (2016). Equity as a basis for inclusive educational systems change. *Australasian Journal of Special Education, 1*-17. doi: 10.1017/jse.2016.12
- Sermier Dessemontet, R., & Bless, G. R. (2013). The impact of including children with intellectual disability in general education classrooms on the academic achievement of their low-, average-, and high-achieving peers. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 38*(1), 23-30.
- Sermier Dessemontet, R., Bless, G., & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 56*(6), 579-587. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01497.x
- Schaefer, J. M., Cannella-Malone, H. I., & Carter, E. W. (2016). The Place of Peers in Peer-Mediated Interventions for Students With Intellectual Disability. *Remedial and Special Education, 37*(6), 345-356.
- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. *Disability & Society, 23*(7), 773-785.
- Shogren, K. A., Gross, J. M. S., Forber-Pratt, A. J., Francis, G. L., Satter, A. L., Blue-Banning, M., & Hill, C. (2015). The perspectives of students with and without

- disabilities on inclusive schools. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40(4), 243-260. doi: 10.1177/1540796915583493.
- Shogren, K., McCart, A., Lyon, K., & Sailor, W. (2015). All means all: Building knowledge for inclusive schoolwide transformation. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40(3), 173-191. doi: 10.1177/1540796915586191.
- Skiba, R. J., & Losen, D. J. (2015). From reaction to prevention: Turning the page on school discipline. *American Educator*, 39(4), 4-11 & 44.
- Steege, M. W., & Watson, T. S. (2009). *Conducting school-based functional behavioral assessments: A practitioner's guide*. Guilford Press.
- Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis. *International education journal*, 7(7), 935-947.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-Intervention and School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports: Integration of Multi-Tiered System Approaches. *Exceptionality*, 17(4), 223-237. doi:10.1080/09362830903235375
- Suter, J. C., & Bruns, E. J. (2009). Effectiveness of the wraparound process for children with emotional and behavioral disorders: A meta-analysis. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, 12(4), 336.
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-29.
- Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(3), 160-181. 10.1177/0885728809346960
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice?. *Theory into Practice*, 44(3), 262-269.
- Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmer, M., Sim, A., Scott, M., Cordier, R., & Falkmer, T. (2015). Factors associated with primary school teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities. *PloS one*, 10(8), 1-12.
- Vincent, C. G., Sprague, J. R., Pavel, M., Tobin, T. J., & Gau, J. M. (2015). Effectiveness of schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in reducing racially inequitable disciplinary exclusion (Ch. 14). In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion*. Columbia, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wakeman, S. Y., Browder, D., & Flowers, C. (2011). Alternate achievement standards for alternate assessments: Considerations for policy and practice. In M. Russell (Ed.), *Assessment in the margins*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Waldron, N. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 58-74.
- Watkins, L., O'Reilly, M., Kuhn, M., Gevarter, C., Lancioni, G. E., Sigafoos, J., & Lang, R.

- (2015). A review of peer-mediated social interaction interventions for students with autism in inclusive settings. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 45(4), 1070-1083.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (2006). Beyond access: Ensuring progress in the general curriculum for students with severe disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31(4), 322-326. doi: 10.1177/154079690603100405
- White, J., & Weiner, J. S. (2004). Influence of least restrictive environment and community based training on integrated employment outcomes for transitioning students with severe disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 21, 149-156.
- Woodman, A. C., Smith, L. E., Greenberg, J. S., & Mailick, M. R. (2016). Contextual factors predict patterns of change in functioning over 10 years among adolescents and adults with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(1), 176-189. doi:10.1007/s10803-015-2561-z



SWIFT Center produced this document under the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant No. H326Y120005. OSEP Project Officers Grace Zamora Durán and Tina Diamond served as the project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred. This product is public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, please use the citation provided above.