Viewpoint

Conflict Engagement for Individualized Education Program Team Members

Gregory Abell[a,b] iD

[a] Sound Options Group, LLC, Bainbridge Island, WA [b] Sandbox Leadership, LLC, Bainbridge Island, WA

ABSTRACT

As professionals working in schools, we are often expected to function as teams to meet the unique needs of the children, youth, and families we serve. This provides us the opportunity to work with people of diverse experience, perspective, and expertise. In this context, we will encounter conflict. How we engage this challenge will ultimately determine what is possible. Conflict has the potential to be productive or destructive. Our individual and collective experience with conflict is based on the choices we make in our engagement of this shared experience. Ineffective conflict engagement practices will often compromise trust, erode social capital, and challenge psychological safety. This may result in individual and collective disengagement from the pursuit of a shared objective and be manifested in the avoidance of, and unwillingness to, engage critical complex challenges. We can individually and collectively adopt practices and develop skills for aligning our actions and speaking with what we say we believe that there is value in diversity of experience and perspective. New learning, innovation, and creativity are born in the context of conflict. Effective and intentional conflict engagement practices have the potential to build trust, build social capital, increase the possibilities for innovation and creativity, and improve the capacity to address complex challenges. We can learn to leverage conflict to better serve the needs of the children, youth, and families we serve. In this viewpoint article, we will explore the role of conflict in shared learning, innovation, and creativity in service of children with special needs.

Public Law 94–142 was passed in 1975 to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act (U.S. Department of Education, 1975). It brought the vision of collaboration for families and educators in service of children and youth with unique needs. It was heralded as key civil rights legislation. Students determined to be eligible for these services are entitled to a free and appropriate public education (FAPE), which includes specially designed instruction (SDI) delivered in the least restrictive environment (LRE). While this may seem to be a somewhat straightforward charge, the challenge is that the specifics of these services

and resources are differentially determined for each individual student. The opportunity is that the diverse experience and expertise of a team is focused on the unique needs of the student.

Services are described in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and determined annually by an IEP team. This team, composed of the family and a range of professionals, brings a diversity of experience and expertise to this complex task. Included in this process are the parent or guardian; general education teacher; special education teacher or interventionist; administrator; school psychologist or diagnostician; a speech, occupation, or physical therapist; and the student when appropriate.

The diverse composition of this team presents both the challenge and the opportunity of the process. The challenge of supporting children and youth with unique needs is complex and requires new learning, innovation,

and creativity. This is found in the diversity of experience and expertise of the individual team members and is unfortunately too often experienced negatively as conflict. We tend to have a complex relationship with conflict, and how we individually and collectively engage our differences will determine the value of the experience.

Ineffective conflict engagement practices can often compromise trust; erode social capital; challenge psychological safety; result in individual and collective disengagement from the pursuit of a shared objective; and be manifested in the avoidance of, and unwillingness to, engage critical complex challenges. Effective and intentional conflict engagement practices have the potential to build trust, build social capital, increase the possibilities for innovation and creativity, and improve the capacity to address complex challenges.

Now while I recognize that this is a bit of a generalization, I have found many educators to be conflict averse. Individually and collectively, they will, when possible, avoid conflict. Educator Roland Barth (Barth, 2002) addresses this in his writing about school culture. He says that most every school he has worked with has what he calls "undiscussables." These are issues that need to be addressed but are too often avoided so as to not experience the inevitable conflict that will be encountered. In too many cases, the issues avoided are correlated to individual and collective student success. This can be a problem when it is believed by many that new learning, creativity, and innovations are uncovered in the context of conflicting ideas. Peter Senge (1990) states, "In great teams, conflict becomes productive." "The free flow of conflicting ideas is critical for creative thinking, for discovering new solutions no one individual would have come to on his own" (p. 249). In this viewpoint article, we will explore the landscape of conflict, identify skills and strategies for engaging conflict in service of new learning, and apply this to the context of the IEP team and IEP process.

What Is Conflict?

We experience conflict when interacting with another person or persons; we interpret the interaction as evidencing the presence of an incompatible difference or threat. In a sense, conflict starts between our ears based on what we make our interaction(s) with others mean. We come to believe that the "other's" ideas, suggestions, worldview, and so forth pose some level of threat to us. Or, stated in another way: In any discussion where we are experiencing differences of opinion, we too often believe that there is a right and a wrong answer. From my perspective it is obvious that I am right. Given that we cannot both be right, then you, the other, are obviously

wrong. It is therefore my job to fix this problem by convincing you that I am right, and you are wrong. This is too often our approach in conflict with little energy going toward exploring our divergent ideas.

Understanding the Conflict

Conflicts are very often not about what we think they are about. If this is the case, then a key attribute of those who are effective at engaging conflict is curiosity. What is the conflict about? To help focus our curiosity, what follows are two paradigms used by conflict interventionists to better understand the conflict context.

The first is a fundamental model based on the work of William Ury and Roger Fisher described in their book, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (Fisher & Ury, 1991). When people come together to address a shared issue, they typically bring their position to the conversation. Positions express a person's perspective (interpretation) of the issue along with a suggested solution or course of action for best addressing the issue. When positions are perceived to be compatible, there is no problem. However, when parties believe that their individual positions threaten each other, they experience conflict. This is where self-awareness and the recognition of choice become critical. The choice is to defend your position or to suspend judgment and work to identify and understand the interests driving your position and the position of others. In this context, your position expresses "what" you want. The interests are "why" this is important to you. Interests include your objectives, values, needs, and so forth. A wise decision is not found in a compromise between positions. A wise agreement is one that meets as many shared and independent interests as possible.

Examples that might show up in the context of an IEP include the following:

- Position: Provide SLP services in a small group instead of one-on-one setting.

- Interest: Integrate social emotional learning with language/communication development.

- Position: Addition of a full-time instructional aide.

- Interest: Successful implementation of a new behavior intervention plan.

- Position: Refusal of request for full-time instructional aide.

- Interest: LRE.

- Position: Services provided in the student's neighborhood school.

- Interest: Opportunities to develop relationships with children in the neighborhood.

- Position: Serving children with low incidence needs in centralized locations.

- Interest: Effective allocation of resources.

In our context, the role of the IEP team is to identify the common and independent interests of the team related to the delivery of FAPE and use these interests as the criteria for defining FAPE and developing the IEP. I stated earlier that we experience conflict when interacting with another person or persons; we interpret the interaction as evidencing the presence of an incompatible difference or threat. Chris Argyris (Senge, 1990), business theorist and a key thinker around the notion of learning organizations, developed the "Ladder of Inference" as a model for explaining how people process information and make meaning.

Visualize a ladder as we stand at the base in our process of making meaning out of an experience. At the base of the ladder, we encounter, engage, and experience the world around us. We step to the first rung be attending to specific experiences. Certain things catch our attention. What we pay attention to is influenced by our past, our expectations, our values, and so forth. We move to the second rung by adding meaning to what draws our attention. This is a critical shift from facts (actual events) to creating our interpretation of these facts. As we continue to the third rung, we form assumptions based on the meaning we attach to the events, and at fourth rung, we draw conclusions as to what this means for us. At the fifth rung, these beliefs are adopted and/or reinforced. Finally, upon reaching the top of the ladder, we act on these beliefs, the results of which become a framework for the interpretation of new experiences and data.

Let's apply this model to the interpretation of conflict. You are having a conversation on your team and are in the process of sharing your perspective. While sharing, you notice two people turning to talk to each and while doing so glancing in your direction and shaking their heads. You notice this behavior as it is so different from everyone else who are clearly interested in and paying attention to your input. What do you make this behavior to mean? It is obvious that they don't agree with what you are sharing and are discussing their disagreement. They clearly do not respect your ideas and are not interested in understanding your point of view. You better get ready to defend yourself and be cautious with these two. We now have what we refer to as a conflict story, and going forward, we will be very sensitive to evidence that supports this story.

How do these models inform the work of an IEP team? Teams can become polarized and/or reach impasse over a suggestion, request, or proposal made by the family or participant from the LEA. All attention becomes focused on the specifics of the suggestion and reasons for disagreement with little curiosity as to the needs, objectives, and interests underlying the suggestion. The determination of FAPE is made in the context of a shared understanding of the common and independent interests of the team members. The work of the team is to identify, explore, understand, and possibly prioritize these interests in developing an IEP.

In conversations focused on shared decision making, we are constantly making meaning about what we are hearing from others. Where there is disagreement, we are talking about important issues, and there are strong emotions; it is easy to misinterpret the input of others. An instructor I had years ago said that in contexts such as this, we need to "shift from judgement and fear to curiosity and compassion." We need to shift from debate to dialogue in which our objective is to reach a deeper, richer, shared understanding of our common challenge.

Enduring Conflict

Dr. Bernard Mayer, in his book, *Staying With Conflict: A Strategic Approach to Ongoing Disputes* (Mayer, 2009), takes a more nuanced look at conflict by describing what he refers to as the Six Faces of Conflict (p. 21). What is common among the first five faces of conflict (low impact conflict through stubborn conflict) is that they are for the most part resolvable given a sufficient commitment of time, attention, and resources. In comparison, enduring conflict, his sixth face, is fundamentally not resolvable. Mayer (2009) states:

> Enduring conflict is that aspect of a dispute that is embedded in structures, systems, values, or identity and will therefore not be resolved through short-term, resolution-oriented conflict interventions. Enduring conflict is long lasting because of its nature, not because of ineffective or inappropriate efforts to resolve it. Until the roots of the conflict change, the system evolves, or the identity or values-based element are profoundly transformed, the conflict will remain, although how it is manifested may vary over time. (p. 24)

Conflict experienced in the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, n.d.) is often of this enduring nature. Let me provide an example. The fundamental issue addressed by the IEP team is the determination of FAPE. As a parent, how will I most likely define FAPE? Whatever I believe my child needs to

be successful. As educators, how will we determine FAPE? Whatever is "appropriate" given a range of factors (including funding, which we are not supposed to talk about). This creates a tension that will be addressed at many meetings of the IEP team. By creating awareness of the context of enduring conflict, Mayer recognizes the importance of dispute resolution capacity, but also the capacity for being with, effectively engaging, and navigating enduring conflict over time. Mayer goes on to say that when working in the context of enduring conflict, there is a need to rethink key suppositions driving the challenge. He invites us to step out of the fundamental paradigms of conflict resolution and step into a paradigm of conflict engagement. In this context, our objective is to learn to be with conflict in relationships over time, living in the context of our diversity, and not focus on resolving or fixing this conflict. Our goal is to reach agreements that focus on our mutual purpose in the context of what may be fundamental areas of conflict; maintain relationships characterized by healthy communication; and see conflict as essential for new learning, innovation, and creativity.

Conflict and Teaming

In this viewpoint article, we are focusing our attention on the context of the IEP process and the functioning of the IEP team. Whenever you gather as a team to engage shared work and mutual purpose, your number one function is to engage in shared learning. The work of the group is to share diverse expertise, experience, perspectives, and so forth to create a deeper and more complex understanding of the challenge. While many groups state that they respect and value diversity, this is too often only true until the diversity shows up. Brene Brown, in her book, *Daring Greatly* (Brown, 2012), writes that Kevin Surace, CEO of Serious Materials, and Inc. magazine's 2009 Entrepreneur of the Year, when asked, "What's the most significant barrier to creativity and innovation?" responded:

> I don't know if it has a name, but honestly, it's the fear of introducing an idea and being ridiculed, laughed at, and belittled. If you're willing to subject yourself to that experience, and if you survive it, then it becomes the fear of failure and the fear of being wrong. (Brown, p. 186)

When we claim to respect diversity of opinion and then attack and/or ridicule the person(s) sharing diverse ideas, we are out of integrity with our commitment to divergent thinking and new learning. Trust and safety are compromised, and people disengage from the work. This happens far too often and seriously compromises our individual and collective effectiveness at addressing complex issues.

The Nature of the Work

When I started working in this context in 1979 as a new school psychologist, the IEP document in my LEA was three to four pages long. Suffice it to say that it is now considerably longer. In my experience, this increase in pages does not necessarily represent better services but rather focuses on the increased need to document program compliance. I was having dinner with a group of educators several years ago and asked how their LEA defined a good IEP. The rather quick response was that it needed to be legally defensible. Now I believe in the importance of legal compliance; however, I do not believe that the primary function of the IEP team is to produce a legally compliant document. The purpose of the team is to determine FAPE for an individual student and then document the plan addressing compliance and implementation.

Ronald Heifetz of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, in his book, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Heifetz, 1994), differentiates between two types of work in which groups and teams are most often engaged. Technical work involves the engagement of a technical challenge. "Technical problems are those that, in some sense, we already know how to respond to them" (p. 71). Technical work is about accessing existing learning to solve the problem or address the challenge. For example, there may be a single solution as defined by policy or a procedure or what everyone acknowledges as best practice. Or there might be a range of viable options for the group to choose from. The work in this case is to decide what best meets the need of the actual context. Technical work consists of accessing and applying existing learning.

Adaptive work is more complex. In adaptive work, "the problem definition is not clear-cut, and technical fixes are not available. Learning is required to both define challenges and implement solutions" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 75). New learning at the individual and collective levels is the core work. Beliefs and assumptions must be challenged. I believe that adaptive work is at the heart of the IDEA. SDI and the determination of an FAPE is fundamentally adaptive work. This requires us to leverage the value of our diversity of experience and expertise.

Conversations as the Context

Interpersonal conflict is experienced and most often engaged in the context of a conversation. Every conversation has a structure. We can influence the structure of the

conversation and therefore the outcome by the choices we make individually and collectively.

In their book, *Difficult Conversations: How to Discuss What Matters Most* (Stone et al., 1999), authors Stone, Patton, and Heen provide a framework for understanding the structure of a difficult conversation. When we enter a difficult conversation, we too often approach it as a debate, our goal being to prove who is right and who is wrong and to win the conversation. Deborah Tannen in her book, *The Argument Culture: Moving From Debate to Dialogue* (Tannen, 1998), speaks to our strong propensity as a culture to this orientation to conversations about complex issues. This ongoing challenge is addressed in more recent literature such as *I Never Thought of It That Way* by Monica Guzman (2022) and *High Conflict: Why We Get Trapped and How We Get Out* by Amanda Ripley (2021).

By contrast, Stone, Patton, and Heen advocate that we adopt a learning approach by which we bring a different set of objectives to the conversation. At a most fundamental level, we enter the conversation with curiosity. We believe that while we may know a lot about the issue(s), we do not know what the other person knows, and while we might not agree with the other person, we acknowledge that we will know more if we are willing to listen. In service of curiosity, we bring a sense of presence to the conversation. We are present and open to the opportunity for new learning. Finally, a learning stance has us engaging the conversation at integrity with what we often state as a core value, a respect for diversity of opinion.

In the book, *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together* (Isaacs, 1999), author William Isaacs introduces a schema for describing an unfolding conversation. In his model, he describes what he refers to as choice points, in which the choices participants make in the context of these phases of and unfolding conversation will influence the structure of the subsequent conversation, the parties experience of each other, and the outcome. In his model, when engaged in a conversation where there are differences of opinion, strong emotions, and important issues at stake, we initially engage in deliberation which means to "weigh out" (p. 37). In other words, we think about what is being said. At this point, participants tend to make one of two choices: suspend judgment or defend their point of view.

Suspending judgment starts with an awareness that I am making a judgment about you, your perspective, your ideas. I choose to dis-identify with this judgment and choose to "listen without resistance" (p. 41). My goal is to understand your thinking and point of view more deeply.

When describing the choice to defend, Isaac says:

The word defend comes from roots that mean "to ward off an attack." This is a billiard ball model of conversations. In a discussion people see themselves as separate from one another. They take positions to put forth arguments and defend their stakes. (p. 41)

When we choose to suspend judgment, we are engaging with a learning stance. When we choose to defend ourselves, we are engaging with a debate stance.

We have explored the landscape of conflict and the role it plays in shared decision making and the IEP process. We will now shift our attention to skills and strategies for individually and collectively improving our relationship to this challenge.

Effectively Engaging Conflict

There are core concepts, processes, and skills for engaging conflict. These are not simply a set of tools, but core competencies that include both attention to what we are doing and how we are being as we engage conflict. What follows are 10 essentials for effectively engaging conflict.

Mutual Purpose/Mutual Benefit

As a culture, we place a high value on individualism. While we exist independent of each other, we are interdependent with one another. This is true when we choose to be part of a team to pursue some mutual purpose. This is at the heart of the work of an IEP team. Team members explore and jointly understand their common and individual perspectives, ideas, needs, objectives, and so forth. The team is committed to collaborate to maximize their ability to address common and independent needs and objectives in service of defining FAPE for the student.

Curiosity

One of the first casualties of conflict is curiosity. In her book, *The Last Word on Power* (Goss, 2010), Tracy Goss introduces the notion of the Universal Human Paradigm. These are the elements of the paradigm. I believe that there is a way things should be. When they are the way I believe that they should be, things are right with the world. And when they are not the way they should be, there must be something wrong with me, with you, or with it and we need to fix it. Since there is obviously nothing wrong with me and I cannot fix it, then the only choice left for me is to fix you.

Or, stated in another way: In any discussion where we are experiencing differences of opinion, there is

obviously a right and a wrong answer. From my perspective it is obvious that I am right. Given that we cannot both be right, then you are wrong. In the context of the Universal Human Paradigm, it is my job to fix this discord by convincing you that I am right, and you are wrong.

It is our propensity to fall into this paradigm that compromises our effectiveness in navigating conflict. We become polarized, and our thinking and behavior becomes focused on defending our perspective. Very little effort, if any, is directed at understanding the thinking of the person whom we now see as our adversary.

The value in conflict is not found in fixing it, but rather in acknowledging and understanding the differences. Again, while we state as a core value, our respect for diversity of opinion, this respect is often absent from our challenging conversations. It is at times like these that we must increase our capacity for curiosity.

Self-Awareness

Most of us have developed a way of being when confronting conflict. While in many cases, our response is somewhat situation specific, we tend to have a default response or style. Over the years, I have learned that it is not about differentiating a right style from a wrong style. For the most part, one can identify both pros and cons of just about any style of conflict engagement. The point is that our ability to be effective is dependent on a level of self-awareness as to what we tend to do.

Effectiveness in conflict engagement is built on making intentional choices to bring our action and our speaking into alignment to a commitment to mutual purpose and healthy interdependence. In support of self-awareness and healthy choice, I propose the following questions to guide you:

- **Who is the situation calling me to be?** What is my responsibility as I engage this challenge?

- **Who am I committed to being?** What is my personal relationship and commitment to participating in this challenge?

- **What will I choose to do?** How will align my behavior (action and speaking) with my responsibilities and commitments?

Inquiry

The conversations we have are determined by the questions we ask. In general, questions focused on divergent thinking are intended to increase our shared thinking and our understanding of an issue. They are designed to take the conversation into deeper understanding of the complexity of a subject. They are questions that push the conversation beyond the known into the unknown. Questions intended to support divergent thinking focus on increasing our awareness of alternatives, encourage open discussion, are designed to gather diverse points of view, and facilitate unpacking the deeper structure of a challenge. This is how we mine conflict for its potential value. This is how we leverage individual and collective curiosity to create shared learning and understanding. In conflict, it is how we move from me to we.

Advocacy

It is my experience that many who are uncomfortable with conflict are also uncomfortable requesting what they need or sharing what they think. Initiating a request or sharing a divergent opinion is seen as risky. Our comments might be perceived as critical of the other and serve to upset the relationship. There is also a risk of having the request denied, the opinion ignored, and the subsequent conflict that may emerge. Maybe it is just easier not to ask or share.

The question we too often face is this: Is this context safe, and are these trustworthy people with whom to share my thoughts and ideas? At a basic level, we engage in a cost/benefit analysis. What are the risks of sharing my perspective on this topic? What is possible, or what are the potential benefits of putting forth my ideas? While these questions may be valid, our analysis of the situation does not always provide a complete or accurate understanding of the situation. We too often focus on the risks and lose sight of the benefits.

Asking the question, "Should I share?" may be appropriate. However, the fundamental question needs to be: How do I put forth what I need to share in a way that will make it easy for the others to hear, understand, and respond? How do I clarify my intent to focus on mutual benefit when you interpret my sharing as rebuttal? How do I stay at integrity with my commitment to our mutual purpose?

Synthesis

In the book, *Crucial Conversations: Tools for Talking When Stakes Are High* (Patterson et al., 2002), the authors introduce the notion of a "pool of shared meaning" (p. 21). This represents the collection of personal opinions, theories, and experiences that inform us on any issue. Effective conflict engagement invites the creation

of a "shared pool of understanding" from our individual pools. Synthesis is the creation of this shared pool.

What is essential to acknowledge at this point is that we are not describing a place of total agreement. We often refer to a process of reaching common ground, and while we will experience points of agreement, this is not the whole picture. My experience in creating shared pools of meaning is that they include elements of agreement, elements of on-going confusion, uncertainty, and lack of clarity and elements of what may be on-going strongly held differences. Fundamentally, we have created a more comprehensive and complex picture of the issue(s) being explored. We have also experienced a level of shared learning that will be the foundation for shared and innovative ideas and action.

Moving Forward

An early lesson from alternative dispute resolution is that the objective is not about resolving the past but moving forward toward a more desired outcome. It is believed that successful engagement of the presenting conflict will get the parties "unstuck" and create a foundation for moving forward with mutual purpose and in pursuit of mutual benefit. While agreements are reached about issues related to the current manifestation of the conflict, the deeper conflict remains. Our goal is to engage the current challenge with respect for our divergent perspectives and ideas, so as to sustain our relationship and commitment to our mutual purpose.

Dealing With Imperfection

In his book, *Staying With Conflict: A Strategic Approach to Ongoing Disputes* (Mayer, 2009), author Bernard Mayer describes some of the dilemmas of engaging and being with enduring conflict:

- No comprehensive solution will solve the problem, but the problem must be addressed.

- Struggle is necessary; cooperation is essential.

- Decisions must be made in condition of profound uncertainty.

- Need to live with ambiguity but find the energy that derives from clarity.

This articulates some of the challenges faced by the IEP team in the determination of FAPE. Much of the language used to date to describe our work focuses on the goal of conflict resolution. If you and I can just sit down and have a productive conversation, we will resolve our differences, and everything will be great. I do not mean to disrespect, in any way, the work of alternative dispute resolution. I do want to point out that the work of the IEP team is very complex. It is at times messy work and often moving forward does not always look like what we would like it to look like.

Years ago, I asked an early mentor of mine what they thought were the key characteristics of those committed to the effective engagement of conflict. Optimism and perseverance were the reply. These still seem appropriate in the face of profound uncertainty and imperfection.

Long-Term Perspective

We can no longer define the engagement of conflict as a discrete event in time. For those of us who define ourselves as conflict averse, we must shift out of the paradigm that conflict is something to be resolved or fixed, so that we can make it go away. Too often when faced with this reality, we choose to avoid the conflict and live in what author Scott Peck in his book, *The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace* (Peck, 1987), refers to as "pseudo-community" (p. 86), or denial of our areas of difference. Conflict is part of our daily existence. This longer-term perspective does not simply mean learning more skills and strategies for managing conflict but calls us to fundamentally change our individual and collective relationship to this experience. If it is true that conflict is a context for new learning and we are committed to life-long learning, well, you see the connection.

Conflict Engagement

When asked why they choose to work as part of a team, many will identify the value of the diversity of perspective and experience as part of their response. If this is true, then we are not always well served when we are focused on managing, resolving, or fixing these differences. We must increase our capacity to engage, be with, and explore conflict for the value to be found. We must confront our desire to avoid conflict and learning to engage it with some level of hope and optimism. As I write these words, I struggle a bit with the sense that I will be perceived as being naïve. And yet, I believe that our ability to pursue our shared purpose in a range of contexts requires this shift. This is essential in the context of implementation of the IDEA in the work of an IEP team.

Conclusions

The IDEA entitles students to a FAPE. However, the determination of FAPE is the work of the IEP team who

makes this determination for each individual student based on their individualized need. This requires us to leverage our diversity of expertise, experience, and perspective in service of the unique needs of the children and families we serve. Both how we engage this work and the agreements we reach will impact student success. This is reflected in the following quote from an article in the *Education Leadership* journal entitled, "Improving Relationships Within the Schoolhouse" (Barth, 2006), by Roland Barth:

> One incontrovertible finding emerges from my career spent working in and around schools: The nature of relationships among the adults within a school has a greater influence on the character and quality of that school and on student accomplishments than anything else. (p. 1)

Our ability as adults to collaborate in service of the complex needs of the children and youth that we serve requires us to change our individual and collective relationship to conflict and learn to leverage our diversity in service of this work.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

References

Barth, R. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Education Leadership, 63*(6).

Barth, R. (2002). The culture builder. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8).

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring greatly*. Avery.

Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin.

Goss, T. (2010). *The last work on power*. Rosetta Books.

Guzman, M. (2022). *I never thought of it that way*. BenBella Books.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674038479

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). (n.d.) https://sites.ed.gov/idea/

Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. Currency.

Mayer, B. (2009). *Staying with conflict: A strategic approach to ongoing disputes*. Jossey-Bass.

Patterson, K., Grenny, J., McMillan, R., & Switzler, A. (2002). *Crucial conversations: Tools for talking when stakes are high*. McGraw Hill.

Peck, M. S. (1987). *The different drum: Community making and peace*. Touchstone.

Ripley, A. (2021). *High conflict: Why we get trapped and how we get out*. Simon Schuster.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.

Stone, D., Patton, B., & Heen, S. (1999). *Difficult conversations: How to discuss what matters most*. Penguin Books.

Tannen, D. (1998). *The argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue*. Random House.

U.S. Department of Education. (1975). Public Law 94–142, 94th Congress. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/IDEA-History