**Case Study One**

 **Zurizaday**

The fact that not all students are at the same level does not mean that students are not at the level, or even creating levels in the school structure. In other words, the question of student differences has always been a fact: cognitive heterogeneity has become increasingly prevalent in classrooms, even though social heterogeneity and cultural heterogeneity. But this fact has been handled in very different ways. We will avoid going back to Antiquity or even the Middle Ages on this point, even if everyone remembers that at the university the students who listened to the same teachers had very different ages and came from a diversified curriculum.

 There are three levels of management of student differences and special classroom for instruction. At first the institutional level is then a question of distributing the pupils in different and hierarchical institutions, which can take several forms: primary / secondary, private / public, general / professional, compensation by so-called positive discrimination. An organizational level is the differences are then recorded within the institution itself, which ranks internally by sectors, options, groupings, temporary or permanent specific assignments. Finally pedagogical level assumes that the issue of managing differences between students is taken into account within the class itself, through a pedagogical device that is supposed to respond to everyday reality.

The history of special school policy clearly reminds us. For our part, we will consider here only the pedagogical level and we will retrace the history of the educational consideration of the differences between students in the classes. First, it justifies them by equal opportunities: the school for all is given to all (the same knowledge, the same teachers), so much so that the inequalities do not come from the functioning of the institution but from individuals themselves in their school investment. In short, a whole system is put in place that makes it possible to distribute the different pupils in heterogeneous circuits between them but more homogeneous in each one. Finally, it reduces the internal heterogeneity of each class by a regulatory device responsible for ensuring homogeneity of functioning on behalf of all: grades, classifications, repetitions, non-presentation to exams, etc. The order of the same must prevail: the same class, the same master, the same contents, the same pupils. The simultaneous teaching supposes the maintenance and the succession of the same in the order of the school. He manages the differences by reinforcing the similarities. Somehow, it excludes pluralism in the class to refer to the organization of the school system. But what to do when the latter, for example in the name of the fight against disability or in the name of the single school, reduces its external management of heterogeneity and tends to strengthen it within the class itself, knowing that the simultaneous mode is based on the opposite principle? In general education assume homogeneity is one thing, to live it is another. The idea of ​​different pedagogies within the class will not cease to arise, as we will see. Knowing that the simultaneous mode is based on the opposite principle? Because to assume homogeneity is one thing, to live it is another. The idea of ​​different pedagogies within the class will not cease to arise, as we will see. Knowing that the simultaneous mode is based on the opposite principle? Because to assume homogeneity is one thing, to live it is another. The idea of ​​different pedagogies within the class will not cease to arise, as we will see.

A move to full inclusion a result to the students are separated into small groups and receive learning and assessment tasks that cover the same general subject, but with varying levels of difficulty. Choice of difficulty levels for classroom learning tasks and associated assessments can be done by the student or the teacher. The intervention of the first stage takes place in ordinary class. The teaching methods and pedagogical strategies used here reflect the approaches to pedagogical differentiation and the principles of universal design of learning. Lessons are structured and planned for all students in the class, regardless of anomalies, and curriculum expectations are not changed. Throughout this process, the classroom teacher monitors students' progress to identify those who are struggling and falling behind their peers.**References**
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