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Abstract

Bullying has a long history of being problematic in the school setting with incidence figures ranging as high as 86%. The ESL learner who has a concomitant special need is at increased risk, due to both disability and cultural difference. While schools have attempted to decrease the incidence of bullying through modifying the school environment, initiating peer support groups, and focusing on individual training in social skills and assertiveness, results have often proven ineffective, due, at least in part, to many misconceptions. Because this issue is crucially important for all teachers of ESL students to be aware of so they can proactively advocate for their students, this article provides an overview of bullying characteristics, discusses cross-cultural characteristics that can trigger bullying, explores reasons that those with disabilities miss critical social cues, considers common misperceptions, and offers suggestions for intervention programs as teachers seek to serve for a better world.

Introduction: The Problem

Bullying has a long history of being problematic in the school setting; however, it has received heightened attention following the Columbine massacre in 1999. Since then, incidence figures in general have ranged from 6.3-41.4% (Crothers, Kolbert, & Barker, 2006), ranging as high as 86% in some populations (Pelon, 2011). English Language Learners (ELLs) with a concomitant disability may fall within the higher incidence categories due to exhibiting multiple differences, as will be seen later in this article.

Attempted interventions for the problem of bullying have included modifying the school environment/climate, initiating peer support groups, and focusing on individual training in social skills and assertiveness (Espalage & Swearer, 2011; Mah, 2009; Rose 2011), though results have been mixed with many programs showing a lack of effectiveness (Rodkin, 2012; Schurman, 2009). Additional confounds to successful intervention include the following: many teachers do not feel there is a problem and/or are unaware of what is actually occurring; those who are aware do not see it in their own children; many misperceptions surround this issue; and any perceived difference can trigger an incidence of bullying. These perceptions of multiple differences cause the ELL learner with an underlying language learning disability or other special need to be at higher risk of being bullied, yet there are few, if any, studies on this population, even though ELLs are a rapidly increasing population already at risk of being marginalized due to language and cultural differences in general.

Therefore, all teachers of ELL students need 1) to be aware of all aspects of bullying, and 2) to be proactive in both supporting students while at the same time decreasing their risk of being bullied. But why is this so important? Vaillancourt, Hymal, and McDougall (2011) have stated “bullying and related experiences such as peer rejection and ostracism interfere with that
which is instinctively human – the quest to find a social place within the peer group and to fulfill a fundamental need to belong” (p. 24). Without this sense of acceptance and belonging, receptiveness to learning will not be optimized. So, in order to address the above needs of teachers, so that they, in turn, can support their students, the following section will provide an overview of bullying characteristics at multiple levels; discuss how cross-cultural differences can exacerbate the risk for being bullied; and explore reasons that those challenged by disabilities, including the ELL special education learner, miss crucial social cues.

**Bullying 101**

When discussing bullying, there are multiple layers that involve the individual, peers, the classroom, and the school-home-community partnership (Espelage & Swearer, 2011). In a very brief overview of a complex problem, at the individual level, those who are bullied may exhibit a difference in gender, personality (e.g., involving self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and stress-related illness), weight, disability, and sexual orientation, along with cultural and/or language differences. At the peer level, issues of dominance and victimization play prominent roles, with the incidence of problems increasing when students move from the primary to secondary school setting. The classroom level involves teacher attitudes and expectations regarding socialized gender roles in the classroom. Finally, at the interface of school, home, and community, views on bullying, prevention, intervention, and on personality come to the forefront. Expectations regarding the degree of social support that should be given by the family, the school, and the community-at-large should also be considered as part of the solution. Scholarship about warning signs that bullying may be taking place has been discussed by Olweus (1993) who was the first to conduct a systematic study of the phenomena in the 1970’s. These warning signs include: damaged clothing and/or belongings, physical/bodily damage, lack of friends, fears of typical school activities, loss of interest in school or change in grades, change in emotional states and/or increased anxiety, frequent physical complaints (e.g., headaches, stomachaches), sleep problems, and loss of appetite, among others.

With an awareness of the layers of the problem and specific warning signs, the next question becomes: why are ELLs, especially those with underlying disabilities, at increased risk? Since bullies tend to be drawn to perceived differences, cross-cultural differences exhibited by ELLs may be a first trigger. These differences include the following: speech (e.g., rhythm, stress, tempo, interval of silence); directness vs. indirectness; formality vs. informality; facial expressions, including eye contact or lack thereof; body language and gestures; spatial orientation (as an indicator of dominance, extroversion, and such); movement; clothing; courtesy cues (e.g., politeness rituals); and cultural norms and cultural expectations. For those unfamiliar with differing cultural characteristics and belief systems, Lynch and Hanson (2011) provide in-depth discussions of ten groups, including those with African-American, Asian, South Asian, and Middle-Eastern roots.

A second trigger for ELLs being the target of bullying occurs when the ELLs have an additional difference, that of disability. That is, differences due to culture and language (including pragmatics), plus characteristics of specific disabilities and other differences, equals an increased risk of being bullied. Mah (2009) and Rose (2011) have much to offer about the interface of ELLs and special education. They point out that the more anxious one is about differences and vulnerabilities, the more this attracts predatory bullies. This results in a cycle: those with special education status are twice as likely as those in the general education population to be bullied – and the reverse – they are twice as likely, in turn, to become bully-like.
However, in the general education population, those who are bullied tend to become bullies themselves over time, whereas in the special education population, those who are bullied tend to become more aggressive, exhibiting fighting behavior, yet not initiating actual bullying. That is, they become more aggressive, but not the aggressor (defensive reacting vs. initiating bullying). For these latter special education students, being bullied causes frustration, which leads to resentment, which then leads to aggression and fighting.

The situation is more complex, though, than is evidenced above, with additional interaction of the following: class placement (inclusive setting vs. self-contained classroom), visibility of the difference/disability, and the specific characteristics of the difference/disability (Rose, 2011). Additionally, lack of age appropriate social skills – either delay or precociousness – in individual students can lead to a lack of close relationships, a misreading of non-verbal communication, and a misinterpretation of non-threatening cues. These are all issues for ELLs in general, but they can increase exponentially depending upon some special education areas.

**Missing Crucial Social Cues**

What, then, are some reasons for missing and/or misinterpreting these social cues? According to Mah (2009), four main areas can contribute to this problem. The first involves cross-cultural differences, for example, how to make a polite refusal. What are the cultural norms of the first language (L1) culture and what are the norms of the second language (L2) culture for this speech act? Further, what are the cultural expectations of each culture? Since the area of pragmatics is seldom explicitly taught, it can take considerable time for differences in speech acts (e.g., refusals, apologies, requests) to be acquired. With each learner coming from different norms and with different expectations, breakdowns in communication can occur. These pragmatic failures are often more devastating than grammatical mistakes as many – both teachers and students – do not realize that cross-cultural differences in pragmatics exist. A second area that causes problems with social cues is that of overstimulation and/or stress. This area is typically experienced even by normal ELLs who are simply trying to survive in an academic setting with or without age-appropriate academic language or prior educational experiences. Sensory overload can occur due to the hum of florescent lights, new sights and sounds, even floating dust. Additionally, family problems, lack of sleep, and chronic illness can all lead to stress which takes away the mental processing space needed to correctly interpret social cues.

Anxiety is another area that contributes to a breakdown in social cue interpretation. (As a note, fear is specific, whereas anxiety is non-specific/generalized.) Once again, a different problem, in this case anxiety, takes away the mental processing space needed to focus on differences in social cues between cultures. As is known from second language acquisition theory, in order for input to become intake, features that need to be learned first need to be noticed, then processed (VanPatten, 2007). When students are anxious, they are less able to attend to key points in lessons by teachers or social cues on the playground by peers. Anxiety also causes hypersensitivity and hyper-alertness, though not necessarily to social cues (Mah, 2009). This, then, leads to being overly-cautious and overly-negative, which, in turn, can lead to failure and the anxiety-failure cycle (Mah, p. 58). Finally, there is the possibility of an actual social information processing deficit and/or pragmatic language disorder, either alone or secondary to another type of disorder, as a cause of missing and/or misinterpreting social cues (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2007). The first three areas noted above weave into a complex problem for ELLs, even without any type of special education need. For those with an underlying disorder, the problem becomes even more complex. It is to these problems, that we now turn.
Special Education Areas with an Affected Language Component – Two Examples

Several disorders that fall under special education have characteristics that put such learners at greater risk of being bullied. One of these is Asperger Syndrome. This disorder is sometimes placed within the autism spectrum; however, those with Asperger’s typically have normal to above normal intelligence. Along with this, though, is a problem with pragmatics – how to use language. Because of this, expectations are often not met, thus setting the student with Asperger’s up for being bullied. Characteristics of Asperger Syndrome include: lack of eye contact, self-soothing behaviors (e.g., rocking), lack of turn-taking skills (i.e., the “give and take” of conversation), an intent focus on specialized topics, lack of comprehension of humor/jokes (which results in a literal rather than non-literal interpretation), verbosity, poor social skills in general, clumsy body language, and unusual body alignment/physical awkwardness (Mah, 2009). These characteristics often result in a student with Asperger Syndrome being a loner and thus an easy target for bullies. With so many characteristics that make such a student different, as well as the problem with pragmatics that causes misinterpreted social cues from both directions, the situation can easily seem overwhelming. Now, if the additional layers of a second language and cross-cultural differences are included, it is easy to understand why this special education population would be at significant risk for bullying.

Another type of special education population, one that is rarely considered such, is that of the gifted and talented (GT). These students are also at greater risk of being bullied due to the following characteristics: a perception of arrogance and entitlement; a sense of superiority or bragging behavior; an appearance of aloofness, defiance, and disrespect; seemingly evasive answers due to “responding to nuances or perspectives unanticipated by [the] listener” (Mah, 2009, p. 50-51); a lack of awareness that others’ perspectives do not match their own; an aura of bossiness as they instruct others in how to complete tasks; a discourse style that appears intimidating and dominating; the perception of having a negative attitude due to frequent use of ridicule and sarcasm; and a tendency to talk about themselves with undue frequency (Mah, 2009). Again, it can be seen that these characteristics will set these students apart as being different; and again, once the additional layer of cultural and linguistic diversity (CLD) is woven in, these students also are at increased risk of bullying.

Asperger’s Syndrome and GT are just two special populations that are at risk; those with cognitive impairments, behavior disorders, and learning disabilities also are prime targets. And as the degree of difference expands to include cultural and linguistic diversity, the risk increases further. It should be noted, as well, that the misreading and misinterpretation of social cues goes in both directions: those with disorders, along with CLD students, do not understand why they are being targeted as they are not able to process or fully understand the linguistic and cultural expectations, while bullies do not understand an operating system beyond their own. The question for teachers becomes: what needs to be explicitly and repeatedly taught in order to help CLD learners and special populations become less noticeable to bullies? In other words, how can characteristics of these groups be “dampened down” or “muffled” so as to draw less attention? Though a challenging task, it becomes incumbent upon teachers and other education personnel to work with all populations of students, in multiple ways, in order to decrease the incidence of bullying. Yet teachers often make the situation worse.

Misperceptions: Teachers as Contributors to the Problem of Bullying
Teachers often contribute to the problem, albeit unknowingly, due to their erroneous beliefs about bullying and victimization. Espelage and Swearer (2004) detail the following bullying myths:

- “Bullying is just a normal part of childhood.”
- “Bullying is child’s play.”
- “Name-calling, spreading rumors, or purposefully embarrassing a student is simply kids being kids.”
- “Children will outgrow bullying.”
- “Only boys bully.”
- “Bullying happens on the way to and from school, not during the school day.”
- “Some children are just born rough.”
- “Some kids ask to be bullied. They act in unusual ways that attract the bully.”
- “Bullies help kids who seem weaker by pushing them to learn to stand up for themselves.”
- “Aggressive behaviors of bullies are related to school frustrations.”

(Espelage & Swearer, 2004, pp. 309, 315, 317)

As noted, the above are all myths, yet they remain prevalent in teachers’ perceptions and in schools. In contrast, reality is that children need to be socialized in appropriate behavior. That although the number of bullies decreases over time, the incidence and severity of bullying increases; that bullying leads to isolation and rejection which can have long-term severe consequences including suicide; that bullying is on-going throughout the day, though increases when the presence of adults is not felt; that bullying is a socially learned behavior; that bullying is a power issue that must be solved by teachers; and that blaming the victim is not appropriate (Espelage & Swearer, 2004). That being said, how does one go about shifting views from myth to reality? Or are these misperceptions even prevalent in one’s own school? A further question is whether, due to political correctness, educators indicate they understand the reality, but, in fact, continue to hold the misperceptions as truth. This becomes a much more difficult situation for the schools to deal with, not only on a more global level, but also for those individuals being bullied, as it appears on the surface they are being supported when they are not – a situation, in a way, of being doubly bullied. Therefore, it is crucially important to find out teachers’ true beliefs about bullying, as well as the administrative stand, as these will determine what kind of intervention plan can be implemented.

Just as there are misperceptions on bullying, there are misperceptions regarding intervention strategies as well. Here, again, Espelage and Swearer (2004) offer the most common myths.

- “Teachers ‘can’t’ intervene in bullying situations because they lack adequate training and skills.”
- “Intervening will only add ‘fuel to the fire’ and result in continued or increased bullying.”
- “It is best to ignore bullying incidents.”
- “Teachers cannot change the way children are treated at home.”
- “If the teachers do not see bullying as it takes place, there’s nothing they can do about the behavior, because they cannot be sure it really happened.”
- “There isn’t enough time during the school day to address bullying incidents or to introduce issues related to bullying into the curriculum.”
- “Teachers want to help their students and hope that students will talk to them, but they really don’t want to create a situation where everyone is tattling on each other.”
- “Bullying is not a problem in a particular class or school.”

(Espelage & Swearer, 2004, pp. 309, 315, 317)

As was seen above, reality is often much different than myth. It takes effort to acquire training and skills, but it can – and must – be done. If bullies find that their behavior does not have consequences, they will continue or even increase it; further, without consequences, there is the tacit statement that their behavior is condoned and accepted which also sends an additional message to those being bullied that teachers do not care about them (Espelage & Swearer, 2004). In addition to lack of training, lack of time to deal with bullying is another concern of teachers. The questions must be asked, however, of how much time does it take to teach a learner who is not in an emotional state, due to fear, that is conducive to learning; how much time does it take to deal with incidences of bullying as they occur; and how much time does it take to help the bully catch up if removed from the classroom for a period of time? Would not this time be better spent in prevention strategies to begin with?

Regarding the fourth myth listed above, it may be true that teachers do not have influence over what occurs in the home, but they do have control over what occurs in their classroom and at school. Since bullying is a socially learned behavior, it follows that other ways of behaving in different contexts (home vs. school) can also be learned. So, what kinds of proactive preventative programs are possible and what kinds of learning across contexts are realistic?

**Intervention**

Intervention programs that have been discussed in the literature include curricular modifications and/or additions in the regular classroom (Breakstone, Dreblatt, & Dreblatt, 2009), school-wide student leadership training, peer mentoring, and experiential learning through social theater (Sullivan, Cleary, & Sullivan, 2004). At the level of the individual, scaffolding of pragmatics, awareness training, teaching of coping mechanisms and character development have been explored (Mah, 2009; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). These one-on-one teacher-student approaches may be most appropriate for those with disabilities. Note, though, that some schools have taken what is termed the No Blame Approach, which appears to consider bullies as being victims themselves due to various life circumstances. Coyne (2011), however, has cautioned against this approach because, for most bullies, the desire for power is stronger than feelings of empathy. In fact, “[t]here is no research to support the notion that bullies express their low self-esteem through aggression. Bullies generally have good self-esteem and are confident and comfortable with their actions” (Coyne, p. 11). Therefore, a carefully designed program, across individual and school levels, that includes a sequence of consequences may be more appropriate.

Attendees at the MITESOL 2012 conference had many ideas for how to improve upon current anti-bullying strategies and programs.² Their suggestions fell into four general areas: training sessions, time issues, direction of perspective, and social justice. Under training, participants suggested anti-bullying workshops for children as well as parents, that include discussion of what the word bully actually means, thus providing a label for previously unlabeled behavior at home. This would serve the purpose of drawing attention to early patterns of behavior that later evolve into bullying, including verbal bullying. Concern was also expressed that many teachers, though they have had previous training, may need retraining. Participants were concerned about teachers who roll their eyes at students, who refer to ELLs as “those kids,”...
and who exhibit an *us vs. them* mentality, all of which sends the implicit message that it is acceptable to be disrespectful and to bully verbally. Tangentially related to this area, there was a suggestion that the school’s D.A.R.E. officer be visible on social media used by students as well as be present at evening events.

Participants also offered suggestions for how to address teachers’ concerns that they do not have enough time to teach respectful behavior. Ideas included the adage of “a stitch in time saves nine,” stressing that if the problem is not addressed while it is small, it will grow into a much larger – and time-consuming – problem. Therefore, explicit lessons on respect must be a priority. One suggestion was to devise content lessons that incorporate an anti-bully or pro-respect theme. If carefully implemented, such lessons would actually be a time-saver if bullying decreases. It was further stressed that ignoring bullying as a time-saving strategy actually increases the amount of bullying that occurs, thus *increasing* the amount of time needed to deal with the problem and decreasing time for content instruction.

The third area involved approaching the problem from a different perspective, namely, supporting positive behaviors rather than focusing on negative behavior. One participant suggested rewarding students for positive behavior by using a token/ticket system that could be used in the school store. The *Be Nice* program that has been implemented in Grandville, Michigan, was mentioned. This is a program where several teams per grade compete for the “Nicest” award. Several participants shared ideas for social contracts: individual social contracts that all students in a class sign stating that they will respect self, peers, and teacher; group contracts that are posted on the classroom wall with signatures by all; and posters displayed throughout the school, created and signed by students, that have a positive message. One participant noted that using the word *fair* rather than *equal* on contracts and posters sends the message that each person receives what they *need* which might not necessarily be the same as others. Another participant shared that saying the “contract caught ya” (i.e., caught being nice) became a positive experience, rather than being caught doing something unacceptable. In these ways, the focus shifts to what is appropriate and respectful, something that all students can strive for, rather than a focus on what is inappropriate that involves only a small portion of the school population.

Finally, participants discussed the idea of a social justice committee at the district level that would provide consistency across all schools in the district. In order for this to be successful, though, it was noted that all teachers must be “on board” with the stated policies, including all support staff and volunteers. Having such a district-wide committee and resulting policies would help ensure that expectations on behavior and consequences were clear and would follow students from grade to grade and school to school. It would also help teachers who might teach different grade levels or in different schools at different times within the district, such as school ESL specialists and speech-language pathologists.

As these ideas are pulled together, the following questions remain: What might feasibly be done to combat the bullying problem in the short term? What might a one-year, 5-year, and 10-year plan look like? And what might a school-wide anti-bullying program – one that specifically addresses the ESL population, most notably the ESL learner with a concomitant disability – ideally look like?

As noted in the introduction, many programs have been found to be ineffective, perhaps due to lack of comprehensiveness, lack of follow-through, or lack of teacher training. What becomes most apparent when viewing the existing literature is that a multifaceted approach, one that includes a shift in perspective, is needed if there is any hope for lasting change.
One example of an intentionally implemented school-wide approach representing a shift away from an anti-bullying perspective toward a model of acceptance can be found in an approach that emerged at Spartan Village Elementary School in East Lansing, Michigan, in the years before it was closed due to district downsizing. Having undergone several transformations over the years, this public school was known for educating local families as well as a large international population, primarily the children of Michigan State University students who lived in university housing and nearby apartments. In 2003, before the school was closed, colorful full-sized flags from nearly 40 countries hung in alphabetical order around the school, welcoming students and visitors alike. Along with native English speakers from the United States, the nearly 275 students from these 40 countries spoke approximately 30 different first languages. Two full-time ELL teachers and a full-time paraprofessional worked with the many students learning English as a second or third language. Needless to say, the linguistic diversity was rich. Additionally, the children represented a wide range of racial, ethnic, cultural, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds, as well as a host of different learning needs.

Spartan Village, established in the 1950’s, was a school with a long tradition of welcoming all students into a learning community. One veteran teacher recalled watching children of different ethnicities and races playing at recess, wishing she could capture their joy on film and use it to teach others what the world should be like. At the school, it was generally felt that children do not see the politics or the biases that adults have, but base friendships upon the quality of the character of their classmates. Teachers often noted that in such a diverse setting, equal does not necessarily mean the same, and that it is more important to provide each child with what s/he, as an individual, needs to learn and grow.

It was upon this long-standing cultural norm of acceptance that a more systematic, proactive approach was codified and implemented in the fall of 2000. After a school-wide election, the cheetah was voted to be the school’s mascot. A second grade teacher, then incorporating the just-held election as part of a unit on elections in a democracy, realized that, in Swahili, the word for cheetah is chui (pronounced “choo-e” or /čui/). She and her class named the newly selected mascot Chui and ultimately wrote what might be called an anti-bullying program with school-wide intention and support around this new mascot. Chui became an acronym standing for Care, Help, Unite, Invite. A simple song, sung to the tune of *Row, Row, Row Your Boat*, became an outline for attitudinal and behavioral objectives in a way that was accessible to children, both conceptually and in terms of concrete actions which could be enacted.

*Care, Help, Unite, Invite*
*This is Chui’s Code*
*Spartan Village kids are great*
*Cuz, this is what we know.*

*Care for your friends at school*
*Help someone each day*
*Unite to meet the goals we set*
*Invite someone to play.*

This simple song gave teachers a way to discuss, describe, and redirect children when necessary, and, most importantly, model expectations for appropriate behaviors with children and with each other. The words provided a template for a proactive positive approach toward
anti-bullying without having to talk about the negative behaviors. It is worth stressing the point that this worked because the words were accessible to children who both already knew and were learning English. They focused on inclusive behaviors that could be noted and enacted. While respect is often used in anti-bulling rhetoric, respect is an abstract concept and less accessible for elementary-aged students. Further, ideas of respect are grounded in cultural norms that mean different things in different communities. Everyone, though, can ultimately understand what it means to help someone each day or invite someone to play.

With the advent of the mascot and the song, what had been a general attitude or norm became a codified approach to acceptance that included teacher modeling and accessible positive behavioral standards that could be discussed and elaborated upon. According to one teacher, what emerged was students caring about each other, respecting each other, and trying to ease the learning difficulties of their classmates.

When the school closed, teachers and parents wrote guidelines for an annual award and grant administered by the East Lansing Education Foundation. The SV G.L.O.B.A.L. Award captures what is at its heart: a shift away from the anti-bullying perspective and toward a model of education that is focused not just on the mere acceptance of all children and their families, but rather a full embrace of everyone who comes through the door of the schoolhouse by providing sound instruction with a focus on proactive, systematic, and intentional recognition of differences in positive ways.

The annual award and grant were developed around the acronym SV G.L.O.B.A.L. (see Appendix A for the full criteria of this award):

- Global Vision of Education
- Learning Community
- Opportunities for Authentic Engagement
- Believing We Can Make a Difference in the World
- Accepting and Accommodating All Children and Families
- Looking to Understand & Meet the Learning Needs of Each Child

Conclusion

This paper began by discussing the incidence of bullying, characteristics of bullying, common triggers for bullying, and reasons teachers need to be aware of the complexity of this phenomenon. Causes for missing critical social cues were then explored, including the problems that culturally and linguistically diverse students experience, as well as the challenges faced by those students with special needs that impact the language realm. From there, common misperceptions regarding both bullying and intervention were discussed before moving on to intervention implementation. Ideas garnered from conference participants who are Michigan educators were shared, along with a description of an exceptional program from the East Lansing area.

The question remains, though, of where do we need to go from here? As specialists in TESOL, we need to begin a broader discussion of how all of this relates to our specific field, especially the situation of the ELL learner with other concomitant challenges. We also need to broaden our discussion to the post-secondary level, where bullying continues to reign, not only student against student, but also student against faculty. And finally, we need to continue to develop comprehensive programs that 1) support the entire school population, 2) address specific subgroups of students who are at greater risk, and 3) specifically work with individuals who are chronic victims and/or perpetrators (Rose, 2011).
Bullying of students, especially those marginalized in some way (ELLs, special needs, cultural differences), is a crucial issue in our service for a better world. It is the hope of the authors that this paper will be a first step in a much-needed discussion on this important issue.

This paper is the merging of two talks on bullying that were given at the MITESOL 2011 and MITESOL 2012 conferences at Western Michigan University and Madonna University, respectively. The first presentation detailed the problem of bullying in relation to ELLs with disabilities. An extension of the talk to include possible intervention strategies was requested, which then became the second presentation the following year.

The following attendees from the 2012 session are gratefully acknowledged for their comments and ideas on possible intervention strategies: Erika Beckett (Wellspring Preparatory High Schools); Glenn Campbell (Pontiac Academy for Excellence); Marie Endres (Grand River Preparatory High School); Maricruz Gutierrez (Grand River Preparatory High School); Shannon Hadley (Novi High School); Amanda Kanaan (Achieve Charter Academy); Andrea Kohls (Novi Middle School); Adriana Ortega (Starkweather Elementary School); James Perren (Eastern Michigan University); Ildi Porter-Szucs (Cambridge Michigan Language Assessments); Tera Schwartz (Lake Orion Community Schools).

D.A.R.E. stands for Drug Abuse Resistance Education, an international cooperative education program between school systems and law enforcement. The goals are to prevent use of illegal drugs, decrease gang involvement, and reduce violent behavior. Further information can be found at www.dare.com.

The first author is indebted to James Perren for emphasizing the need to address student bullying of faculty at the university level, a serious problem of which this author has personal experience.
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Appendix A

SV G.L.O.B.A.L. Award Criteria

Global Vision of Education
Examples might include work in which the nominee:

- Prepares children to fully participate in a diverse, global society,
- Sees the learning environment through the eyes of all students, or
- Creates learning activities that do not overtly, or in subtle ways, discriminate.

Learning Community
Examples might include work in which the nominee:

- Collaborates with colleagues,
- Supports the innovative ideas of colleagues, or
- Is a model of cultural competency in a school or district-wide setting.

Opportunities for Authentic Engagement
Examples might include work in which the nominee creates opportunities where:

- Schoolwork and knowledge reflect the real world,
- Understands that treating all children equally does not mean treating them the same, and/or
- Demonstrates that learning happens in places other than the classroom.

Believing We Can Make A Difference in the World
Examples might include work in which the nominee:

- Welcomes challenges and opportunities to grow, or

Accepting and Accommodating All Children and Their Families
Examples might include work in which the nominee

- Seeks and makes use of parental input,
- Actively welcomes every family into the life of the classroom and school community, and fosters both participation and opportunities for growth, or
- Is an active advocate for all children and families.

Looking for New Ways to Understand and Meet the Needs of Each Child
Examples might include work in which the nominee:

- Sees children through a lens of strength and possibility,
• Engages with children in ways that highlight individual differences and welcome them as learning opportunities, or
• Utilizes ongoing authentic assessments to learn as much as possible about each child and uses that data to accommodate that child.