

FOCUS on Research

Newsletter of the



In This Issue

- OPEN SCIENCE in Special Education: Open Peer Review
- CEC-DR Diversity Committee Spotlight
- CEC-DR Families Research Spotlight
- 2021 DR Research Award Recipients
- CEC-DR Virtual Convention 2021

Newsletter Editors

Interested in providing information for the newsletter? Contact one of the editors:

Pamela J. Mims, PhD
East Tennessee State University
mimspj@etsu.edu

Vicki Knight, PhD
University of British Columbia
vicki.knight@ubc.ca



President's Message

A Look at CEC Division for Research (CEC-DR) as We Begin 2021

Kathleen Lynne Lane, PhD, BCBA-D, CF-L1 *University of Kansas*

I spent New Year's Eve safe at home with my husband, "Zooming" with our children, Nathan and Katie, and their significant others. It was a genuinely happy event as I was glad they were safe in their respective homes. Yet, it was also bittersweet, as I wish we could have all been together at some point during this past holiday season. Actually, I wish we could have been together in person and with our extended family members and friends at any point in 2020. But I recognize our family has been more fortunate than many.

This past year has been an opportunity to reflect and value what was—and is—most important to us. Combing through my Instagram account on New Year's Day, I saw many reflections and celebrations. One that struck me was a posting by my daughter, who is completing her undergraduate degree from Vanderbilt University in spring of 2021 with a major in special education and a minor in quantitative methods.

katieslane For 2021 my goal is to focus on HOPE. We've all faced plenty of challenges, but I believe we're all going to find a lot of joy and gratitude for things we used to take for granted in the year to come. Here are some of the things I'm hoping for this year:

- More hugs with people I love

- In-person family time
- Seeing extended [family] who I've missed for the past year
- Continuing to learn and grow with my love, [*]
- Getting back to the gym
- Dance parties with [*] and [*]
- More traveling
- Competing with my [*] team
- Getting the Covid vaccine
- Making more memories together when we can do so safely

So, here's to hope

[*] redacted

She inspires me. I concur wholeheartedly... on all counts. And, to this list of "hope" for the new year, I would add that I have hope for the CEC-DR community and special education researchers across the country who remain relentlessly committed to rigorous, responsible, and respectful inquiry as we determine how to better serve our students with, and at risk for, exceptionalities in the months ahead. I anticipate our community will rise to the challenge of creating innovative approaches to continue moving our knowledge forward in ways that are healthy not only for our students but for educators and families as well as ourselves.

(continues on page 9)

OPEN SCIENCE in Special Education: Open Peer Review

Sarah Emily Wilson & Bryan G. Cook,
University of Virginia

Open-science reforms have the potential to strengthen the credibility of research, help address the replication crisis, and abridge the research-to-practice gap (Adelson et al., 2019; Cook et al., 2018). *Focus on Research* is featuring a series of articles introducing prominent open-science practices. In this article, we focus on open peer review; specifically, we describe the importance and limitations of traditional peer review, elucidate three primary types of open peer review, and note some purported benefits and limitations of open peer review.

Traditional Peer Review

Peer review of scholarly publications, dating back to 1665 with the Royal Society's publication of *Philosophical Transactions* (Moxham & Fyfe, 2018), "is embedded in the core of our knowledge generation systems" (Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020, p. 1). Peer review is intended to help ensure scientific rigor of publications, select which manuscripts to publish, and improve submitted manuscripts (Ross-Hellauer, 2017; Schmidt et al., 2018). Although scholars generally view traditional peer review positively (Ware, 2016), it has important limitations. For example, peer review has been found to be unreliable and inconsistent; time-consuming, resulting in delayed dissemination of scholarship; prone to inaccuracies and biases; sometimes caustic; ineffective in guarding against the publication of flawed and misleading research; uninformative to research consumers, who typically cannot access reviews; and with few incentives for reviewers, making it difficult for journal editors to attract qualified reviewers (see Ross-Hellauer, 2017, for a review).

Open Peer Review

Open peer review is intended to remediate some of the shortcomings of traditional peer review by applying the principles of openness and transparency (Ross-Hellauer, 2017; Ross-Hellauer et al., 2017). Although open peer review is often considered a core open-science practice, it is not well defined or given much attention in the open-science literature, and it lacks strong evidentiary support (e.g., Bravo et al., 2019; van Rooyen et al., 2010). Based on a systematic review of the literature,

Ross-Hellauer (2017) suggested a pragmatic definition of *open peer review*:

an umbrella term for a number of overlapping ways that peer review models can be adapted in line with the aims of Open Science, including making reviewer and author identities open, publishing review reports and enabling greater participation in the peer review process. (p. 1)

Ross-Hellauer identified seven types of open review, which are often combined in the literature, including (1) open identities, (2) open reports, (3) open participation, (4) open interaction, (5) open pre-review of manuscripts, (6) open final-version commenting, and (7) open platforms or decoupled review. Here, we focus on three types of open review—open identities, open reports, and open participation, which were present in more than 99% of definitions in Ross-Hellauer's review.

Currently, most education journals use double-blind peer review, in which the identities of authors and reviewers are masked to one another, or single-blind review, in which the identities of reviewers are blinded to authors though authors are known to reviewers. In contrast, neither authors nor reviewers are masked in *open identities*, also referred to as *signed peer review* (Ford, 2013) and *unblinded review* (Monsen & Van Horn, 2007). Blinding in the review process is intended to protect authors from potential biases (e.g., gender bias) and reviewers from concerns about retribution from authors dissatisfied with a negative review (Ross-Hellauer, 2017). However, research has indicated that blinding does not influence the rate of error detection in reviews (Godlee et al., 1998), and that reviewers can often identify authors despite blinding (Fisher et al., 1994; Godlee et al., 1998; Ross-Hellauer, 2017). In *open reports*, or *transparent review*, either full reports or summaries of reviewers' comments are published with articles, most often on the journal website. Reviewer identities can be blinded or unblinded, depending on whether the use of open reports is combined with open identities.

Open participation—also referred to as *crowd-sourced peer review* (Ford, 2013), *community/public review* (Walker & Rocha da Silva, 2015), and *public peer review* (Bornmann et al., 2012)—involves allowing a broad community to participate in peer review by providing either full reviews or short commentaries. Open participation can be fully open, with anyone being able to provide reviews. Alternatively, open participation

(continues on page 3)

Open Science (continued from page 2)

can require some form of credentialing, such as being a registered user with a history of publications, for conducting a review (Tennant, 2020). Open participation is most often used in addition to, not instead of, traditional peer review (Ross-Hellauer, 2017).

Potential Benefits of Open Peer Review

Each model of open peer review seeks to address limitations of traditional peer review by making the peer review process more open, potentially leading to increased accountability, transparency, and validity of the peer-review process (Ross-Hellauer, 2017; Ross-Hellauer et al., 2017). Open identities are theorized to reduce the likelihood of biased, perfunctory, inaccurate, and caustic reviews by increasing visibility and accountability (Ross-Hellauer, 2017). That is, if reviewers' identities are known, they may be more likely to submit thorough, constructive, and objective reviews (e.g., Bornmann et al., 2012). Such accountability may be heightened by combining open identities with open reports. Indeed, Bruce et al.'s (2016) review found that open identities improved the quality of peer review and decreased rejection rates. Public availability of reviews with the reviewers' identities could also provide recognition for high-quality reviews, with reviews potentially becoming citable products, thereby incentivizing scholars to serve as reviewers.

Open peer review can also lend greater transparency to the review process. The transparency in open identities and open reports has been suggested as a mechanism for making the overall system fairer (Ross-Hellauer, 2017), as it allows for potential conflicts of interest and opposing theoretical stances between authors and reviewers to be made open and thus subject to public scrutiny. Finally, open peer review has been suggested as a means for increasing the quality of published articles and enriching their scientific record. Open participation can provide researchers and editors considerably more feedback on manuscripts than with traditional peer review. Open reports can provide readers with important context for interpreting publications and understanding how reviews influenced the published article. Open reports and open participation can be combined to amplify their benefits.

Potential Limitations and Obstacles

Open peer review also has important potential limitations and obstacles. A primary concern is the removal of

blinding in open identities. The potential power dynamics between reviewers and authors, especially between more senior scholars and early career researchers, may lead to bias and retaliation and therefore potentially compromise the integrity and rigor of the peer review process. Further, reviewers may be hesitant to conduct reviews if their identities or reviews will be made known to the authors or the public (van Rooyen et al., 2010). This may deplete an already small pool of qualified reviewers. Open participation could also result in unqualified reviewers generating invalid reviews. Moreover, studies suggest only between 5 and 20% of submitted articles are actually commented on using open participation (Fitzpatrick, 2011; Pöschl, 2012), thereby limiting the approach's potential benefits. These authors found traditional, solicited reviews more effectively supported the selection and improvement of manuscripts than open participation reviews.

Conclusion

Despite proposed benefits, research on open peer review shows mixed and inconclusive findings regarding efficacy and practicality. For example, combining open identities and open reports did not improve quality of reviews, in comparison to just using open identities, and increased refusal rates among potential reviewers (e.g., van Rooyen et al., 2010). Bravo and colleagues (2019) found that using open reports with the option for open identities did not influence willingness to review, review quality, or the time to complete reviews; and only 8.1% of reviewers elected to post their review reports unblinded. Further research is needed to understand the potential fit of open peer review in special education scholarship and determine whether and how open review can be implemented in a manner that protects the integrity of the review process. Care in balancing the potential benefits and drawbacks of open peer review may be especially important for early career researchers and in other situations when power dynamics are at play. To this end, we suggest considering a mixture of open and traditional practices (see Bravo et al., 2019), such as using open participation alongside traditional referred reviews, or posting peer reviews with the option for reviewers to self-identify. Perhaps these types of approaches can help address some of the shortcomings of traditional peer review while retaining its strengths (see Ross-Hellauer & Görögh, 2019, for helpful guidelines).

(continues on page 4)

Open Science (continued from page 3)

References

- Adelson, J. L., Barton, E., Bradshaw, C., Bryant, B., Bryant, D., Cook, B. G., ... Troia, G. A. (2019, February 18). *A roadmap for transparent research in special education and related disciplines*. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/sqfy3>
- Bornmann, L., Herich, H., Joos, H., & Daniel, H. D. (2012). In public peer review of submitted manuscripts, how do reviewer comments differ from comments written by interested members of the scientific community? A content analysis of comments written for Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. *Scientometrics*, 93(3), 915–929. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0731-8>
- Bravo, G., Grimaldo, F., López-Iñesta, E., Mehmani, B., & Squazzone, F. (2019). The effect of publishing peer review reports on referee behavior in five scholarly journals. *Nature Communications*, 10(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08250-2>
- Bruce, R., Chauvin, A., Trinquart, L., Ravaut, P., & Boutron, I. (2016). Impact of interventions to improve the quality of peer review of biomedical journals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Medicine*, 14(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0631-5>
- Cook, B. G., Lloyd, J. W., Mellor, D., Nosek, B. A., & Therrien, W. J. (2018). Promoting open science to increase the trustworthiness of evidence in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 85(1), 104–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402918793138>
- Fisher, M., Friedman, S.B., & Strauss, B. (1994). The effects of blinding on acceptance of research papers by peer review. *JAMA*, 272(2), 143–146.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). *Planned obsolescence*. NYU Press.
- Ford, E. (2013). Defining and characterizing open peer review: A review of the literature. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 44(4), 311–326. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.44-4-001>
- Godlee, F., Gale, C. R., & Martyn, C. N. (1998). Effect on the quality of peer review of blinding reviewers and asking them to sign their reports: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*, 280(3), 237–240. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.3.237>
- Monsen, E. R., & Van Horn, L. (2007). *Research: Successful approaches*. American Dietetic Association.
- Moxham, N., & Fyfe, A. (2018). The Royal Society and the prehistory of peer review, 1665–1965. *The Historical Journal*, 61(4), 863–889. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X17000334>
- Pöschl, U. (2012). Multi-stage open peer review: Scientific evaluation integrating the strengths of traditional peer review with the virtues of transparency and self-regulation. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 6, 33. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2012.00033>
- Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What is open peer review? A systematic review. *F1000Research*, 6, 588. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>
- Ross-Hellauer, T., Deppe, A., & Schmidt, B. (2017). Survey on open peer review: Attitudes and experience amongst editors, authors and reviewers. *PLoS ONE*, 12(12), e0189311. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189311>
- Ross-Hellauer, T., & Görögh, E. (2019). Guidelines for open peer review implementation. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0063-9>
- Schmidt, B., Ross-Hellauer, T., van Edig, X., & Moylan, E. C. (2018). Ten considerations for open peer review. *F1000Research*, 7, 969. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15334.1>
- Tennant, J. P. (2020, February 26). *Review instructions for ScienceOpen*. ScienceOpen. <https://blog.scienceopen.com/2016/06/review-instructions-for-scienceopen/>
- Tennant, J. P., & Ross-Hellauer, T. (2020). The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 5, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1>
- van Rooyen, S., Delamothe, T., & Evans, S. J. (2010). Effect on peer review of telling reviewers that their signed reviews might be posted on the web: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*, 341, c5729. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c5729>
- Walker, R., & Rocha da Silva, P. (2015). Emerging trends in peer review-A survey. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 9, 169. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00169>
- Ware, M. (2016). Peer review survey 2015. https://www.elsevier.com/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/655756/PRC-peer-review-survey-report-Final-2016-05-19.pdf



CEC-DR Diversity Committee Spotlight

DR's Diversity Committee's Newsletter Spotlight presents four of our newest committee members. For this Spotlight we asked each of them to describe their background and share why they have chosen to lean into this critical work.



Dr. Lakeisha Johnson is an assistant professor in the Communication Science and Disorders Program at Florida State University and an ASHA certified speech-language pathologist. Her primary research interests include language, literacy, dialect, and executive function development in African American children.

(continues on page 5)

Diversity Committee Spotlight (continued from page 4)

Dr. Johnson believes in building and leveraging research-practice partnerships to ensure children from vulnerable and underserved populations obtain strong language and literacy skills. **My Why?** I am passionate about culturally responsive assessment and intervention practices and their use in determining eligibility for special education services. Children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds bring unique experiences into the classroom, and these experiences should be leveraged to help them best meet academic outcomes



Dr. Taucia González is an assistant professor of special education at the University of Arizona. Her research addresses issues of equity and inclusion for dual language learners with and without learning disabilities using participatory methods including youth

participatory action research. Her identity as a Chicana mother-scholar shapes her research interests and activities. **My Why?** I joined the CEC Division for Research Diversity Committee because I am excited that special education, as a field, is beginning to attend more to issues of race, culture, and language differences. CEC is a critical venue for shaping the field, and being a DR Diversity Committee member is a way for me to contribute to advancing that momentum.



Dr. Suki Jones Mozenter is an assistant professor of reading/literacies in the Integrated Elementary & Special Education program at University of Minnesota Duluth. Her research interests include student identities, literacies, and languaging practices;

critical pedagogy in teacher education; and partnership work geared toward critical, systemic change. She is a researcher and teacher educator interested in understanding how students come to see themselves and each other as readers and writers. **My Why?** As a teacher, I saw the richness in my students and their communities, as well as how the schooling systems restricted this very same richness. I work with CEC's DR Diversity Committee to center the richness of these intersectional identities and to amplify research that does the same.



Dr. William Hunter is an associate professor of special education at the University of Memphis. Dr. Hunter has worked as a special education teacher, administrator, and residential mental health intervention specialist. He has published in the areas of

engagement, classroom management, culturally relevant pedagogy, instructional strategies, transition, and post-secondary instruction for students with exceptionalities.

My Why? I look forward to serving on DR's Diversity Committee as well as the CEC's Project 20/20 Committee. I see a need for intersectional research designed to examine the support of students from diverse (including marginalized) backgrounds that focuses on their assets versus their deficits. My aim is to be a thought partner to encourage research that focuses on equity and the promotion of an "educational community of learners." ■



CEC-DR Families Research Spotlight

Shana Haines, *University of Vermont*

The Research on Families Committee has three goals: (1) to develop and propose mechanisms for including individuals with disabilities and their families in research and dissemination processes; (2) to promote ongoing communication among research, family, and practitioner communities by assisting the research community in understanding critical issues for families of individuals with disabilities and by assisting families in accessing and interpreting research outcomes related to individuals with disabilities; and (3) to foster a research agenda that addresses critical issues regarding families of individuals with disabilities. Towards these ends, the CEC-DR Families Research Spotlight highlights articles (nominated by DR members) that address critical issues affecting families with disabilities. Send your nominations to **Zachary Rossetti** (zsr@bu.edu) with the subject line "CECDR Families Research Spotlight," provide the citation for and a brief explanation of your

(continues on page 6)

Families Research Spotlight (continued from page 5)

nomination, and attach a PDF of the article. Our committee will evaluate nominations based on this *rubric*. We consider nominations for each quarter on these dates: February 15th, May 15th, August 15th, and November 15th. The Winter 2020 CEC-DR Families Research Spotlight is a co-authored article led by Dr. Kathleen Kyzar at Texas Christian University.

Kyzar, K. B., Mueller, T. G., Francis, G. L., & Haines, S. J. (2019). Special education teacher preparation for family-professional partnerships: Results from a national survey of teacher educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*(4), 320–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419839123>

The parent participation principle of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) sought to involve families in educational decision-making and protect the rights of families and their children with disabilities. Specifically, all parents/caregivers of eligible students with disabilities have the right to collaborate as equal members of educational teams in the development and implementation of their child’s individualized education program. The development of family-professional partnerships (FPPs) reflects the ideal of collaborative relationships between families and school personnel during the special education process. FPPs have been linked to positive outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as for families and school personnel.

Although special education teacher preparation programs offer a viable and sustainable way to enhance FPPs, little is known about the degree to which these programs address FPPs within their curricula. The purpose of this study—possibly the first to do so—was to examine the ways in which special education teacher preparation programs address FPPs. A total of 113 special education faculty members across 52 institutions responded to a national online survey addressing this topic. Results indicated (a) a disconnect in the value and implementation of FPP-related knowledge and skills at the program and individual faculty levels and (b) patterns of inconsistent FPP-related content coverage across undergraduate and graduate offerings as well as across FPP-specific and non-FPP-specific coursework. Notably, there were few FPP-specific (50% or more devoted to FPP content) courses, and in non-FPP-specific (less than 50% devoted to FPP content)

courses, FPP-related content was typically covered in just a few course sessions. Thus, despite IDEA’s emphasis on parent participation, pre-service teachers’ access to FPP-related content appears to vary based on the type of course in which they are enrolled. Based on these results, the authors suggest that “faculty should evaluate the extent to which FPP-related content is covered within non-FPP-specific coursework and, if relevant, identify barriers to FPP-related coverage such as time, professional development, or other resources” (p. 332). Considerations for future research include replicating the study with a larger sample, further examining the reasons for the disconnect between educators’ perceived value of FPP-related content and their perceived time and resources for delivering FPP-related content, and examining pre-service teacher (teacher candidate) outcomes related to FPPs. ■



2021 DR Award Recipients

The Division for Research is pleased to announce the recipients of its 2021 research awards. Recipients will be recognized on March 12, 2021, at the DR Business Meeting and Reception to be held during the Virtual CEC Convention and Expo. Awards will be made to the following outstanding recipients.

2021 Kauffman-Hallahan-Pullen Distinguished Researcher Award: **Dr. Patricia Snyder, University of Florida**

Dr. Snyder is a scholar whose work shapes and improves research, policy, and practices in early intervention and early childhood special education in the context of the broader early childhood field. Her research focuses on (a) embedded instruction in early learning; (b) social-emotional and communication foundations for early learning; (c) applications of research designs and methods in early intervention and early childhood special education; (c) measurement and assessment in early childhood; and (d) evidence-informed professional development implementation support practices, including practice-based coaching. She and her colleagues developed a practice-based coaching model, which is used widely in early childhood, including by Head Start. Dr. Snyder is a former editor of the *Journal of Early*

(continues on page 7)

2021 DR Award Recipients (continued from page 6)

Intervention. She is a member of the Pyramid Model Consortium and she chairs the Division for Early Childhood's Recommended Practices Evidence Synthesis Group. As her nominator stated, Dr. Snyder "has addressed practical needs in real-world contexts" and her "work has raised the bar for rigor in examining the implementation of effective practices."

Nominator: Erica McCray, *University of Florida*

2021 Martin J. Kaufman Distinguished Early Career Research Award:

Dr. Nicholas Gage, University of Florida

Dr. Nicholas Gage has been named the recipient of the CEC-DR 2021 Distinguished Early Career Research Award. He received his doctorate in 2010 in special education from the University of Missouri and is currently an associate professor in the School of Special Education, School Psychology, and Early Childhood studies at the University of Florida. Dr. Gage is one of the most promising young scholars in the area of evidence-based policies and practices at the national, state, local, and classroom levels that support students with, or at risk for, behavioral disabilities. His work is encompassed within a multi-tiered system of support framework commonly used in schools. He has published extensively in top tier journals, such as the *American Educational Research Journal*, *Exceptional Children*, and the *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*. He has also published multiple book chapters and makes numerous presentations yearly at national conferences. Additionally, Dr. Gage has secured seven research and training grants totaling \$4 million and has a strong commitment to mentoring the next generation of teachers and researchers in the field of special education. Dr. Gage's scholarly accomplishments are particularly impressive in light of the service he provides educators in the field through ongoing professional development in classroom management, school-wide positive supports, and bullying prevention.

Nominator: Erica McCray, *University of Florida*

2021 Division for Research Early Career Publication Award:

Dr. Corey Peltier, University of Oklahoma

The Division for Research is pleased to announce Dr. Corey Peltier as the recipient of the 2021 DR Early

Career Publication Award. Dr. Peltier, assistant professor at the University of Oklahoma, was nominated for his original research report, "Effects of Schema-Based Instruction on Immediate, Generalized, and Combined Structured Word Problems," published in *The Journal of Special Education* in 2020. In this paper, Dr. Peltier extended research on schema-based instruction in mathematics problem-solving in several ways. His research was novel in that he (a) used teachers as interventionists, (b) tested an adapted form of the intervention that included lessons of shorter duration delivered to small groups, and (c) assessed student performance on generalized and combined schema structure problems. Members of the review committee were impressed with the overall rigor of Dr. Peltier's research, which used a multiple probe design across participant groups, and which resulted in improved student performance on word problems representing simple, generalized, and combined schema structures. They commented specifically on the originality of his line of inquiry and the extent to which this study systematically and impactfully extended the literature in this area.

Peltier, C., Sinclair, T. E., Pulos, J. M., & Suk, A. (2020). Effects of schema-based instruction on immediate, generalized, and combined structured word problems. *The Journal of Special Education*, 54(2), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466919883397>

Nominator: Kimberly J. Vannest, *University of Vermont*

2021 Student Research Awards

Through its student research awards program, the CEC Division for Research recognizes high-quality research conducted by students in the course of their undergraduate or graduate special education training program. CEC-DR invites nominations for research in the following categories: qualitative, quantitative, single subject, and mixed methods design. For 2021, CEC-DR is pleased to announce the following awards:

Student Research Award: Qualitative Design

Student Awardee: Matthew Vandercar, *Concordia University Chicago*

Advisor: Andrea P. Dinaro, *Concordia University Chicago*

Title: *An Exploration of Nontenured Special Education Teacher Attrition*

(continues on page 8)

2021 DR Award Recipients (continued from page 7)

Abstract: This qualitative study included seven nontenured special education teachers who were assigned experienced teachers as mentors. The study was conducted in public elementary and middle schools in suburban Chicago. Themes were identified as obstacles or commonalities of their mentoring experiences. Themes include (a) having a “go-to” mentor, (b) lack of administrative support, (c) pressure from colleagues, and (d) abundance of paperwork. The most important factor is to have a personal mentor experienced in special education. Another factor is support from administration. In this study, contributors consistently reported a lack of support from their director of special education and superintendent. The most surprising and repetitive conclusion was these teachers felt a great deal of pressure from colleagues. Recommendations include (1) research mentors in the same field; (2) include directors and superintendents as members of the mentoring process; (3) educate general and special education personnel in each other’s roles; and (4) reduce paperwork.

Student Research Award: Mixed Methods Design

Student Awardee: Erica N. Mason, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

Advisor: Erica Lembke, *University of Missouri*

Title: *Teachers’ Views of the Mathematical Capabilities of Students with Disabilities: A Mixed Methods Study*

Abstract: Students with disabilities often have difficulty demonstrating mathematical understanding on conventional measures. One reason for this difficulty could be an instructional opportunity gap. Federal law, recent case law, and recommendations from professional organizations converge on the need for students with disabilities to have access to mathematical learning opportunities aimed at rigorous learning outcomes. However, beyond the existence of these policies and recommendations, enactment relies on individual teachers. Recent research suggests teachers’ views of their students’ mathematical capabilities may relate to the enactment of learning opportunities aimed at rigorous learning outcomes. A mixed methods study was conducted in order to understand teachers’ views of the mathematical capabilities of students with disabilities. General education mathematics teachers gave unproductive explanations for students’ struggle and articulated

rationales for instructional adjustments aimed at unproductive learning outcomes. When further scrutinized, teachers’ views qualitatively and quantitatively differed between students with and without disabilities.

Student Research Award: Single-Subject Design

Student Awardee: Holly N. Whittenburg, *Washington State University*

Advisors: Yaoying Xu and Colleen Thoma, *Virginia Commonwealth University*

Title: *Effects of Behavioral Skills Training with in Situ Training on Workplace Conversational Skills of Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder*

Abstract: Young adults with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) experience high rates of unemployment in the years immediately following high school, yet very few studies to date have investigated approaches to teaching transition-age high school students work-related social skills within competitive, integrated workplace settings. This study investigated the effects of a behavioral skills training (BST) with an in-situ training intervention package on workplace conversational skills of four transition-age high school students with ASD enrolled in a community-based internship program. Data were collected on participants’ accuracy in demonstrating the steps to conversing with coworkers during BST probes in training settings and in using the same steps in authentic conversations with coworkers during in situ trials in internship settings. Findings demonstrated a functional relationship between the implementation of the intervention package and increases in skill accuracy on in situ trials for all participants. All participants maintained skill mastery on BST probes, and three out of four participants maintained skill mastery on in situ trials.

Student Research Award: Quantitative Design

Student Awardee: Christy Austin, *University of Utah*

Advisor: Sharon Vaughn, *University of Texas at Austin*

Title: *The effects of instruction linking word reading and word meaning*

Abstract: This within-participants experimental study investigated the relative effects of word reading and word meaning instruction (WR+WM) compared to word reading instruction alone (WR) on the accuracy, fluency,

(continues on page 10)

President's Message (continued from page 1)

I remain hopeful we will embrace a better new normal in the years ahead, benefitting from this renewed and urgent shift to determining what works, for whom, and under what conditions during *and* after the COVID-19 era. As was mentioned in our last newsletter, it is essential for CEC-DR members and other educational researchers to facilitate continued inquiry regarding evidence-based practices in the new range of instructional settings, as well as how best to facilitate the well-being of students, educators, and family members. We are hopeful current and future CEC-DR members will come together and engage in collaborative inquiry to address this important charge with a strong commitment to understanding and addressing historical and structural inequities that have created gaps in educational opportunity and attainment. This is a tall order, but an important one. As our CEC-DR members head into this new year, I urge you all to revisit the mission of your work and your programmatic lines of inquiry, and ask yourself: What commitments can I make to understanding and addressing issues of inequity?

Teachers and Brussels Sprouts

As part of this inquiry, teacher well-being and issues of retention must be addressed. Recently, I have been thinking about how teachers are like brussels sprouts. Think about brussels sprouts: they are a “healthy” food. In terms of macro nutrients, 1 serving of steamed brussels sprouts (100 grams) features 43 calories, 3.5 g carbohydrates, 1.3 g fat, and 2.9 g protein. Yet, about five years ago brussels sprouts were hardly a desired food. Rarely—if ever—was this vegetable featured on a restaurant menu. The brussels sprouts were undervalued. Yet, now, brussels sprouts receive much attention. They are now featured appetizers, side dishes, and even entrées at a range of restaurants. In fact, brussels sprouts are often sold out in the frozen vegetable section of my local grocery store.

Now, think about teachers. Since March 2020, general and special education teachers shifted to work swiftly and relentlessly to provide a range of instructional opportunities for students: online, hybrid, and in-person. Our research team, as part of Project ENHANCE (iMTSS Network grant funded by the Institute of Education Sciences), has had the honor of collaborat-

ing with hundreds of educators across five districts and three geographic regions who used their Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (Ci3T) models of prevention to pivot to ever-changing instructional settings and educational needs. These administrators, general educators, special educators, and others are amazing. They are looking to the science—some of which does not yet exist—on how to navigate this complex situation that poses particular challenges to students who require special education services. Families are also struggling and looking for guidance from educators on how to support their children’s education. This past year, one parent reached out to me and said, “I don’t know what to do. I am not a teacher. I don’t know how to teach. My son needs his teacher.”

Society is watching—and I hope appreciating in new ways—how valuable and “healthy” teachers are for our nations’ youth, our families, and society as a whole. To function properly, a democratic society depends on an educated population. Teachers are important and valuable. We need to empower teachers with the full set of strategies, practices, and programs to meet students’ multiple needs. Empowering teachers with the resources they need and in ways that support their well-being and sense of efficacy will hopefully mitigate burnout. Again, this is complicated. I am grateful for the educational practitioners and researchers who are committing to continued inquiry in the coming years. I am hopeful that together we will create a better “new normal” in our educational systems, grounded in evidence-based practices, with a healthy respect for teachers and science. Fortunately, CEC-DR members are contributing in important ways.

CEC-DR: Honoring Our Exemplary Scientists

It is with gratitude and appreciation that we look forward to acknowledging the 2021 CEC Division for Research Award recipients virtually this spring at the CEC Convention. It is an honor to recognize exemplary contributions to the field by paying tribute to the contributions of researchers at various stages in their careers. Please come join our virtual program of awards and reception! If it were in-person this year, we would be serving brussels sprouts.

This year’s award winners include **Dr. Patricia Snyder** (Kauffman-Hallahan-Pullen Distinguished

(continues on page 10)

President's Message (continued from page 9)

Researcher Award), **Dr. Nicholas Gage** (Martin J. Kaufman Distinguished Early Career Research Award), and **Dr. Corey Peltier** (Early Career Publication Award). In the Student Research Awards categories, the winners are **Matthew Vandercar** (Qualitative Design), **Erica N. Mason** (Mixed-Methods Design), **Holly N. Whittenburg** (Single-Case Design), and **Christy Austin** (Quantitative Design). More informa-

tion on all of the recipients can be found beginning on [page 6](#).

In the meantime, please be safe, hopeful, and productive. ■

With respect,
Kathleen Lynne Lane, PhD, BCBA-D, CF-L1
University of Kansas
Roy A. Roberts Distinguished Professor
Associate Vice Chancellor for Research



2021 DR Award Recipients (continued from page 9)

and word meaning knowledge of 4th and 5th graders with dyslexia. We matched word lists on syllables, phonemes, frequency, and number of definitions. We assigned half the words to WR and half to WR+WM.

WR+WM significantly improved accuracy ($d = 0.65$), fluency ($d = 0.43$), and word meaning knowledge ($d = 1.92$) immediately following intervention, and significantly improved accuracy ($d = 0.74$), fluency ($d = 0.84$), and word meaning knowledge ($d = 1.03$) at posttest. ■

Council for Exceptional Children–Division for Research Events CEC Virtual Convention 2021

CEC-DR Meetings

Friday, 3/12	2:00 pm Central	DR Business Meeting
Friday, 3/12	2:30–3:30 pm Central	DR Reception
Thursday, 3/11	11:00 am–1:00 pm Central	DR Executive Board Meeting

CEC-DR Showcase and Invited Presentations

Friday, 3/12	Philip Capin, Brandy Gatlin-Nash, Colby Hall, Lakeisha Johnson, Sharon Vaughn	CEC-DR Showcase: <i>Evidence-based Instructional Approaches for Linguistically Diverse Learners: A Call to Action</i>
	Moderators: Endia Lindo, Nicole Patton Terry	

Friday, 3/12	Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds, Joseph Wehby, Christerralyn Brown, Caitlyn Majeika	CEC-DR Showcase: <i>Enhancing Intensive Intervention Research and Implementation Capacity Through Collaborative Doctoral Training</i>
--------------	--	---

Friday, 3/12	Sara McDaniel	2020 DR Early Career Researcher Award Recipient: Mapping Tier 2 for Social, Emotional, Behavioral Needs: Identification, Matching, Adaptation
--------------	---------------	--

Friday, 3/12	Mary Theresa Kiely	Graduate Student Research Colloquium: Exploring the Hallmarks of Excellent Special Education Research
--------------	--------------------	--



Follow CEC-DR on Facebook: [Division for Research CEC DR](#)
 Follow CEC-DR on Twitter: [CEC-DivisionResearch](#)